“Nothing does more to shape one’s attitudes and beliefs than knowledge and understanding of our world—its peoples and its problems,” said Max Stanley in 1983. While this concept is behind all of the Stanley Foundation’s efforts, no foundation program works toward this goal in a more direct, hands-on fashion than the summer youth programs begun over 20 years ago.
Creating Global Citizens

Youth Programs

Creating Global Citizens

Summer Events Change, Grow

Every summer, Stanley Foundation staff and dozens of youth head out into the real world to discover how their lives and their communities are connected to a much larger world. The ultimate goal is to create a new generation of global citizens.

Global citizens are people who:

• Know they have an impact on the world, and that the world impacts them.

• Appreciate the interconnectedness among and between humans and their environment.

• Recognize their ability to make choices that affect the future.

• Have the ability to see multiple perspectives.

• Realize that all people share common needs and wants.

• Know that conflict is inevitable, but manageable.

• Respect beliefs and ways of life other than their own.

• See how global change can begin at a local level.

Summer Programs

The foundation summer youth programs include: Summer Special (for 5th and 6th graders in the Muscatine, Iowa, area), Summer Explorations (for 7th and 8th grade girls in eastern Iowa), Summer Arts Experience (for 6th through 8th graders in Columbus Junction, Wapello, and Williamsburg, Iowa), St. Louis Global Camp (for 7th graders), and the Nebraska International Camp (for 10- to 16-year-olds).

Although these programs target a range of young people and use a variety of techniques, they share many of the same objectives:

• Increasing the participants’ sense of responsibility for the impact of their behavior locally and globally.

• Increasing their understanding of other cultures and ethnicities.

• Improving their problem-solving skills.

• Acquiring knowledge of and information about the state of the world.

• Increasing the number of positive leadership options available to participants.

• Increasing the number of community activities in which they participate.

These events help young people develop an enhanced and more complete picture of themselves through learning about others and exposure to new ideas. The summer of 2001 was no exception. In fact, two programs, Summer Explorations and Summer Arts Experience, underwent changes this summer which laid the groundwork for an even more exciting future.

Exploration Has New Leader

Fulani mud cloth, the Mississippi River, Tibetan mandalas, limestone caves, and Thai New Year—how are these related? They all have some connection to the precious liquid which makes life on earth possible—water. At this year’s Summer Explorations, 15 teenage girls and 3 women leaders gathered to explore the uses of water by, and the effects of water on, people all over the world.

Summer Explorations is in its fifth year, but this was the first year under the direction of new foundation staff member Angie Sauer. Among the ideas she brought to the program was using a theme as a way to focus energy on greater learning potential for the participants.

“Girls who participate in these annual week-long retreats begin to develop a curiosity for learning about the planet’s many cultures, an understanding of the limits of global natural resources, and a desire to act in their communities with an eye on their role as global citizens,” according to Sauer. The project also strives to catch girls’ attention at a critical stage in their lives. Sauer hopes participants come away from the week more self-confident, independent, and ready to lead. “With activities from the arts, sciences, and literature—and a beautiful world to explore—we want to make all that learning come easy,” says Sauer.
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Arts Experience Grows
What words come to mind when you think of shadows: darkness, mystery, shadow puppets, silhouettes, shadow of a doubt? You can probably brainstorm a long list—which is exactly what the staff of Summer Arts Experience did after selecting “Shadows” as their 2001 theme. From that list, the staff came up with a variety of activities encompassing many of the fine arts. Drawing, digital photomontages, dancing, singing, solar prints, movement exercises, sculpture, architecture, music appreciation, foreign language, creating shadow puppets, photography with pinhole cameras, painting, and instrumental music were all part of the program.

This was the seventh year for the program in Columbus Junction, Iowa, but it was the first year for the Iowa communities of Wapello and Williamsburg. Wapello and Williamsburg were selected as components of the foundation’s initiative to expand youth program offerings. Each four-day camp this year had around 30 participants. Some resources were shared among the three camps. An actor from New York City led separate sessions for all three groups.

Summer Arts Experience is intended to promote global awareness and art, not as a thing, but as a perspective on viewing the world.

The foundation seeks partner schools or organizations that want to adapt Summer Arts Experience or Summer Special projects to their locale. A community outside of Iowa will be chosen for 2002.

