In traditional US policy toward the Mexican regime, stability has been stressed above all,” according to Professor Jorge Castañeda from the National Autonomous University of Mexico. And yet, stability in Mexico is facing its greatest challenge in the last fifty years. Mexico’s government has long been seen as authoritarian and its election process undemocratic. But less noticed from the outside has been the growing disparity between the rich and poor, especially in Mexico’s southern states.

These twin economic and political injustices exploded on January 1, 1994, when the Zapatista rebels, a group almost completely made up of indigenous Mexicans, began an insurrection in the Mexican state of Chiapas. That the rebellion began on the day the North American Free Trade Agreement took effect was no coincidence. The Zapatistas made it clear that Mexico should deal with domestic inequalities before linking itself to the largest economic power in the world.

All this has taken place at a time when the fates of the United States and Mexico have become linked as never before. “With the collapse of the Soviet Union, there is no nation that could have a greater effect on our national security than Mexico,” according to former Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs Bernard Aronson.

MEXICO
Changing Inside and Out
Combining this analysis from Aronson with the tremendous political, social, and economic upheavals in Mexico leads to the realization that US-Mexican relations will be a critical issue for the remainder of this century. Making matters even more urgent are US fears about the southern flow of jobs and capital and the northern flow of immigrants.

Poverty, government neglect, and racism have plagued the indigenous people of Mexico for centuries. Medea Benjamin, co-director of Global Exchange, arrived in Chiapas with a human rights delegation shortly after the rebellion began. She spoke with many people affected by both the revolt and the heavy-handed response of the Mexican military. But the most telling moment may have come on a bus ride through the region when Benjamin says she overheard a resident say, “Oh, those horrible Indians, I hate them. I’m glad they took up arms because now we have an excuse to exterminate them.”

“[The Zapatista rebellion] is a movement that, by its composition, origins, and demands, is a very traditional Mexican reformist movement,” according to Castañeda. “Basically all they are asking for are clean elections, land, and dignity.” Castañeda adds, “Mexico tends to function through these sorts of very symbolic, very expressive manifestations of discontent—which with hindsight become forewarnings of broader processes to come, though at the time they seem to be isolated questions. We have already seen that many of the problems the peasants in Chiapas took up arms against exist in other areas of the country and are generating similar forms of unrest—perhaps not guerrilla uprisings like Chiapas, but certainly takeovers of land, municipal governments, government offices, banks, etc. There is something like a rolling municipal insurrection going on in southeastern Mexico.”

Another Mexican scholar, Gabriel Székely of El Colegio de Mexico, agrees that the revolt may be the precursor to major change in Mexico. “It is amazing to a lot of us that it has been the poorest of the poor in society who have reminded us of the tremendous need to reach for those changes,” Székely said. “What the rebels have done is touch our souls, our national soul. We are now in a soul-searching process reminding us that no matter what changes we have implemented and the success of those changes, there are millions of people we have left on the side. We forgot that they are also Mexicans and have to participate in these changes. With the uprising, everyone becomes aware once again that we are a very complex nation with sectors in the
high that the presidential election scheduled for August would gain new credibility. Plans were created for a truly independent election authority, free of PRI influence and with international observers from the United Nations or Organization of American States.

Mexican stability and hopes for reform were thrown into further doubt, however, on March 23 when PRI presidential candidate Luis Donaldo Colosio was assassinated while campaigning in Tijuana. He has since been replaced by Ernesto Zedillo Ponce de León, but the sense of turmoil and tension leading up to the August 21 election remains.

Writing in the New York Times, Bernard Aronson says, “A crisis of confidence in the election could lead to significant capital flight and pressure on the peso, putting economic recovery at risk. If the election is deemed fraudulent, moreover, the implicit threat of renewed civil violence, present since the Zapatista rebellion in Chiapas in January, could materialize.”

The electoral reforms that will create that legitimacy will not come easy. “It will be very hard to have an honest election,” says Professor Rodolfo de la Garza of the University of Texas, “if by that we mean more than simply counting the votes correctly. That’s the last part of an election. That’s the culmination of an election. An election is all the other things including access to media, access to finances, and opportunities to freely present platforms and freely select candidates.”

