Good Intentions, Controversial Actions

Responding to Humanitarian Crises

Since the end of the Cold War there have been few foreign policy issues that have polarized the international community more than the issue of humanitarian intervention. At the heart of the controversy is the principle of sovereignty, and whether the violation of humanitarian norms by a state constitutes a right and obligation to intervene by the international community.

In recognition of the challenge posed by this and other issues, the Stanley Foundation convened its 35th annual conference on the United Nations of the Next Decade from June 11 to 16, 2000, in Vail, Colorado. The conference brought together a diverse group of participants from the United Nations, nongovernmental organizations, and the US government. Conference objectives were ambitious. Participants were asked to identify when military-led humanitarian intervention might be justified, who can and should decide when intervention should occur, what elements are needed for an intervention to succeed, and what role the United Nations should play.

► Who Decides? NATO led the military intervention in Kosovo. Some think only the United Nations Security Council should authorize such violations of sovereignty.

Intervention—continued on page 2
Sovereignty is, and will remain for the foreseeable future, the fundamental principle of international order. Most states, many of them small and recently constituted, remain opposed to any general subordination of national sovereignty to humanitarian norms—although they might support humanitarian intervention in specific cases. However, international norms have moved the fulcrum in favor of more often putting humanitarian concerns before those of sovereignty—a reflection that sovereignty is now understood differently than a decade ago. As such, humanitarian interests sometimes constitute a ground to violate national sovereignty. However, the matter remains highly controversial, and sovereignty is still a key pillar of international order. Participants concurred that, "...we should not be handicapped by state sovereignty, though we should also not underestimate it."

Guidelines
Because of the controversial nature of humanitarian intervention, there was broad agreement that the "bar" for the use of force in the pursuit of humanitarian objectives should be high. Some participants suggested a list of criteria that would help decide when humanitarian intervention should occur. However, much of the criteria offered by the participants were vague and not specifically defined. Some urged the creation of guidelines for the Security Council that would advise international action in response to the "violation of humanitarian law." Others opposed this saying such a guideline would be too restrictive and strongly urged that the broader "protection of human rights" be invoked.

In the end, many participants were reluctant to precisely define what might constitute the need for humanitarian intervention. As one participant put it, "I can't tell you what such a reason [for humanitarian intervention] is, but I know it when I see it."

Although humanitarian intervention and sovereignty remain controversial, the likelihood that a humanitarian operation will occur in the future has increased. Thus it is necessary to ask what role the United Nations should play in humanitarian intervention. The United Nations' ability to foster peace in past operations in Bosnia, Rwanda, Somalia, and elsewhere have been less than successful and have raised questions about the United Nations' ability to carry out robust military operations.

While the United Nations has many years of experience deploying troops for peacekeeping duties, the quality of these troops and their mission definition for these operations have been left wanting. Furthermore, a humanitarian intervention operation could mean that combat by UN troops is a distinct possibility. Can the United Nations field troops that are capable of combat operations was an often-raised question. To most of the participants, the answer is no—at least not now. Therefore, the United Nations should foster coalitions of willing states who have trained troops and deployment capabilities in place that are required to carry out a humanitarian intervention operation.

UN Role
To many of the participants, the United Nations' comparative advantage in humanitarian intervention lies in fitting the military effort into the larger political and social objectives. In effect, the United Nations should be the coordinator and organizer of a humanitarian intervention operation and should have the strategic and organizational capabilities to form an effective intervention force with a clear mandate and mission definition.

The United Nations' first role for a humanitarian intervention should be to authorize and sanction the use of force. For many participants, the UN Security Council should play this authorizing role. Citing Chapter VII and authorizing the use of force, the Security Council would add legitimacy to any action undertaken by a coalition of willing states, especially one that contained a major power. Such authorization would help to ease fears by small states over military action.

Chapter VII, Article 39
The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken...to maintain or restore international peace and security.

