When a line of T-72 tanks commanded by troops loyal to Boris Yeltsin opened fire on the Russian White House last October 4, millions of Americans watched live on network television. News accounts reported that hundreds, perhaps thousands, of American citizens called, faxed, or started up their computers to communicate by modem with friends and colleagues in Russia.

Instant communication, often two-way communication, is one of the most important forces fostering the development of new ties between American citizens and their counterparts in other countries. The rapid development of these ties between societies—ties that circumvent and are largely uncontrollable by governments—are dramatically altering the conduct of foreign policy. In fact, according to Michael Clough and David Doerge, "It seems that the traditional view of foreign policy as principally a matter of relations between states and their governments is becoming less valid and less useful."

Clough is a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations and Doerge is a vice president at the Stanley Foundation. Together they organized the Stanley Foundation's 34th Strategy for Peace Conference, held last October 14-16 at Airlie, Virginia. Strategy for Peace is the foundation's annual examination of US foreign policy, traditionally focusing on four topics which are discussed in separate, concurrent sessions. Participants are experts from government or academia, members of "the foreign policy community."

AMERICAN GLOBAL POLICY
-continued on page 2
...societal ties between countries must be given heed because they are helping reshape America’s relations with the world.

Together, Clough and Doerge argue, these factors demand that the examination of relations between two countries go well beyond the typical discussion of government-to-government issues which are the province of traditional foreign policy debates. The societal ties between countries must be given heed because they are helping reshape America’s relations with the world.

**Connected Citizens**

American-Russian relations provide an excellent example of the rising importance of societal ties. The discussion group on this relationship, chaired by Blair Ruble of the Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies, noted that until recently relations between the two countries were dominated by government-to-government contacts focused on security issues.

But in the past five years or so, nongovernmental actors, businesses, cities, states, financial institutions, and private citizens have developed relationships with Russian citizens both in and out of government. This process has raced ahead, in parallel with the decline of the influence of both governments. The Russian government has been in nearly constant turmoil, and the US government has lost its Cold War fighting zeal.

The China group, chaired by Miles Kahler, professor of international relations at the University of California, San Diego, also found widening societal ties, but which are occurring at a slower, more uneven pace. Business and academic links between American and Chinese citizens have grown in recent years. But connections between other groups—e.g., labor and religious organizations—are more “sporadic and furtive.”

The key is that the Chinese government, rooted in Marxist-Leninist ideology, does not allow the development of citizen groups that could challenge the Communist Party. The heavy hand of the Chinese government creates an asymmetry in the dynamic of American-Chinese government/citizen relations. In the United States there are many vocal citizen groups, including Chinese-American organizations, influencing American policy. But a parallel phenomenon is disallowed in China.

Government-to-government contacts are almost dwarfed by citizen connections in the relationship between the US and Mexico. Obviously, the large Mexican-American population (particularly because it is concentrated in the Southwest and Southern California) provides a powerful ethnic tie. But Americans without ethnic ties have also established deep interests and connections in Mexico, e.g., environmental and human rights activists among others.

The “America and Mexico” group, chaired by Rodolfo de la Garza, professor of community affairs at the University of Texas, noted that business ties with Mexico abound as well. And they are likely to grow in the wake of the passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA).
Perhaps the greatest example of US civil society impacting US foreign policy has been the anti-apartheid movement. The report from the "America and South Africa" discussion group acknowledges that the "anti-apartheid struggle was not simple; but the issue had unquestionable moral clarity, and it was easy to tell the good guys from the bad." This resulted in a broad-based, loosely clustered movement that included churches, college groups, trade unions, business leaders, state and local governments, and others. But what now? In the following excerpts from the report by Nancy Bodurth the examine how this enthusiasm and commitment can be used now that South Africa is committed to a reform process:

"Have US anti-apartheid forces dropped the ball on US policy toward South Africa's political transition? Some group members indicated that it is time for the informed community, 'The Community of People Concerned with South Africa's Future,' to shake off the hangover of the anti-apartheid movement's victory celebrations and let their opinions on the current situation be known to policymakers. Debates and differences will emerge within the community of nontraditional actors, based on individual groups' values and priorities, but this should not prevent policymakers from hearing all the perspectives and concerns.