“One way or another we are going to be seeing substantial political change in Mexico,” says Andrew Reding of the World Policy Institute. “Now it is a question of what kind of alternative we are going to see and if it is going to happen all through peaceful change or if it is going to have to happen through some degree of confrontation as well.”

**US-Mexican Relations**

That possibility of further internal confrontation, together with the new trade agreement, has raised the level of interest in Mexico among American policymakers.

A recent Stanley Foundation Foreign Policy Forum, titled “The United States and Mexico: Rethinking the Boundaries of US Foreign Policy,” brought US congressional staff members together with leaders on the stage at the American Progress Forum, March 1994

—“Shaping American Global Policy: The Growing Impact of Societal Relations,” America and Mexico discussion group, 34th Strategy for Peace Conference, October 1993

—“Shaping Stanley Foundation work on US-Mexican relations:

—“The United States and Mexico: Rethinking the Boundaries of US Foreign Policy,” Foreign Policy Forum, March 1994

—the Dumping

Ground,” Common Ground radio program on life in Tijuana’s landfill, June 1993

—“Power and Politics in Latin America,” Common Ground radio interview with Mexican political analyst Jorge Castañeda, November 1993

This new relationship cannot be based on past US tactics of direct intervention or support for the one-party government. According to de la Garza, co-organizer of the foundation’s forum, the relationship should instead rely on basic American principles. He says, “We should make clear what our commitments are. Our commitments are to human rights and democratic reform. It seems ridiculous to me that we would demand that sort of thing of other countries and not demand it of Mexico.” Finally, Bernard Aronson’s keynote address reminded participants in the foundation’s forum about the importance of US policy in this matter. “Whether we act or fail to act,” according to Aronson, “we will have an enormous impact on events in Mexico. The best we can do is try to act wisely.”

—Keith Porter
A Revolution in Conflict Resolution?

Last August, Israel and the PLO shocked the world when they reported that they had struck an agreement on Palestinian self-rule for Jericho and the Gaza Strip. How they had secretly reached this historic moment in an age-old conflict is almost as historic as the agreement itself.

The September 13, 1993, issue of *Time* in its article “Swimming the Oslo Channel” recounts how this amazing process was instigated by so-called “free-lance peacemakers”:

“In December 1992 a secret meeting took place at a hotel in central London. Six months in the arranging, it lasted only a few hours... Yair Hirschfeld, a Middle East history professor, was breaking Israeli law by talking to Ahmed Kriah, head of the PLO’s economics department. But other Israeli free-lance peacemakers had worked their Palestinian connections before in private attempts to jump-start the peace process. None had succeeded. In the hotel Kriah said he was interested in broad bilateral talks with Israeli officials. So was Hirschfeld. That was exciting—but hardly promising. Recalls Hirschfeld’s partner Ron Pundak, a history research fellow:  ‘Nobody believed that out of this funny meeting in London, involving an academic and someone who is not a high-ranking politician, something big would happen.’ ”

Why had these free-lancers succeeded when so many others, including official government negotiators, had failed? Peacemakers and conflict mediators will no doubt study the process for its effectiveness for years to come. As *Time* reported: “...the work of hammering out a draft proposal was wearing down animosities. ...[A]fter plowing through reams of documents, the Israelis and the Palestinians shared plates of Norwegian salmon and wandered together in nearby woods. ...The enemies drank wine and brandy together, watched the news and video movies on television and... got down on the floor to play with their hosts’ four-year-old son....”

A Humanistic Approach

The idea that personal relationships are a key element in conflict resolution at any level is supported by Dr. Mark Umbreit, assistant professor of social work at the University of Minnesota and experienced practitioner in community corrections and mediation through a process he calls “restorative justice.” Umbreit says that too much attention placed on the mechanics of mediation can lead to a “false peace” because relationship issues have been short-changed or ignored altogether. He acknowledged that mediation skills are required but stressed the “real power is inside the relationship.” He maintained that one of the mediator’s primary responsibilities is to promote the parties’ mutual recognition of each other as human beings despite their adverse positions.