“Foundation youth programs are experiential, which means active participation in thought-provoking activities for the students,” according to Summer Arts Experience program coordinator Jill Goldesberry. “For the staff, this means risk-taking in trying new methods and ideas. For the foundation, it means experimenting with diverse locales, formats, and audiences. What is learned in the process will be shared with global education advocates and others involved in youth programming,” said Goldesberry. This process of change, experimentation, and sharing the results is a central part of the quest to create global citizens.

—Keith Porter

▲ Summer Explorations.
Alexandra Weaver (right) produced a painted cloth styled after Bamana bogolanfini (mud cloth) similar to those made by bogolan artist, Nakunte Diarra (left) in Mali.
Defining Sovereignty

A Responsibility to Protect

The Discussion Evolves

“[The] developing international norm in favor of intervention to protect civilians from wholesale slaughter will no doubt continue to pose profound challenges to the international community. Any such evolution in our understanding of State sovereignty and individual sovereignty will, in some quarters, be met with distrust, skepticism, even hostility. But it is an evolution that we should welcome.”

—Kofi Annan
Secretary-General
of the United Nations

Here, Kofi Annan describes a transitional moment in which the sovereignty that governments are assumed to have within their borders is being reassessed in response to the man-made catastrophes of the last decade. Even with this evolution, sovereignty is likely to remain a key organizing principle for international relations for many years to come. So what will a new concept of sovereignty look like, and what, if anything, will governments lose in the process?

This question was on the agenda last June for the Stanley Foundation’s 36th conference on the United Nations of the Next Decade, the subject of which was “Using ‘Any Means Necessary’ for Humanitarian Crisis Response.” A number of brutal bloodbaths over the last several years have shocked the conscience of the world community, prompting a widespread recognition that national sovereignty must have limits. Conference participants agreed that when gross atrocities are committed outsiders can and should step in to halt the carnage and destruction, hopefully with a mandate from the United Nations Security Council.

Rather than leaving it to the Security Council to override sovereignty on a case-by-case basis, many observers think the very concept of sovereignty should be revised to establish a working standard. One standard being explored by senior practitioners, and discussed in depth at the June conference, is to view sovereignty as a “responsibility to protect.” Under this idea, states have a fundamental duty to protect people within their borders, and if a government fails in this duty—through either active persecution or failure to maintain order—the responsibility shifts to the international community.

For some conference participants, such a concept is already part and parcel of governments’ obligations under key human rights and other international treaties (the United Nations Charter perhaps most importantly)—it is, in other words, a core requirement of citizenship in the world community. That said, it was recognized that not all human rights set forth in international agreements should carry the potential sanction of armed intervention and loss of sovereignty. The prevailing view in the discussion was that forceful intervention should be reserved to respond only to mass killings or displacement (or an imminent threat), and since human rights is a fairly broad category, participants suggested that the term humanitarian crisis would describe such situations.

It may be some time before a responsibility to protect or any alternative takes root as the prevailing concept of national sovereignty, but one participant described a clear trend in this direction whereby “something is happening out there both in thinking and in practice.”

—David Shorr

No Man’s Land?

Every deployment of military forces under the UN banner raises serious questions about sovereignty. These UN troops from Sweden were sent to southern Lebanon...but only after the Lebanese government granted permission.

...the very concept of sovereignty should be revised....

Resources


The Common Ground radio programs #0137, #0132, #0133, and #0134 on humanitarian intervention, are online at www.commongroundradio.org or see page 11 to order.
India, Pakistan, and Israel

Are Nuclear Weapons the Ultimate Status Symbol?

Implications for Nonproliferation

The goals of the 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) are ambitious. They include stopping the spread of nuclear weapons beyond the original nuclear powers (United States, Russia, France, Great Britain, and China), sharing the peaceful uses of nuclear technology, and eventually ridding the world of nuclear arms.

While a nuclear weapon-free world still seems a long way off, the NPT has been quite successful in keeping nuclear weapons confined to a mere handful of countries. But many experts say unless the NPT is universal (meaning all countries have signed on) the treaty may never fulfill its ultimate goals.

Four nations have not signed the NPT: Cuba, Israel, India, and Pakistan. All but Cuba have nuclear weapons, and this is seen as a serious threat to the future of the NPT. A recent Stanley Foundation conference, titled “The Challenges of Regional Nuclear Arsenals,” brought together experts to address a broad range of nuclear nonproliferation issues. Much of the discussion, however, focused on whether the world should offer India, Pakistan, and Israel some kind of “special status” (like the original five nuclear powers) to get them to join the NPT or at least become part of the NPT process.