"Once South Africa becomes a 'normal' state, some of the elements of South African society (such as the African National Congress) with which nontraditional actors in the United States formed linkages will be folded into the government. As one participant pointed out, governments act like governments, and they relate to other governments. Continuing the links and relationships to South African nongovernmental organizations will remain an important means for preserving the special societal connections which resulted from the anti-apartheid movement. Further, South African civic organizations will be a critical factor in developing a new state which is truly democratic. As one participant commented, the wealth and variety of societal organizations is a genuine area of optimism. These organizations jealously guard their autonomy and will help keep the new government honest and in line. They are also an appropriate focus for US resources, but it was cautioned not to overly romanticize the grassroots democratic movement. As organizations acquire more access to resources, they can become centers of increased political conflict at the local level, and as one observer put it, there will be 'plenty of local Buthelezis' emerging to get a piece of the pie.

"Although the mass mobilization aspect of the anti-apartheid movement has fallen away, there remains a diffuse collection of activists, advocates, and organizations engaged in activities related to South Africa's political, social, and economic development. The idea was posed that these groups might forge a national network or 'Organization for South African Reconstruction.' The organization could serve as a forum for groups and programs scattered across the United States to exchange information and share ideas. The group agreed that the old movement is over, but a national network could help to rekindle a broader sense of efficacy and solidarity and also could serve as the core of a constituency for South Africa. Even if another mass movement is unlikely, there was concern within the group that more should be done to develop a constituency for South Africa in the post-apartheid era. Despite all of the conceivable land mines, South Africa does have a promising case politically and economically, but it is at risk of being forgotten. Of all the areas of transformation and political change on the globe, South Africa could become the successful transformational society."

—Keith Porter

See page 10 to order the report entitled Shaping American Global Policy.
American citizens’ involvement with South Africans has played a special role in recent history. The report of the discussion group chaired by Edwin M. Smith, professor of law and international relations at the University of Southern California, discusses the significance of the anti-apartheid movement. “[I]t embraced a variety of actors including church-related organizations, trade unions, college campuses, and city governments. These groups formed linkages and relationships with sister organizations, communities, and individuals in South Africa and are proof of the increasing interconnectedness of global and domestic societies.”

Ironically, the anti-apartheid movement prompted the severance of some ties—namely business involvement. Now there is a need to re-establish business connections by working with different actors in South Africa.

**Affecting Policy**

In fact, the South Africa group noted that some people who were active in the anti-apartheid movement hope to launch a movement for South African reconstruction. But others are not clear on how much Americans can do. For example, deepening violence in South Africa and uncertainty about the stability of the coming government hurt the business climate. Yet, some think that promoting socially responsible investing by American firms and investment entities like pension funds could make a difference in South Africa’s economy and society.

Though not as focused as in the days of the anti-apartheid movement, US citizen groups are likely to take part in projects with their South African counterparts, promote socially responsible investing, and continue advocacy and educational outreach. They are likely to remain deeply involved in American-South African relations.

---

**America and Mexico**

**An Ambivalent Relationship**

International trade barriers are coming down, but barriers between people have not. This is particularly true in the case of the United States and Mexico, two countries which share a large border and a long history. The recently concluded North American Free Trade Agreement will enhance the free flow of goods and services between the US, Canada, and Mexico. At the same time, some Americans want to cut down the flow of Mexicans, both legal and illegal, into the US. Others want to curtail the growing influence of Hispanic culture here.

The conference group “America and Mexico” discussed these and other idiosyncrasies that characterize America’s relationship with Mexico. The conference report written by Elizabeth Yeager notes that “while intensely pursuing closer economic ties and cooperation in other policy areas with Mexican federal authorities, American officials are simultaneously antagonizing Mexican authorities and the general public with initiatives such as the Immigration and Naturalization Service blockade of the El Paso-Juarez border. In Colorado, state officials and business groups are positioning themselves to become a focal point of the increased economic activity that will result from Canadian-US-Mexican integration. However, in what is widely recognized as a reaction against Mexican immigration, Coloradans in 1988 voted to make English the state’s official language. In San Diego, the community has for the first time begun identifying itself as a border city, and governmental authorities and community organizations are increasingly collaborating with their counterparts in Tijuana to find ways to deal with common concerns. At the same time, there are strong local protests against Mexican immigration that are now being echoed throughout California, and California also made English the state’s official language in 1988.”