However, there may be instances where the need to act supersedes UN authorization. In the case of deadlock in the Security Council, some felt regional organizations should have leeway for deciding on intervention, as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization did in Kosovo. Furthermore, many in the group underlined the need for exceptional individuals to exercise judgment in the face of competing values, complicated relationships, and unpredictable developments. In the end, the group concurred...
that a case-by-case approach will be the road most likely taken—even at the risk of double standards and a regression to pure power politics.

**Military vs. Civilian**

Once the military operation has ended, the United Nations' primary role should be in ensuring a smooth transition from the military to the civilian phase of the operation. Key to a successful transition is reconstituting the state's civil and administrative functions, most importantly the rule-of-law. To achieve this, the United Nations should pursue the creation of a rapid-reaction police force complete with judicial capability that can be called upon to resurrect policing and a judicial system. Reinstating the rule-of-law within the society will help establish a sound foundation from which the United Nations can coordinate aid relief and political and economic development.

However, the United Nations' ability to successfully coordinate a humanitarian intervention operation depends heavily on the commitment by the international community to support such operations from beginning to end. Many participants highlighted this commitment as a key element for successful intervention, although this has been undermined by the diffusion of responsibility within the UN system.

Sufficient forces for UN operations are rarely forthcoming from the 80 countries that have signed standby agreements. Furthermore, participants highlighted the US commitment problem in terms of funding or political support for new initiatives at the United Nations. Time and again the United States has refused to provide the United Nations with the resources it needed for humanitarian operations, and then criticized it for not being up to the challenge.

**Clear Strategy**

Mission definition is another critical element. Missions should have clarity of purpose, a clear and robust mandate, and a clear strategy from initial intervention to state reconstitution. Finally, effective coordination in the transition from military to civilian rule is a critical area. As one participant noted, the "...disjuncture between magnitude of military might and [paucity] of civilian efforts on the ground," has repeatedly undermined the success of humanitarian intervention.

Humanitarian intervention has proven to be one of the most controversial issues facing the international community today. The likelihood of the international community undertaking operations in the future has only increased, and therefore it behooves the international community, especially the United Nations, to assess past operations so that they can prepare for operations in the future. Sovereignty is still the fundamental principle for international order, but consensus is building so that states cannot use sovereignty as a shield when they violate humanitarian norms.

—James Henderson

**Humanitarian Intervention Resources**

The report and policy bulletin entitled "Problems and Prospects for Humanitarian Intervention" is on the Web at reports.stanleyfdn.org or order on page 11. Common Ground radio program #0031—"Intervention on Behalf of Humanity" is on the Web at commongroundradio.org, or see page 11 to order.
Ambassadors Speak

Hope and Promise in Africa
Overcoming war, rebuilding nations

Africa is a continent in conflict. From the Ivory Coast to the Horn of Africa and points in between, armed conflicts are making headlines in the West. One of the more recent and deadly flash points happened along the 600-mile border between Ethiopia and Eritrea. Common Ground Producer Kristin McHugh discussed the conflict with Mohamed Sahnoun, a special adviser to UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan and a man who has played a key role in negotiating an end to the two-year Ethiopian-Eritrean war.

Sahnoun says, unlike many of Africa’s conflicts, ethnic differences are not the main reason behind the battle for land between the two countries.

Sahnoun
Eritrea for a long time had fought for independence from Ethiopia. It was one of the provinces of Ethiopia. But they always felt that they had their own kind of identity, their own kind of history. And it was a long, protracted guerrilla war. Finally, when the former regime, Mengistu in Addis Ababa, was overthrown, the people who took over were good friends with the Eritreans and gave them independence. But then gradually there were some misunderstandings of exactly what would be the shape of the relationship between the two.

To some extent, I think on the Ethiopian side, they were thinking that Eritrea would be part of the same customary union, the same monetary union, the same economic union, and therefore that they would cooperate and work closely together. Especially that Ethiopia needed the ports—they have no outlet to the sea—and they needed the Eritrean ports.

When Eritrea decided to coin [its] own currency... it looked that they were very clearly now detaching themselves from Ethiopia. And then there were some tensions on the border. Really at the beginning, too, trade issues, economic issues, and then with the intervention of military units on the border, it became the conflict which started slowly, but then had terrible proportions.