Umbreit spoke at a seminar entitled “Growing Conflict Resolution: Fostering Peace at Work, at Home, in School, and in the Community” cosponsored by the Stanley Foundation, the Iowa Peace Institute, and Drake University. Held in April, this conference was the fourth in an annual series devoted to issues of conflict resolution.

In the last few years there has been a proliferation of mediation as a recognized way to solve disputes—in schools, communities, divorce, families, etc. Even in criminal cases such as rape, assault, and robbery, victims are turning to mediation for settlement. In many of these incidents, Umbreit agrees that a “linear” model of mediation—controlling, highly legalistic, and devoid of feelings—can work. Its strengths lie in being easily understood by the participants, having a structure that forces two parties together in a safe environment with strict boundaries, and being generally more time efficient. But will this model heal trauma? Umbreit thinks a process of restorative justice, which promotes expression of feelings, periods of silence, and face-to-face meetings over longer periods of time, has a better chance of doing that.

Umbreit also pointed out that the westernized model of “settlement-driven resolution” has another significant shortcoming—it does not fit with many other cultures around the world. As evidenced in the Norwegian connection during the Mideast settlement described earlier, an integral part of the peacemaking process was the connectedness among all the participants where feelings had a chance to be absorbed or at least confronted.

Another conference presenter, Dan Clark, would agree. Through his organization called “Friendly Work,” Clark specializes in dispute mediation, global exchanges, and peace projects. "Resolving conflict should be seen as a building or restoring of relationships," he says. “In fact, conflict resolution is really a misnomer. Calling the process ‘conflict management’ is more in keeping with the idea that 95 percent of working out conflict is getting the parties to the table and keeping them there—and selling..."
their agreements to those they represent. The word ‘resolution’ implies an end to the conflict, and that’s just not so in relationships. Conflict is inevitable in relationships. So by building strong relationships, conflict becomes more manageable.”

**Conflict Resolution as Empowerment**

Settlement-driven solutions to conflict use judges or other public entities to set forth a “verdict,” and the disputants are expected to follow through with a planned procedure of resolution. Again, this approach may be flawed. Dr. Umbreit emphasized the need for mediators to encourage an approach where parties recognize their innate ability to determine for themselves how and why to resolve disputes. His model uses face-to-face storytelling and dialogue with disputants helping each other and expressing their own needs and interests while the facilitator fades into the background.

The idea of empowerment also coincides with Dan Clark’s vision of common citizens participating in peacemaking. Increasingly, at the local level—in schools, families, communities, organizations, and businesses—people are actively and successfully employing models of managing dispute management that call on their own resources and common sense. Clark maintains that the same principles, skills, and values can be applied on a broader scale of international conflict.

For example, Clark says, “While the world watches the agony of former Yugoslavia, ‘hidden wars’ brew in the Northern Caucasus region of southern Russia and former Soviet republics. Few outside peacemakers are involved in this critical arena. However, hundreds, if not thousands, of American citizens are joined in friendship with the peoples of these hills and plains through sister-city and sister-state programs.” Clark is encouraging these people to seize this opportunity in international peacemaking.

**A Practical Solution?**

Is it practical to think that resolving conflict on an international level can utilize these principles of restorative justice—relationship-building and empowerment—especially given the heavy cost of time and resources needed for this process?

Recently at a lecture at the University of Iowa, Dr. Johan Galtung, recognized world leader in conflict resolution and founder of the International Peace Research Institute in Oslo, discussed how peace has been absent since the end of the Cold War. When asked his solution to the Bosnian War, he conceded that presently the situation there seems irreparable. However, he offered one solution that he believed could work. It would involve installing “a blue carpet rather than just blue helmets” in the region—in other words, deploying many, many more international peacekeepers to deal with the dire and complex circumstances of Bosnia. In fact, he would disarm these blue-helmeted soldiers and equip them with extensive training in resolving conflict through dialogue and building relationships. But Galtung acknowledged that the extraordinary cost and risks incurred in this approach make it highly unlikely to be seriously considered.