Outside US government circles there are groups working on a number of issues in Mexico such as improving the environment and developing democratic institutions, but the conference participants did not feel the US government is concerned with those issues. “In the group’s view,” the report concludes, “the US government has two objectives: It wants Mexico to do the United States’ ‘dirty work,’ and it wants a good business environment.” The report cited Mexico’s detention of Chinese refugees bound for the United States as just one example of such dirty work.

Mexico’s problematic democracy seems to be of sporadic importance to US policymakers. During the 1980s, conservative Republicans dominated the discussion about Mexico’s need to develop as a democracy. With “the advent of NAFTA, the Americans now raising this issue are made up primarily of NAFTA opponents, i.e., Democrats in Congress, labor...
Clearly, private citizens and their organizations and businesses are likely to remain heavily involved in developing a new relationship with Russia as well. Given Russia’s political and economic instability, it is impossible to predict how relations will develop. Absent strong institutions, citizens must seek out individual contacts. But it is hard to know who to deal with, and cultural differences come into play as well. Furthermore, security issues remain a serious concern and that is still primarily a government-to-government matter.

Both governments and their citizens will necessarily continue to feel their way through the situation; but as the report states, “the involvement of nongovernment actors in Russian exerts a significant influence on the relationship.” In any event the goal is clear: “Americans should want a strong, healthy Russia that is a good trading partner and has good relations with the US.”

The goals of US foreign policy with China are also in transition. There, the effect of societal ties has already been felt; according to the group, “The surge in interest-group demands over the past five years has pushed the US government away from overt strategic concerns imposed by the Cold War.”

American citizen groups can affect both governments’ policies but in different ways. In the United States they function as interest groups promoting their agendas. Pressure on the Chinese government happens more indirectly by supporting Chinese social sectors with which the American groups are able to come into contact. Sometimes the contacts are sanctioned by the Chinese government; other times they are not.
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*High Fives and Border Guards.*

Vice President Al Gore is greeted by Mexican students during a recent visit. A border patrol officer takes a break. Being neighbors is a complex business.

---

activists, human rights organizations, and environmental groups.”

The era of intermittent attention and contradictory positions toward Mexico may be ending since “economic growth and stability have replaced anticommunism in the rhetoric of national security policy.” Conference participants agree that Mexico has attained an unprecedented status among American policymakers and that “Mexico is the linchpin in the spread of free-market democracy throughout the hemisphere.” Most important, nearly every domestic US issue is increasingly related in some way to Mexico: jobs, the environment, health care, social services, immigration, and education.

—Mary Gray Davidson

See page 10 to order the report entitled Shaping American Global Policy.
Regarding issues between the two countries, security is again likely to remain the province of governments. Human rights can be influenced by citizen contacts and by forcing them onto governments’ agendas. Other issues, such as the environment, will most likely be dealt with from the bottom up as citizens work to exchange information on these issues.

A similar disconnect between government concerns and citizen interests is at play in American-Mexican relations. NAFTA has dominated the government agenda. But citizen groups are more likely to be interested in democracy, environment, and human rights issues.

America and China
How Far Can We Go?

In US-China relations, as elsewhere, new information technologies are shrinking the world and changing the role governments play in shaping foreign policy. The report from the “America and China” group says faxes, phones, computers, videos, and satellites are “building a dense and diverse web of interactions between different American and Chinese societies and their respective governments.”

While the Chinese government has increased its effort to restrict private use of satellite receivers and computer modems, this “web” has fostered growing exchanges in the academic and business sectors and, less consistently, in the labor and religious sectors. Chinese citizens have become more aware of global realities—especially following Beijing’s rejection by the International Olympic Committee as a potential host for the 2000 Summer Olympics. And American civil society has become more active in trying to “influence and modify the practices and norms of other countries, including China.” But these positive developments are impeded by China’s communist political system.

In the end, debate over how to deal with the problem of the Chinese government exposed the deepest divisions in the discussion group—divisions reflected in conversations about China at all levels in the United States. Here’s how Myles Nienstadt presented the issue in his report:

“Proponents of the top-down view argued with equal conviction that under the current communist regime...there are distinct and fundamental limits for some nongovernmental entities such as trade unions and religious groups. Under this political system, the government has no incentive to permit these organizations to take shape or to widen social autonomy for these types of groups.”

—Keith Porter

See page 10 to order the report entitled Shaping American Global Policy.
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Furthermore, the discussion group said that border and immigration issues between the two countries may help force a redefinition of sovereignty. The report states, “The historical meanings of borders are inadequate to accommodate changing definitions of markets and for dealing with transnational problems related to the environment and human rights.”