What makes this conflict different than other wars or conflicts in Africa, say in Sierra Leone or the Congo?

Sahnoun
The conflicts occurring today in Africa—Sierra Leone, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, even Somalia, and so on—are conflicts which... are part of the process of the building of... a modern nation-state. We are [now] seeing these countries and these people now speaking about governance, now putting questions concerning human rights. And, therefore, we have strife. [It is] part of the process. But this war between Ethiopia and Eritrea is a war between two countries. It’s a decision of the leaderships. It’s not the people. And that’s what makes it very unacceptable.

On June 18, 2000, Ethiopia and Eritrea jointly pledged to stop fighting what many termed a useless war. The agreement, however, is not an unconditional cease-fire. Instead, it only calls for cessation of hostilities. Although the accord doesn’t guarantee a lasting peace, Sahnoun is hopeful both countries are committed to moving beyond the two-year conflict.

Sahnoun
There is...now some very good hope for peace. Earlier on there was actually no cease-fire. There [was] an attempt to have a cease-fire, but there was no sign of [a] cease-fire since the beginning of the conflict. There were negotiations—a couple of times there were documents which were submitted by the OAU [Organization of African Unity], which were accepted by both sides, but were never signed. So we hope this time that we might have reached a serious agreement.

Are you hopeful that Africa will become a very peaceful continent in the future?

Sahnoun
Yes, actually I always tell what we call the Afro- pessimists [that] for the first time we’re seeing the people in Africa really coming with questions to their government... And really questioning their...
governments much more than before. We see in some countries where the process is already very encouraging. We have seen democratic elections in Senegal [and] Nigeria. There are countries which are showing stability, such as Ghana, Mali, South Africa, Mozambique, and so on. So there are countries which are really showing a good governance and democratic—and also economic—development, but there is a need for more assistance to be given.

Over the last ten years, development assistance has gone down by 20 percent. At a time where they need assistance, this assistance is going down.

While the West focuses its attention on Africa's war zones, Mozambique and South Africa are on the road to recovery. Both nations, while emerging from conflict, still face an uncertain future. Common Ground Producer Kristin McHugh discussed the so-called “African Renaissance” with Carlos dos Santos, the permanent representative of the Republic of Mozambique, and Dumisani Kumalo, the permanent representative of the Republic of South Africa to the United Nations.

dos Santos
It’s the coming into being of real democracy in Africa. The president of South Africa actually has used the term African Renaissance, and he has written a book about it. And he is seeing Africa, like all leaders in Africa, seeing Africa resolving the conflicts within the continent and actually initiating development of all countries within the context of African unity. [We] are hoping that will sustain democracy in Africa.

Kumalo
The path of democracy is still going on. Mozambique just had their successful election; Namibia has had elections. So really it’s the path of democracy [that is] going on, but it is also true we have two of the major problems in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Sierra Leone. So that’s what makes it seem like there is a reversing in the growth of democracy.

Would you say then that perhaps the Western media is focusing too much on the negative and not the positive in Africa?

dos Santos
Definitely. They always focus on the negative. I think it is the way the media works. They consider the bad news the best news to give. But that also is evolving. Some news organizations are also giving some positive developments, and we would encourage them to do more of that.

The United States is viewed as the one remaining superpower in the world, and therefore many countries around the world feel that the United States has a responsibility to help the hot spots of the world. Does South Africa have a responsibility in Africa to bring development to the rest of the continent?

Kumalo
No, our first responsibility is to the region of Southern Africa. [We] see ourselves as a part of the region of Southern Africa, the Southern Development Community. And our economy is intertwined with what’s happening in Southern Africa. [In] Zimbabwe, we now have the issue of the farmers and people invading their farms. It’s affecting the economy in South Africa. So we first see ourselves as a country of Southern Africa, and then a country of Africa.