Majority View
Most of the conference participants, “…opposed the granting of special status to the unrecognized nuclear powers, either within the terms of the NPT or outside it. The very existence of exceptions within the regime could unravel the treaty framework altogether and threaten the goal of treaty universality,” according to the report issued following the event.

Some feared the special status would actually reward these countries for their behavior and encourage other nations to follow suit. Others worried that it would cause more treaty members to doubt the value of the NPT, in general, as a tool for protecting their security.

Minority View
“The NPT should be judged on the basis of its past and current successes rather than on universal acceptance,” said a few conference participants. At least one of the participants pointed out “…India, Pakistan, and Israel have strong reasons for not joining the NPT, and these reasons are unlikely to change.”

A special status might well include allowing inspection of nuclear facilities in those three nations. “The benefit would be that these countries will have some accountability, and the international community will have some oversight of their nuclear programs.”

Prestige
At a minimum, participants agreed that “…Israel, India, and Pakistan should not be given any special rights without accompanying responsibilities.” But they went on to acknowledge that high-level international status is too often linked with the possession of nuclear arms, India, in particular, is “…sensitive to the issue of differential treatment based on nuclear capabilities, especially regarding the level of respect bestowed by permanent membership in the Security Council.”

The report indicates the big five nuclear powers need to cut this connection between nuclear weapons and international status and take a stronger leadership role in both nuclear arms control and disarmament. If the United States, Russia, France, Great Britain, and China refuse to eventually disarm themselves, this “…might lead other countries to consider nuclear weapons as a source for power and prestige.”

—Keith Porter

Resources
The full report and Policy Bulletin titled “The Challenges of Regional Nuclear Arsenals” is available at reports.stanleyfoundation.org. See page 10 to order.
After a decade of war and political repression under Slobodan Milošević, Serbia and the former Yugoslavia face a long rebuilding process. Reviving the region’s decimated economy is key to reconstruction. Although newly pledged Western aid is providing a glimmer of hope to Serbia and the former Yugoslavia, many say the money is only a fraction of what’s really needed. Ivan Vejvoda is director of Fund for Open Society Yugoslavia. Marina Ottaway is a senior associate for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Common Ground Producer Kristin McHugh recently spoke with both in Belgrade about the tumultuous economic climate and the roadblocks to progress.

Marina Ottaway
The current economic situation is very, very difficult [and is the result of] three major problems. First was the transition from communism, which was not really accomplished successfully. Then you had the period of war economy. And then there was, on top of these two problems, the establishment of a very corrupt economy under Milošević, where whatever privatization took place, took place in the hands of essentially cronies of the president. And so you have these three layers of problems now that need to be sorted out by the present government. And, of course, that’s not an easy proposition.

Ivan Vejvoda
One of the main tasks at hand of the reformist government is a struggle against corruption throughout. Whether it’s public administration, the state-run enterprises that will be privatized in the near future, [or] whether it’s the everyday life of values of citizens. And to reintegrate the world economy or become part of the [global] economy, many of these things simply have to be straightened out. The task is enormous.

Yugoslavia, Serbia in particular, has an image problem. How do Serbs feel about the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia?

Ivan Vejvoda
They feel ambivalent, I would say. The paramount thing in the lives of people is to move on. I think one thing is very important to stress…we are really in the very first steps of the transition. The key change was, of course, [when] real power was taken over from the Milošević regime. [Since then] I think that it is fair to say that very much has been done. All the heads of the secret service are in prison [and] Milošević himself is in prison. There have been a number of legislative moves, laws that have been enacted. Of course, because the government has inherited such a devastated country…it’s very hard to see the initial results in the street, on the faces of people.

Marina Ottaway
Yes. On one level, yes, it is true that Serbia has a bad image in the West; but Serbia also has a good image in the West. Because you have the Serbia of Milošević, but then there is the Serbia of the students, the group that overthrew the Milošević government. And on that basis, on the basis of this second image, Serbia is receiving, at this point, a lot of international assistance and a lot of international cooperation.
How would you describe Yugoslavian views on relations with their immediate neighbors?