Granted, the conflict in the Middle East is far from over. But the freelancers who met in Norway went a long way in bringing a road to peace between the Israelis and the Palestinians. Many people see seeds of hope in how they accomplished this as well as in what they accomplished.

—Kathy Christensen
Like many of our readers, you probably set aside a few dollars or maybe some of your time each year for your favorite cause. Perhaps you volunteer at the YWCA or belong to a local Kiwanis or Rotary Club. Or, you may prefer a more international focus and choose to support such groups as Amnesty International, Save the Children, or Greenpeace. What you may not be aware of is that all of these organizations and thousands of others throughout the world are part of a vast, informal network of citizen groups known in official circles as nongovernmental organizations, or NGOs—and their numbers and influence are growing.

Why are NGOs flourishing today? Thierry Lemaresquier, who manages the NGO Programme for the United Nations Development Programme, believes that NGOs fill in “where government services are no longer available, for one reason or another. Because the state has ceased to exist in some countries.

[Or] because the state is unable or underresourced to provide services.” Lemaresquier, interviewed at a recent Stanley Foundation conference on the changing role of NGOs in today’s international system, added that “NGOs are also coping with the failures of market institutions.”

Frank Judd, another conference participant and former director of OXFAM UK, considered whether the rise in the popularity of NGOs is due to “a tremendous frustration about formal politics—that the formal political systems are not delivering, and that, therefore, a lot of highly intelligent [and often] young people...with real dedication, say ‘we want to get directly involved in doing something about specific issues on which we can have an impact.’”

There are many kinds of NGOs. Some focus on specific issues like human rights and crisis relief efforts. They may take a global perspective or work on a unique regional, national, or even community concern. Other NGOs may address the interests of business through such groups as the International Chamber of Commerce or the rights of workers through the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. Their membership rolls may range from a handful of people to thousands. Oftentimes, NGOs begin with only a small group of like-minded people who perceive a problem, as in the early days of the environmental movement, and then burgeon into a major international consortium of organizations which influence policy decisions or even play a direct role in policy formation. But the ability to coalesce around an issue is all that is necessary to form an NGO, and more people than ever before are putting their faith in NGOs rather than governments to meet their needs or represent their views. Just how representative they are of civil society is a matter of debate, but their growth in influence is indisputable.

New Openings
Changing political, economic, social, and even technological forces are fueling the demand for NGOs. The downfall of many authoritarian regimes in recent years and the spread of democratic ideas have created openings in civil society for ordinary citizens. Market economies with a wide array of players have eclipsed
centrally controlled economies. The telecommunications revolution has given people access to empowering information. People are more mobile. All of these factors have contributed to the decentralization of decision making in the nation-state system and a growing number of opportunities for new voices.

The Cold War tended to obscure the fundamental global changes underway. It dominated international affairs, and world leaders preoccupied with security issues often paid little heed to sectors outside government circles. Another conference participant, Jessica Tuchman Mathews, a founder of the nongovernmental World Resources Institute, said during an interview that, "by and large, individual behavior and people's individual feelings...or concerns played almost an invisibly small role [during the Cold War]. Now, with that issue gone, issues much closer to people's everyday lives are rising on the international agenda, even in some places coming to dominate it. I mean jobs and economic competitiveness, but also pollution and poverty and drugs and health and a whole spectrum of issues in which people...have a much greater knowledge of what the problems are and also what the solutions are."

**Relations with Governments**

While governments may be relieved when NGOs can step in and effectively deal with crisis situations, these ad hoc organizations may not be so well-liked in government circles when they're lobbying for policy changes or opposing government practices. As Thierry Lemaesquier sees it, "A lot of the time you still feel, particularly in middle-level government bureaucracies, a feeling that nongovernmental actually means antigovernmental."

Frank Judd considers that adversarial relationship useful. "It should be," he said, "a creative—but uncomfortable—relationship." On the other hand, he warns, NGOs should be vigilant. "What I detect is a danger that governments—and perhaps international organizations too—get a bit irritated by the pressure which NGOs are bringing to bear and will now have a campaign to coopt them. And will, sort of, seduce them by subcontracting them—using them as cheap providers of service so that the organizations become dependent on official funds."