Does Mozambique feel that South Africa has a responsibility?

dos Santos
[We] believe that each country of the subregion has a responsibility in relation to the subregion. Just as any country within the continent of Africa has a responsibility towards the continent. And we see South Africa as the one country that is endowed with resources, much more development than other countries. And the good thing that has happened is that with the change of regime in South Africa, with the whole change of the apartheid system, we find the leadership there that is willing to work within the context of the subregion...and within the context of the continent, to promote Africa as a whole. And this is very positive.

—Excerpted by Kristin McHugh

Resources
The Common Ground radio program #0028—“Africa: Continent in Conflict” is on the Web at commongroundradio.org, or see page 11 to order.
Summer Arts Experience 2000

Finding New Perspectives

$A^2 = Art \times Air$

"Children naturally surround us when we show up, but pretty soon the adults are crowding in to receive their own balloon hat," says Addi Somekh. He and photographer Charlie Eckert have traveled the world bringing a peculiar type of art form to some extraordinary places. Somekh is an expert in shaping objects—especially hats—from balloons. He and Eckert spent a day this summer with 30 young people who attended an art camp in Columbus Junction, Iowa. The theme of the camp was air, and participants saw how air plays into many art processes and forms. In this globally focused camp, learning about the world is integrated into many of the activities. The balloon hat artists, for example, showed slides from some of the 34 countries they have visited, sharing stories of their cross-cultural communications.

The day camp also strives to give participants some new appreciations for their own community. This year a local man with an ultralight aircraft exhibited his grounded flying machine, answering questions and allowing students to sit in the vehicle. While campers were firing off rockets (an air and science connection), the ultralight owner flew overhead and communicated with those on the ground through use of a walkie-talkie.

Music was part of the camp too. Research turned up a song about an airship, which the students easily learned. A staff member accompanied them on accordion and demonstrated how the instrument uses forced air to make sound. Another visiting artist was a bagpipe player, who also explained the operation of the instrument and held a discussion with the young people.

Animals that utilize air in interesting ways were incorporated into the program. Aquariums with puffers (fresh water blowfish), Bubble Eye and Oranda goldfish, and frogs were in the classroom space. The most popular reptile was a bearded dragon, affectionately named Lizzie by the students.

Time was spent each day on construction of hot air balloons. Groups of three participants each designed and made a balloon out of colored tissue paper. On the last day of the program, camp stoves and long pipe "chimneys" were used to fill the eight-foot-high balloons with hot air and provide lift off. As the balloons were launched, campers were left with the memory of their bright balloons sailing through the air.

—Jill Goldeshberry
...campers were left with the memory of their bright balloons sailing through the air.
Improving the Strained US-Cuban Relationship

New Opportunities for Dialogue

Intervention, sanctions, and immigration on the agenda

International relations scholars and policy analysts from Cuba and the United States are coming together for three meetings in 2000-2001. These events create an opportunity to exchange views and share ideas on a range of issues that are of interest to both countries but that are also outside the usual dynamics of the strained US-Cuban relationship.

The meetings are designed to bring together specialists in international relations who rarely get the chance to meet colleagues working on the same issue in the other country. The discussions are organized by the Stanley Foundation in cooperation with the Instituto Superior de Relaciones Internacionales in Havana.

The first meeting was held in St. Paul, Minnesota, in July. Scholars and policy analysts from both countries who specialize in international law, international organizations, and military intervention in international politics gathered together with comparative area specialists to discuss military intervention in the 1990s. They focused on three recent cases: Rwanda, Kosovo, and Haiti.

In the lively and open discussion, many in the Cuban group took on the role of making claims for sovereignty and national independence that often emanate from the developing countries of the global South. Many in the group from the United States took on the role of making claims for humanitarianism that often emanate from the developed countries of the global North. All participants agreed that the process was important in highlighting areas of common agreement as well as disagreement.

For most participants, military intervention meant the use of armed forces, the crossing of geopolitical boundaries, and the violation of sovereignty, and all agreed that in the 1990s the world saw a resurgence of military interventions in the name of protecting human rights, as well as calls for other interventions for the same reasons.

Much of the discussion centered on interventions led by the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the United States, and other world powers. Most participants agreed that this new type of interventionism was, in the post-Cold War era, not happening by chance but orchestrated by a new world order in the political arena through a conglomerate of a few world powers.