Ivan Vejvoda
There is a sense and a growing awareness, both on the part of the new political and economic elites, that there is no future in Europe without completely normalized relations with one’s neighborhood. And, in fact, one of the striking things after the changes in September and October [2000] was that many of the economic ties or initial contacts between business- men from Croatia and Serbia, Bosnia and Serbia, were immediately reenacted. But then one should add to that that relations with countries like Romania, or Bulgaria, or Albania are being reenacted much more quickly, in fact, than we would have expected. Because people know that only if we in the region—as the Balkans—show that we are able to live normally with each other, [will] Europe be opening it’s doors more quickly to us.

Marina Ottaway
I think it’s also important to remember that the reconciliation is not always easy. [In] people’s daily life there are conflicts between different population groups, there are conflicts concerning refugees coming back to certain areas. You have a problem created by the presence of the Serbs from Kosovo that have left the country and cannot go back, and so on. So despite what I think is a generalized understanding…that this reconciliation take place, very basic grassroots problems need to be worked through in order for reconciliation really to take place.

What role should the United States play in all of this?

Marina Ottaway
I think the United States should try and handle its impatience a little better. We know that an American administration is only in office for four [or] eight years. So there is a tendency to set very short-term goals…and unfortunately a lot of these issues that the country [Federal Republic of Yugoslavia] needs to work through are not going to be solved in the short term. I think none of the problems—the economic problems, the political problems, the problems of reconciliation, and so on—are going to be settled in the next few years. And I think it’s very important that outside agents [such as] the United States do not try to impose a pace to reform that corresponds to their political calendar rather than to what are the needs of the country.

There are many who feel that they will not see stability or peace in this region for decades, if not longer. Are you more optimistic?

Ivan Vejvoda
I definitely am. I think, strangely enough, that with the changes in Croatia, with the developments in Bosnia, however wary we might be about the slow pace of them, with the change in Serbia, the fact that we have democratic regimes—with all their weaknesses—I think is the coming of stability in the region. We must…focus on the issue of Kosovo [and] Macedonia. But I don’t think, unless there is something of a major catastrophe [in Kosovo], that we can be destabilized to that measure that we reengage in a new cycle.

Marina Ottaway
I think it’s important not to confuse stability and the absence of problems, because it’s going to be a long time before all the outstanding issues among the countries of the Balkans are going to be settled. What is really crucial is that the violence stops—that there are no more outbreaks that will cause governments to abandon the reform agenda. I don’t know how long it will take Serbia and Croatia to sort out the problems that developed during the war. The important problem is that we don’t have more explosions of violence in Kosovo, that we do not have any explosion of violence in Macedonia that undermines peace in the entire region, and so on. Those are the real issues of stability right now.

—Excerpted by Kristin McHugh

An Action Plan for Serbia

A Task Force of experts from the United States, Serbia, and South-Central Europe are developing an Action Plan for integrating Serbia into the Balkan region and the Euro-Atlantic community. This project, titled “Serbia and the Challenge of Regional Integration,” is part of the Stanley Foundation’s Euro-Atlantic Initiatives program.

The Task Force has recruited an Advisory Group of Serbian political and opinion leaders to assist in developing and, eventually, implementing the plan. Project coordinator James Henderson says, “The project is taking a mid- to long-term approach to Serbia in the context of the region as a whole. It will focus on the ‘psychological transition’ necessary to achieve reconciliation and integration of Serbia into its neighborhood and, eventually, the rest of Europe.”

The Action Plan is expected to be completed early next year. More information on the project is available at www.euro-atlanticinitiatives.org.

—Keith Porter

Resources
The Common Ground radio program #0131—“Rebuilding Serbia” is available online at www.commongroundradio.org or see page 11 to order.
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Global Civil Society

A New Power Emerges

UN Leadership Needed

In Rome in July 1998, the treaty establishing an International Criminal Court was adopted. All involved in the process credit the essential role of nongovernmental organizations in pushing for the treaty and even helping draft some sections. In recent years many multinational corporations have signed onto a Global Compact with the United Nations, voluntarily accepting a set of principles for responsible corporate citizenship. And also in recent years, from Seattle to Genoa, protesters have made their mark at intergovernmental meetings on such things as trade and international economic cooperation. Each of these is an example—some cooperative, others confrontational—of the emerging power of civil society at the global level. While generally considered salutary, global civil society often butts heads with intergovernmental institutions.