Developing a more effective relationship between NGOs and international institutions, particularly the United Nations, became a central focus of the Stanley Foundation conference. For example, the issue of NGO access to official discussions was a very contentious point at the recent Earth and Human Rights Summits where many NGOs, who have more clout on environmental and human rights issues than many governments, felt they were shut out of the official proceedings. The UN is now reviewing how it works with NGOs and may change its procedures based on that review.

The new world climate presents a profound challenge to these new global actors. Despite the diminishing authority of the state, NGOs need strong state institutions, the resources that state agencies can command, and the legitimacy that the state brings to the international arena to most effectively advance their agendas and to operate as representatives of civil society. The dilemma is that NGOs will need to balance their partnerships with states against the requirement that they remain independent global actors.

"People... have a much greater knowledge of what the problems are and also what the solutions are.”

*Mary Gray Davidson*

See page 10 to order the report entitled *The UN System and NGOs: New Relationships for a New Era? or a Common Ground program on this topic called “People Power”(#9414).*
Opening a Discussion

If you connect on the Internet with people from around the world, are you in danger of becoming a foreign policy maven? If your employment duties include providing advice to entrepreneurs in Ukraine, are you acting as some sort of American ambassador?

There are thousands of ways in which American citizens interact with the world, yet their ideas and experiences rarely are sought when the official foreign policy of the United States is being adopted. However, given recent trends it may not matter quite so much. A growing network of global interaction is redefining the character of relations between societies. The New American Global Dialogue, a project being launched by the Stanley Foundation, postulates that Americans engaged in international activities are part of the creation of a new kind of foreign relations and that their voices need to be brought to a national discussion on the goals of American policy in a new global era.

The Dialogue emerged out of meetings spanning more than two years in which the foundation explored changes on the global and national scene, a project called “Global Changes and Domestic Transformations.” Several principles join together to underpin the Dialogue. Among them:

1. America’s foreign policy in the post-Cold War world lacks the cohesive and widely accepted goals necessary to guide the effective execution of policy by those in the diplomatic, military, and other relevant professions.

2. We live in a global economy and in a world in which many issues, from drug trafficking to the environment to the AIDS pandemic to human rights and dozens more, are simultaneously local and global. In other words, trying to formulate exclusively domestic or foreign policies is futile.

3. Technology, the global economy, and increasing ethnic diversity mean that Americans are connected to the world like never before. Often this is through their place of employment; through pursuit of their interest in an issue like AIDS, the environment, etc.; or through transnational ethnic

The Dialogue will bring together local and regional leaders with members of the foreign policy community in programs which include: national study groups, national and regional conferences, and national media projects.

Michael Clough, senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, and Stanley Foundation Vice President David Doerge have provided much of the intellectual energy for the project. They note that the project is not intended to find quick or easy answers. In fact, they recently wrote, “A premise of our thinking and of those we have engaged is that we

must accept the discomfort of not knowing what the future of the world looks like.” The Dialogue, however, is meant to lend new voices to a discussion of how to get along in this uncertain situation.

An advisory committee made up of citizens from across the country and from diverse backgrounds will work collaboratively on Dialogue programs. It will be co-chaired by Clough and Doerge. The executive committee will be chaired by foundation president Richard H. Stanley.

--Jeffrey Martin
Peacekeeping Chief on Capitol Hill

Peacekeeping is under siege. While UN troops in the former Yugoslavia, Rwanda, and elsewhere dodge bullets and mediate conflict, diplomats in national capitals, most notably in the United States, are taking their own potshots at the United Nations' peacekeeping operations.

Anthony Lake, President Clinton's national security advisor, recently stated in an editorial for the New York Times that "Our armed forces' primary mission is not to conduct peace but to win wars. ... Do UN peacekeeping operations always benefit the American people? No." On May 5, the president released Presidential Decision Directive 25. The goal of the policy directive, as articulated by the US ambassador to the United Nations, Madeleine Albright, "is to insure that we refrain from asking the United Nations to undertake missions it is not equipped to do...."