All four discussion groups were energized by the focus on societal ties and the inclusion of participants who have never been considered a part of the foreign policy elite. The dynamism of the groups and the conclusions they reached reinforce the idea that American global policy is, in fact, being reshaped by new forces and new actors.

-Jeff Martin

---

America and Russia
High Stakes

The new Russia is an increasingly fragile state. That fact was underscored in the final months of 1993. Both the bloody October confrontation between President Boris Yeltsin and his parliamentary opponents and the strong showing of Vladimir Zhiri
novsky’s ultranationalist Liberal Democratic Party in the December elections reveal the deep divisions in the government and the vulnerability of President Yeltsin. Through all this, the US has remained committed to Mr. Yeltsin.

While the Clinton administration is now reviewing its Russia policy, US-Russia relations are no longer solely in the hands of government officials. Americans and Russians at all levels are finding ways to help ensure Russia’s transition to a democracy and a market economy. To be sure, there are many opportunists and carpetbaggers and even some criminals taking advantage of Russia’s current opening to the world, but many others truly want to solidify a positive relationship between two of the world’s most powerful nations.

The Stanley Foundation’s conference “America and Russia” examined how these private organizations and citizens are shaping Russian-American relations and their role in the dramatic transformations taking place in Russian society. According to the conference report by Katherine Magraw, “Western commercial enterprises, in particular, now are offered the opportunity to compete for Russian markets, skilled labor, resources, and technology. In addition, the revolution in information sharing and globalization of the economy has facilitated greater integration among societies.... Some American regions and cities are developing independent relations with counterparts in Russia.... Sister city arrangements are becoming increasingly common, and there are even examples of US states establishing and funding public works or humanitarian projects in Russia.” The report is clear to state: “The profit motive is responsible for much American involvement. The enormous Russian market, its highly skilled labor force, and abundant natural resources offer tantalizing opportunities for business.”

Political and ideological factors as well as humanitarian impulses motivate other Americans in Russia. There are numerous “organizations and individuals...bringing Russians to the United States on scholarship to study, helping to draft a new constitution, assisting the arrangements and monitoring of elections, training labor activists, integrating Russian women’s organizations into the international women’s movement, and helping to establish an environmental activist community.”

While Russia presents a “new frontier,” particularly for American business, the United States must still be concerned with traditional security issues such as arms control.

Alarming new issues are emerging as well, including:

• The nuclear status of Ukraine
• Withdrawing and dismantling thousands of nuclear and chemical warheads
• The conversion of defense industries to civilian purposes
• The dangerously decrepit condition of Russian nuclear power plants

For the most part, Russia welcomes the outsiders working with them both on security issues and at other levels of society. But the conference participants stressed the need to be sensitive to cultural differences between the US and Russia. Otherwise, there may be a backlash if Russians feel that Americans are riding roughshod over them, imposing programs and methods inappropriate to their society.

Most important, the report maintains, “American efforts should be aimed at creating a secure environment, that is, an environment with a measure of political stability and free of personal threats of dire economic hardship. Free markets and democracy will prosper over the long term only in a secure environment.”

-Mary Gray Davidson

See page 10 to order the report entitled Shaping American Global Policy.
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Dr. Scott Peck, speaker and best-selling author on psychological and spiritual development, thinks the world stands at “the brink of self-annihilation” because its peoples are disconnected and fragmented. Little wonder then that wars—big and small—dot the globe and that Americans feel hopeless about effectively intervening to stop them. He writes, “I fail to see how we Americans will be able to communicate effectively with the...peoples of other cultures when generally we don’t even know how to communicate with the neighbors next door, much less our neighbors on the other side of the tracks.”

What Is Community?
Community is basically defined as groups of people with something in common—geographic location, interests, culture/lifestyle, or an agenda. People often mourn the loss of community, inferring that it was something their foremothers and fathers had in “the good old days” when people were thought to be safer, more caring, and more understanding. Whether that is myth or reality, it seems to stretch the definition of community to encompass commitment, inclusivity, and consensus as well as safety, caring, and understanding.

The Work of the Foundation
The Stanley Foundation adheres to this expanded definition of community, and nurturing communities of peacemakers is a central theme in the foundation’s work. In particular, four people in the Stanley Foundation’s Outreach Department see the building of communities as their contribution toward the foundation’s goal “of a secure peace with freedom and justice by encouraging study, research, and discussion of international issues.” They strive to build and link communities on a local, state, and regional level among educators, students, church groups, opinion leaders, decision makers, or citizen activists. (See sidebar below for brief descriptions of some of these programs.)