This past spring the Stanley Foundation together with the World Federation of United Nations Associations and the president of the United Nations General Assembly, former Finnish Prime Minister Harri Holkeri, convened the UN Civil Society Outreach Symposium, a two-day conference held outside New York City. At the symposium’s opening dinner Michael Edwards, director of the Ford Foundation’s Global Governance and Civil Society program, delivered an opening address (excerpted below) issuing a number of challenges to the symposium and civil society at large:

“How does a strong civil society lead to a society that is strong and civil...?”

“...representation (NGOs who claim to speak on behalf of others, but lack any accountability mechanisms to their constituents), structure (too many voices from the North, not enough from the South), expertise (are NGO positions tested and substantiated with any real rigor?), and the weakness of linkages between citizen action at the local, national, and global levels (the tendency to leapfrog of democratic authority over matters of public concern. Two processes are occurring simultaneously, driven by globalization, market integration, information technology, and rising questions about the legitimacy and effectiveness of conventional politics in addressing problems of collective action across national borders. The first is a shift in the locus of authority, down the political system to subnational units and up to new global institutions. The second is a shift in the focus of authority, away from state monopolies to nonstate actors, both for-profit and not-for-profit. These changes are likely to have both positive and negative consequences: positive in providing greater opportunities for citizen participation and efficiency gains in the provision of public goods, negative in threatening the ability of the state to protect universal rights and entitlements and hold global institutions accountable for their actions. But at the global level, it is undeniable that these changes are opening more spaces for civil society participation.”

Michael Edwards

“How does a strong civil society lead to a society that is strong and civil in all that it does? That question provides a useful framework for considering questions of roles and functions, structure and characteristics, values, and relationships in global civil society.

“Although it lacks a coherent alternative vision, the current wave of global citizen action is, I think, comparable with earlier waves in the 1960s and earlier periods in history. Over 30,000 international NGOs are already active on the world stage, joined by approximately 20,000 transnational civil society networks of various kinds—90 percent of which have been formed during the last 30 years. At the heart of these efforts lie two simple, common, but very powerful, messages:

• That life is about more than economics.
• And that democracy governs markets, not the other way around.

“Below this level of generality there is much less consensus on what needs to be done, at any level of detail.”

“...representation (NGOs who claim to speak on behalf of others, but lack any accountability mechanisms to their constituents), structure (too many voices from the North, not enough from the South), expertise (are NGO positions tested and substantiated with any real rigor?), and the weakness of linkages between citizen action at the local, national, and global levels (the tendency to leapfrog
Global Grassroots. At many United Nations’ conferences, nongovernmental organizations have served as valuable resources and vocal critics. Here, the late Bella Abzug and other NGO leaders are seen at the 1995 UN World Conference on Women in Beijing.

Edwards then offered general principles for such institutionalization:

- Leveling the playing field (promoting equal voice, capacity, and opportunity for different civil society organizations in the global arena).
- Self-regulation or self-discipline within global civil society networks—not imposed accountability from governments or intergovernmental bodies.
- Integration instead of displacement—marring together different levels of citizen action from the local to the global, and building from the bottom up.

Finally, he identified the United Nations as a natural leader in this process:

“In my view, this is a debate about changing the rules of global governance in order to achieve better and more sustainable outcomes through wider stakeholder participation. Who better to lead this debate than the UN, as the world’s custodian of the ‘rules of the game,’ the ultimate standard-setting body, and the institution that can bestow some sense of legitimacy on public participation?”

“These questions are demanding, and their answers are as yet unclear. However, a century ago we could not have imagined the extent to which citizens across the world have since succeeded in their struggles for more complete and inclusive democracies in their localities and national polities. In the 21st century, the globalization of power demands a new form of global citizen action that extends the theory and practice of democracy still further.”

—Excerpted by Jeffrey G. Martin and David Shorr

Resources
The report from this event, titled “Report of the UN Civil Society Outreach Symposium,” is available at reports.stanleyfoundation.org. See page 10 to order.
Resources

Stanley Foundation Publications

On the Web at reports.stanleyfoundation.org

Colored entries indicate new publications.