The group reached a number of conclusions, though not all participants agreed with each statement. • Most agreed that humanitarian intervention as it is currently structured legitimates intervention by world powers at any time and in any part of the Third World. • Half stated that if humanitarian intervention is used as a precedent for any type of intervention, the sovereignty of states is at stake. This was of most concern for the people of the global South. • Some participants stated that if the socioeconomic inequalities of the world are not solved, there would continue to be many humanitarian crises. • Most agreed that there should be instances where humanitarian intervention would be permitted. • The entire group agreed that a common definition of humanitarian crisis is needed. • The entire group agreed that in Rwanda there should have been intervention. • The entire group agreed that the military interventions in Haiti and Kosovo were undertaken not
for humanitarian reasons, but for political ones.
• Most agreed that in Haiti and Kosovo military intervention should not have occurred and that in both cases negative effects on the civil population can be seen as a direct result from those interventions.
• Most agreed that military initiatives should be considered only when diplomatic, economic, and other options have been seriously attempted.
• Most also agreed that the term international community is problematic and that the term really identifies a core group of countries that hold a disproportionate share of global political and economic power.

The group discussed broad policy changes required to more effectively support humanitarian concerns within the international system. The changes suggested by some or all participants included:
• Restructuring international organizations (e.g., the United Nations) so they can address humanitarian concerns effectively.
• Developing new regional organizations to assist with humanitarian crises.
• Forging a new international community based on equality between nations.
• Addressing the long-term socio-economic causes of humanitarian crises.
• Defining both “humanitarian principles” and “humanitarian crisis.”
• Defining rules of humanitarian intervention.

The next meeting, to be held in the United States in February 2001, will focus on sanctions as a foreign policy instrument. The series concludes in Havana in September 2001 with a look at immigration and borders.
—Sherry Gray

"Cubans Are a Lovely People"

The Elian Gonzalez case and the potential easing of the decades-old embargo are refocusing attention on the current status of US-Cuban relations. Common Ground Producer Kristin McHugh recently spoke with four Cuban scholars about the embargo, the American media, and the future of US-Cuban relations.

Are you optimistic that things will change in the next five years or so, in terms of relations with the United States?

David González López
I’m optimistic in the long run, and it’s something that at some point it must be overcome and it must disappear. It has nothing to do with contemporary international relations. I know it’s mixed with so many things of US politics, and there are so many complexities that, well, maybe it will still take some time. I would like to hope for the best, but I think like most Cubans we’re prepared to continue like we are now.

If there was one thing that you wanted to tell our American audience about Cuba, what would that be?

Isabel Jaramillo Edwards
Cubans are a lovely people...the Cubans have a great sense of solidarity, a great sense of humor, great culture. So I think there’s a lot of space for communications, exchange, and building a new relationship.

If the embargo goes away, will that solve all of Cuba’s economic problems? Or are additional reforms needed in order to make Cuba a prosperous country?

Santiago Pérez Benítez
I wouldn’t be so optimistic that if the embargo is lifted everything is going to be solved and Cuba is going to be next year a prosperous society. [We] do have our own internal problems linked with efficiency, etc. And I think that Cuba shouldn’t follow the pattern it had before ’59, [when] everything [was] acquired from the US. I think that Cuba should continue the way of diversifying dependency.

Miguel Alfonso Martínez and Santiago Pérez Benítez are with the Institute of International Relations. The Institute is closely tied to Cuba’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs. David González López with the Center for Studies on Africa and the Middle East. Isabel Jaramillo Edwards is from the Center of Studies on Central America.
—Excerpted by Kristin McHugh
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United Nations

Problems and Prospects for Humanitarian Intervention
The 35th United Nations of the Next Decade conference weighed the justifications used for military-led humanitarian intervention and explored ways to make such missions more successful. 6/00, policy bulletin, 4pp, or full report, 48pp.