When asked why it is important to think about community as a central theme in their work, Jack Smith, vice president and head of the department, says, “In building communities, what we have said to ourselves is that cohesiveness is lacking in some of these communities, and we can help. Unfortunately, some communities are not large enough yet to help satisfy the objectives of the foundation—we need growing numbers of people involved in the foreign policy decision-making process. Building community, therefore, leads to that ultimate objective.”

Committed, caring people often feel very alone. The foundation tries to help them find each other. For example, a group of Muscatine teachers representing eight elementary buildings, two middle schools, and one high school have joined together in a Global Education Task Force. Mary Steinmaus, one of the foundation’s project coordinators, is a part of that group. She explains its strong sense of community and the satisfaction they have in being a part of it, “Teachers want to connect with others who are doing a lot of global education in their class-

---

**Summer Special**
A 2-week experience for students in grades 5–7 to explore their own values, experience their effect on the planet, have fun with the diversity of their community, and discover their abilities as self-educators.

**Iowa Global Education Association**
An association of K-16 educators striving to infuse a global perspective into Iowa classrooms and communities.

**Iowa Global Village**
A one-week “camping” experience of learning and living together for primarily college-age students from many countries and backgrounds.

**Sister City/Sister State**
People-to-people exchanges emphasize relationships and discovering commonalities. The foundation has been involved in Muscatine’s city partnerships in Argentina, Japan, Russia, and Uruguay.

**Global Cedar Rapids**
A citizen-based organization formed in 1989 to promote community dialogue on world issues through annual conferences.

**All-African Student Conference**
Since 1988 students from across Africa who are studying in North America gather to network in a way that’s difficult to do at home.

**Peace Agenda in Iowa**
Thirteen conferences since 1983 bring together organizational leaders and activists concerned about war and peace and American policy—community-building is more important than is consensus.

**Quad City Conference on Peace and Security**
Ten years ago Iowa church leaders issued a statement against the nuclear arms race and then traveled throughout the state with their message. This conference began as one community’s response and grew into an annual tradition.

For additional information on any of these programs, contact the Outreach Department at the foundation.
rooms. They want that network, those linkages, and then they want to multiply it by incorporating new strategies in their own buildings.”

Encouraging and enabling groups of common citizens to speak out about and act upon their concerns is the basis of much of this work. Dan Clark, a program officer at the foundation for eleven years, says community implies a model of cosponsored programming that includes participation, responsibility, and interchange. He says, “We’re all in this thing together. You have some assets and we have some assets, and you have some knowledge and we have some knowledge, and we’re trying to build something together.”

Building community also means providing reasons for people to form relationships—people from very different places and having very different world views. Clark says, “People-to-people activities engage some people to take note of issues which wouldn’t interest them if it was just a cold presentation of facts. If people are involved in relationships around the world, then they have a reason to do their homework.”

Jill Goldesberry, another of the foundation’s project coordinators, gives this example, “Just think of the people in Iowa who paid more attention to newspaper stories or TV news stories...that had anything to do with the Soviet Union after the Peace Walk came through Iowa [in 1988]. Just the fact that these people marched through their town—and they saw them, they saw Russians for the first time ever—made them more interested in hearing something about where those people came from.”

Building and linking communities at the state and local levels is slow and painstaking work. Results are not immediate, and the frustrations are real. Even then, however, this seemingly problematic part of community-building is solved in community, and the foundation’s Outreach Department is well aware of this dynamic. Clark explains: “There’s commitment and enthusiasm out there that we don’t have. I mean it’s not just about us psyching people up. It’s about us being invigorated in return.”

-Kathy Christensen

After eleven years as a program officer in the Stanley Foundation’s Outreach Department, Dan Clark has left the foundation staff in order to start a new business. Clark & Associates will pursue what Dan calls “friendly work”—consulting and collaborating with individuals and institutions interested in issues of concern to him. Those issues include: mediating disputes, networking with peace activists, assisting with international citizen exchanges, and promoting conflict resolution in the former Soviet republics.