The chief of UN Peacekeeping Operations at the United Nations, Kofi Annan, recently had an opportunity to address US concerns. At a luncheon with senior congressional staff, organized by the Stanley Foundation in conjunction with the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, Mr. Annan explained that several factors make operations more difficult today. Some of them include the end of the Cold War, the rise of ethnic conflicts, the expanding definitions of what constitutes peace and security, combining humanitarian missions with enforcement actions, and the expanding number of operations on a tight budget. The over 70,000 troops serving in the 17 operations underway throughout the world cost the United Nations about $3.2 billion annually—and, as of February, about $1.1 billion in contributions had not been paid.

UN peacekeeping troops may continue to be asked to face difficult conflicts with shortages of cash and limited mandates. The effectiveness of these UN operations is contingent, at least in part, on the level of support from member states. Mr. Annan expressed confidence that with the backing of nations such as the United States, the United Nations can play a vital role in resolving conflicts. With that kind of support, perhaps the UN forces will come closer to meeting their mandate: ensuring international peace and security.

---Bruno Pigott, Program Officer and Luncheon Organizer

Consider This...

Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics living in the United States can expect a substantially different quality of life according to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). In 1991, UNDP premiers an annual report on human development which included a new statistic, the Human Development Index (HDI). HDI is meant to be a measure of how countries are doing not just at economic growth (which is usually measured in Gross Domestic Product) but in how they use their resources to improve the lives of people.

HDI is comprised of national income, life expectancy, and knowledge (adult literacy and years of schooling), calculated by UNDP using complex formulas. In 1993, Japan had the highest HDI (0.983) and Guinea the lowest (0.045). The United States ranked sixth at 0.976.

But if the US population is broken out along racial lines,* the accompanying chart shows that American Whites have a higher HDI than the Japanese while Blacks and Hispanics rank below some of what are usually thought to be developing countries.

*The US is one of only a handful of countries with sufficient data to produce an HDI for different population groups. Similar group-specific or regional disparities are apparent in India, Mexico, Turkey, and Swaziland.

(Source: Human Development Report, 1993, UNDP)
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The UN System and NGOs: New Relationships for a New Era?
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International Human Rights and US Foreign Policy.
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Puerto Rico, Island in Limbo

ON PUERTO RICO'S POLITICAL STATUS

Resident Commissioner Carlos Romero Barceló (Statehood Party)
“I am in favor of statehood because I am proud of my US citizenship; I am proud of what it represents. I think the United States is a nation of nations. I want to be part of that nation, but as a partner, not as a sharecropper as we are now. Not as a colony.... We have no vote in Congress even though we’re US citizens.... We cannot vote for the president of the nation that we’re citizens of. That’s a colonial relationship.”

Rubén Berrios (Independence Party President)
“We’re the last remaining colony practically the world over.... This is a bankrupt economy which exiles 40 percent of our population to the United States. Second of all, some 60 percent of our families live off food coupons.

Forty percent of our potential work force is out of work.... Puerto Rico ranks first in the world in homicides.... What does this mean? This means that colonialism in Puerto Rico breeds unemployment, means social discontent, means exile...because the dependant relationship with the United States makes our nation incapable of utilizing its power in order to produce employment, in order to find our own place under the sun. And then in order for people not to revolt, the United States sends food coupons. This is no future for anybody. We need independence to survive.”

State Senator Miguel Hernández Agosto (Commonwealth Party President)
“In statehood you will have permanent union and American citizenship guaranteed. But you would lose your identity. Really, you’d have to. I mean, you have to work in such a way to have one people. E pluribus unum; of many, one. And we would lose our language and our identity. In independence you would keep and protect your identity and your language, but you would lose your American citizenship. So we say in commonwealth you can retain both. You can be an American citizen; you can be united permanently to the United States, but at the same time you are Puerto Rican. You have your own identity, you protect your language, you protect your national symbols like your flag, national anthem, and so forth.”

– excerpted by Mary Gray Davidson
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