The United Nations and the Future of Disarmament and Nonproliferation
Foreign policy experts met to examine the future prospects of nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation. Discussions also sought to clarify the role the United Nations can play in achieving these goals. 2/00, 4pp (policy bulletin only).

Global Governance: Defining the United Nations' Leadership Role
This report from the Stanley Foundation examines the ways regional groups, economic alliances, security arrangements, treaty regimes, and development organizations are changing the atmosphere in which the United Nations operates. 6/99, 32pp.

Getting Down to Cases: Enforcing Security Council Resolutions
An international panel of high-level experts discussed the UN Security Council's role in three major conflicts this decade. Lessons from those cases guided exploration of options for strengthening enforcement of council resolutions. 6/98, 31pp.

US Foreign Policy

Report of the Fortieth Strategy for Peace, US Foreign Policy Conference
Experts met to discuss the following topics:
- Balancing the rights of nation-states, groups, and individuals
- Relations between NGOs and the United Nations
- Humanitarian intervention
- Post-conflict reconciliation

Emerging From Conflict: Improving US Relations With Current and Recent Adversaries
Emerging From Conflict is a multifaceted program that examines ways to build better relations between the United States and some of its most recent adversaries. This program's first report includes an explanation of the project and examines Cuba, North Korea, Vietnam, Iran, and Iraq. 1998, 67pp.

Experts from both sides of the Atlantic met to discuss the state of US-European policies in the Gulf. They worked toward formulating policies while anticipating crises. 9/98, 37pp.

General Interest

Creating the International Legal Assistance Consortium
The International Legal Assistance Consortium is being created to facilitate national and international accountability mechanisms and rehabilitate national judicial systems. This paper sets out the mission, guiding principles, and structure of ILAC. 2/00, 12pp (policy bulletin only).

Educating for the Global Community: A Framework for Community Colleges
Community college leaders and government officials met to consider how to support effective global education in community colleges. They identified attributes of a globally competent learner and institutional requirements to produce such learners. 11/96, 37pp.

These reports and a wealth of other information are available instantly on the Web at reports.stanleyfdn.org or use the order form on page 11.

The foundation's monthly magazine, World Press Review, features excerpts from the press outside the United States. Portions of the magazine are available on the Web at worldpress.org. For a free sample of the magazine, please use the order form on page 11.
0044—Argentina. The globalization trend is alarming labor unions across the world. Find out how unions in Argentina are trying to protect workers from globalization’s downsides and learn why beef from Argentina isn’t welcome in the United States. 10/00

0043—Peacekeeping: One Man’s Account/Training Police. A Midwest police chief recounts his peacekeeping experiences in Bosnia. An American official discusses training police forces in some of the world’s most dangerous places. (Training Police 9952, repeat, 10/00)

0042—Uruguay. Nearly half the women who live in Uruguay are victims of domestic violence; find out what steps the government is taking to combat the problem. Plus, discover Uruguay’s national music. 10/00

0041—Río Negro: Gone But Not Forgotten/IJC. The story of one woman who survived the 1982 Río Negro massacre. Plus a progress report on plans for an International Criminal Court. 10/00

0040—The China Conflict. Scholarly and academics from both countries discuss the issues China and the United States don’t agree on. And a television producer discusses the way news is covered in China. 10/00

0039—Hungarian Cyanide Terror/IARC. Last winter, a major cyanide spill polluted waterways in Romania and Hungary. Learn how the region is coping in the aftermath of the spill. Plus, learn how the International Committee for the Red Cross lends a hand in time of crisis. 9/00

0037—India and Pakistan’s Tension. Tension between India and Pakistan over the disputed territory of Kashmir continues to mount. Journalists from both countries discuss the conflict and the prospects for peace. Plus, an expert critiques the Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference. 9/00

0036—Cuba Reacts. Cuban scholars and academics react to the changing—and sometimes volatile—relationship between their country and the United States. 9/00

0035—East Timor Revisited. Common Ground revisits East Timor to assess the progress of the monumental task of rebuilding a nation. 8/00


0033—The New and Troubled Russia. Learn more about Vladimir Putin’s motivations and get an update on the conflict in Chechnya. 8/00