During his tenure at the Stanley Foundation, Dan played a prominent role in the foundation’s support for the establishment of the Iowa Peace Institute. He helped Iowa peace and environmental advocates form a community through a series of “Peace Agenda” conferences, and he was instrumental in helping to develop the sister state relationship between Iowa and the Stavropol region in Russia and the sister city relationship between Muscatine and Kislovodsk. At the same time, he spent countless hours supporting individuals throughout the Midwest who wanted to organize events in their local communities.

Within the foundation’s walls, Dan was a leading advocate for acquiring new computer and communications technologies. The “filing system” he piled in, on, under, and around his desk, chairs, and credenza will forever be a legend. (Amazingly, he could usually find what he wanted.)

In announcing Dan’s departure, Jack Smith, vice president and head of the Outreach Department, said, “Dan has been a valued, respected staff member these past 11 years and has accomplished much. We are most grateful for his intellect, effectiveness, and compassion. Our best and fondest wishes accompany Dan wherever he goes, whatever he does.”

Indeed.

-Jeffrey Martin
Common Ground
Selected Cassettes

9351/9401—Puerto Rico
A two-part look at Puerto Rico’s political future and the effort to reclaim the island’s cultural identity. (December 1993/January 1994)

9349/50—South Africa’s New Dawn
A two-part series on the hopes and fears shaping a new South Africa and how Americans can help. (December 1993)

9343—Women’s Rights: Toward Beijing
A talk with the secretary-general of the 1995 Fourth World Conference on Women. (October 1993)

9340—Diamonds in Their Souls
Diamonds, DeBeers, and apartheid in South Africa. (October 1993)

9338—Measuring Human Progress
A talk with the principal author of the UN’s annual Human Development Report. (September 1993)

9326—The Consumption Treadmill

9324—The Dumping Ground
A visit to the site in Luis Alberto Urrea’s book, Across the Wire: Life and Hard Times on the Mexican Border. (June 1993)

9323—Dismantling the Defense Economy?
Government, military, business, and labor experts tackle the tough issues of defense conversion in a global economy. (June 1993)

9312—Moyer’s on Healing
What does the quality of health care say about a society? That’s just one of many questions posed to Healing and the Mind author Bill Moyers. (March 1993)

9309—Cuba: The Daily Struggle
9311—Cuba: Inviting the World
9313—Cuba: Democratic Reform?
9315—Cuba: Human Rights and the World
This four-part series examines the crucial issues facing Cuba in the 90s. (March/April 1993)

9302—Russia’s Painful Rebirth
9304—Russia’s Rebirth: Expression
9306—Russia’s Rebirth: Foreign Relations
9307—Russia’s Rebirth: Religion
This four-part series looks at the difficult transition going on in all aspects of Russian life. (January/February 1993)

9252—In the Kindergarten of Global Management
UN veteran Robert Muller says he’s more optimistic about the future of humankind than at any other time. (January 1993)

Cassettes of the foundation’s radio program Common Ground are available at the following prices:

- Single program cassettes: $9.95
- Two-part series cassettes: $15.95
- Four-part series cassettes: $27.95

Shipping is an additional $1.75 for a single cassette, plus $.50 handling for any additional cassettes per order.

TO ORDER CASSETTES CALL TOLL FREE:
(800) 825-5746

Publications

Single copies free, see order form for multiple-copy charge. Blue entries indicate new publications.

Changes & Transformations

Shaping American Global Policy: The Growing Impact of Societal Relations
New actors are emerging to shape America’s global relations. This report examines how these society-to-society interactions have impacted the policymaking process. Specifically, four bilateral relationships were discussed:
- America and China
- America and Mexico
- America and Russia
- America and South Africa
October 1993, 52 pp.

Global Changes and Domestic Transformations: The Midwest and the World
An examination of the Midwest perspective on America’s changing relations with the world. September 1993, 16 pp.

Global Changes and Domestic Transformations: Southern California’s Emerging Role
A diverse group of the region’s thinkers and doers examined possibilities and tensions created when developing global policies, especially economic policies, that are mainly local and regional rather than national. May 1993, 28 pp.

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.

United Nations

The UN Role in Intervention: Where Do We Go From Here?
As the public increasingly looks to the UN to intervene in crises, the organization must improve its ability to respond politically, economically, and militarily. June 1993, 32 pp.