0032—Australia. This edition explores the impact of corruption and scandals that had on the Olympic games and an investigation of Australia’s controversial treatment of the Aborigines. (8/00)

0031—Intervention on Behalf of Humanity. Find out how Britain, Canada, and Australia respond in humanitarian needs. 8/00

0029—Beijing 5-Albanian Tourism. Learn how Albania is working to promote tourism and how women across the globe rate the recent Beijing 5 conference. 7/00

0028—Africa: Continent in Conflict. Africa is a continent in conflict. Get an update on the border war between Ethiopia and Eritrea. Plus, find out how Mozambique and South Africa are looking toward the future. 7/00


TO ORDER call 319-264-1500 or e-mail info@stanleydn.org (Have Visa or MasterCard number ready for cassette orders.)

Order Form (mail or fax this form or call)

Bill to
Name
Address
City _______ State _______ Zip _______

Method of Payment
MasterCard _______ Visa _______ Check _______
Card Number _______ Exp. Date _______
Name on Card _______ Phone ( ) _______

Cassettes ($5 each) and Transcripts (free)
Quantity _______ Number/Title _______ Cost _______

Publications (free in single copies; for bulk orders, see below)
Quantity _______ Title _______ Cost _______

Also Available (free in single copies; for bulk orders, see below)
World Press Review sample _______
Common Ground catalog _______

Quantity Orders
Publications are available in quantity for postage and handling charges as follows:
Individual copies _______ Free 2-10 copies _______ $2
11-25 copies _______ $4 26-50 copies _______ $6
Over 50—Contact the foundation for special pricing.

Please mail or fax completed form to:
The Stanley Foundation
209 Iowa Avenue • Muscatine, IA 52761
319-264-1500 • 319-264-0864 fax

Fall 2000

11
They have endured the wrath of the rebels and the government, risking their lives to tell the story of Sierra Leone's brutal nine-year civil war. In recognition of the extraordinary bravery and professionalism of newspaper editors Paul Kamara of *For di People*, Philip Neville of *Standard Times*, and David Tam-Baryoh of *Punch*, World Press Review magazine named the three as recipients of its 25th annual International Editor of the Year Award.

The award is given annually by the New York City-based monthly magazine, published by the Stanley Foundation, to an editor or editors outside the United States in recognition of enterprise, courage, and leadership in advancing the freedom and responsibility of the press, enhancing human rights, and fostering excellence in journalism.

Kamara, Neville, and Tam-Baryoh have all been detained, jailed, and harassed under successive military dictatorships, as well as under the elected government of President Ahmed Tejan Kabbah, for their hard-hitting investigative reporting of corruption and abuse of power. A few days before the January 1999 invasion of the capital, Freetown, by rebel forces of the Armed Forces Revolutionary Council (AFRC) and the Revolutionary United Front, the three were named on a rebel death list that forced them into hiding. But it didn’t stop them from covering the rebels’ murderous campaign.

“Children had their hands cut off. Some of them had their eyes gouged out. The situation was very bad,” Neville said in his acceptance speech at the awards ceremony, held September 28 at the United Nations. “And it was during this period that we were writing. Because there must be somebody to tell these people that what they are doing is not right. We became the target of the government, and we became the target of the rebels.”

In presenting the awards to Neville and Tam-Baryoh, who represented their colleague Paul Kamara, United Nations Under-Secretary-General and Special Representative for Children and Armed Conflict Olara A. Otunnu spoke of Sierra Leone’s independent journalists as “particularly committed and courageous journalists who, in the midst of everything, continued to print and broadcast and to resist.”

Tam-Baryoh, who recently returned to Freetown from exile in Ghana, said, “I want to believe that this award, actually, is not for the three of us alone, but for the 15 journalists who have been murdered in Sierra Leone.” In a display of the spirit that characterizes these three exemplary journalists, he added, “We work in Sierra Leone not for money, not for anything. Sometimes people ask, ‘Oh, are you coming to stay in the States?’ I say, No. Sierra Leone is where I’m needed.”

—Alice Chasan