Political Symbol or Policy Tool? Making Sanctions Work.
Participants strongly supported the development of the United Nations’ ability to support effective application of sanctions, which includes enhancing UN operational capacity. February 1993, 24 pp.
The United Nations and Multilateral Sanctions: New Options for US Policy?
Renewed global interest in multilateral sanctions challenges conventional wisdom that "sanctions don’t work" and raises important analytical and practical questions regarding their utility as a policy instrument. October 1992, 16pp.

Changing Concepts of Sovereignty: Can the United Nations Keep Pace?
How should the UN respond to this question, considering the organization is both an advocate of national sovereignty and yet an instrument for limiting it? July 1992, 36pp.

Security and Disarmament

Preventing Weapons Proliferation: Should the Regimes Be Combined?
Weapons proliferation has been identified by many as the primary security concern of the post-Cold War era. This conference is the first attempt to bring together experts from all areas to examine the synthesis and integration of nonproliferation efforts. October 1992, 40pp.

Human Rights

International Human Rights and US Foreign Policy.
Human rights advocates met to reflect on the work of the human rights community; on its impact, shortcomings, and accomplishments; and on the issues, responses, and approaches to consider in charting a future course in the post-Cold War era. October 1992, 20pp.

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.

Publications Order Form

Call toll free: (800) 825-5746 to order cassettes.
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Press Review sample</td>
<td>Free*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common Ground catalog</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publications (please print)</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
Fax (319) 264-0864

*Quantity Orders
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<table>
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</tr>
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Old Titles Still Available


Change and Stability in the Middle East: How Do We Get There From Here? September 1991.


Foreign Aid Beyond the Cold War. October 1990.

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.
What Women Want

The United Nations' Fourth World Conference on Women is scheduled for 1995 in Beijing. Previous conferences have been held in Mexico City (1975), Copenhagen (1980), and Nairobi (1985). Late last year, the secretary-general of the upcoming conference, Gertrude Mongella, was a guest on Common Ground, the Stanley Foundation's weekly radio program on international affairs. The following are excerpts of her conversation with Common Ground producer Keith Porter. To order an audio cassette of this program (#9343), please see the ordering information on page 10.

Gertrude Mongella: The logic of the conference we are going to hold in Beijing is to evaluate what we have achieved since Nairobi. We [also] have to come out with a platform for action. The national preparations are going to be a very, very important process because that's where the women are.

Tell me what you think were the most important achievements of the 1985 Forward Looking Strategies document from the Nairobi conference.

Mongella: That document achieved one thing. Every time people are asking, What do you women want? So in 372 paragraphs we've been able to answer that question.

Tell us how you hope this conference will address violence against women.

Mongella: There is more violence within the family. And that is sort of an irony. Because in the family is where you have the beloved ones. And that's where the violence starts—between husband and wife. And because of traditions, taboos, values, and stereotypes of families, the women were silent. The UN conferences have offered an opportunity for women to network and learn to speak. Now the silence has been broken. So we are seeing more of the violence in the family than we used to see.... Society is made up of several families.... So if a brother is supposed to kick a sister and everybody says its okay, and a husband is supposed to batter a wife and everybody says okay, what then limits the neighbor to mistreat the woman? This is one of the critical issues we are going to deal with. It links to peace, because when you have a violent society, there is no peace. And when there is no peace, there is no development.

So often women are left out of the planning of development projects and are then expected to do most of the work in implementation. How do you expect the group will deal with the issue of development?

Mongella: If you just say, "women are left out,” then [people] say, “well, why don't you become members of parliament” and so on. Say you want to make Africa self-sufficient in food production. Whom do you address? It's the women. They do 80 percent of the agriculture production. Once we grab that economic power it is easier to get into the political power. ...I wish there was a strike where women could just sit down and not produce and see what would happen.

How can this conference help women move from rights on paper to rights in practice?

Mongella: At Beijing we are trying to see if we can get to the point where women become the actors. And the government is brought in to feel that it has an assignment to do. If we can develop that concept, we might be in a stronger position. We think the woman is so vulnerable, but how can this woman be vulnerable who is feeding everyone?

excerpted by Keith Porter

Consider This...

What Can We Afford?

Billions of $US

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cigarettes in Europe (Per Year)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Entertaining in Japan (Per Year)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beer in the USA (Per Year)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Hong Kong Airport</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Basic Needs (Per Year)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UNICEF estimates that $25 billion per year could control the major childhood diseases, halve child malnutrition, reduce child deaths by 4 million a year, bring safe water and sanitation to all communities, provide a basic education for all children, and make family planning universally available.
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