Using “Any Means Necessary” for Humanitarian Crisis Response
The 36th annual United Nations of the Next Decade Conference brought together experts wrestling with the political, legal, and practical challenges the world community faces when intra-state conflicts escalate into massive violence. While a broad consensus emerged supporting forceful intervention in the worst cases, the questions of who should intervene, when, and how was the subject of lively debate. 6/01 policy bulletin and full report.

Report of the UN Civil Society Outreach Symposium
The working relationship between NGOs and the UN was the subject of a recent conference bringing together NGO leaders, UN officials, and a number of ambassadors to the UN. A range of ideas and proposals were explored for how NGOs and the UN can cooperate more effectively to achieve their shared goals. 7/01 full report on the Web only.

Strengthening the Nonproliferation Regime: The Challenge of Regional Nuclear Arsenals
Is it possible to preserve the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons while still accommodating the regional security concerns of Israel, India, and Pakistan? This question was recently addressed by a group of international experts at the 32nd annual United Nations Issues Conference. 2/01 policy bulletin and full report.

Ballistic Missile Defense and Northeast Asian Security: Views from Washington, Beijing, and Tokyo
The impact of US missile defense deployments on Northeast Asian security are examined in a series of roundtables involving US, Japanese, and Chinese experts and officials. Areas of conflict and potential compromise are identified. 4/01 policy bulletin and full report.

China, Russia, and the United States: Partners or Competitors?
The 41st annual Strategy for Peace Conference drew together 75 participants in four concurrent, roundtable discussions. Reports from each of the discussion groups are available on the Web. Three Policy Bulletins summarizing the discussions and highlighting specific policy recommendations are available as well. 10/00

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 and full report.

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

World Press Review (WPR), the New York City-based monthly published by the Stanley Foundation, is the only English-language magazine focusing on the international press.

Drawing on newspapers and magazines around the globe and a network of correspondents in dozens of countries, WPR illuminates and analyzes the issues and perspectives that rarely see the light of day in the mainstream US press.

Visit WPR’s Web site at www.worldpress.org, where you’ll find samplings from the latest issue of WPR, daily news updates from around the world, special reports, and more.

For a free sample of WPR, please use the order form on page 11.

To find out more about the work of the Stanley Foundation, visit our Web site at www.stanleyfoundation.org
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0137—The Humanitarian Intervention Debate. Humanitarian intervention is a hot political topic these days thanks to ongoing armed conflicts in the Middle East, Africa, and the Balkans. And while the individual desire to help seems obvious, political willingness remains a source of strong debate. Learn why humanitarian intervention isn’t always as easy as it sounds. 9/01

0140—Crisis in Indonesia (Part 1). Indonesia is facing an uncertain future. Political turmoil and separatist violence are threatening the stability of the world’s fourth largest country. 10/01

0141—Crisis in Indonesia (Part 2). Our special series, “Crisis in Indonesia,” concludes with a profile of the country’s independent media and censorship. 10/01

0135—Crisis in Great Britain. Although foot and mouth disease is no longer front-page news, it’s still wreaking havoc in parts of Europe. Find out how the British are coping with the crisis. And learn why fewer and fewer are seeking higher education in Britain. 8/01

0134—US-European Security. President George W. Bush says he supports the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, but Europeans are skeptical about the level of commitment. Learn more about NATO and the Bush administration’s European security policy. 8/01

0133—India Today/UN Image. Population surveys estimate India could surpass China as the world’s most populous nation by the middle of this century. Learn how India is addressing the population boom, investing in new technology, and managing the conflict in Kashmir. Plus, an assessment of the United Nations’ global image. 8/01

0132—The Global AIDS Fight. Thirty-six million people worldwide are living with HIV/AIDS. And despite the advancement of modern medicine, the infection rate continues to rise. This Common Ground discusses a new worldwide pledge to tackle the epidemic. 8/01

0131—Rebuilding Serbia. Newly pledged Western aid is providing a glimmer of hope to Serbia and the former Yugoslavia. But after nearly a decade of war and political repression, the region faces a long rebuilding process. This edition of Common Ground visits Belgrade to assess the reconstruction. 7/01

0129—African Health and Justice. Nearly 9 percent of all adults in Africa are infected with HIV/AIDS. Despite these epidemic numbers, there is still reason for hope, one expert will tell us why. And we’ll hear about a new attempt to bring justice to Rwanda. 7/01

0128—Japan Today: Tradition Vs. 21st Century Reality. A new wave of nationalism is sweeping across Japan thanks, in part, to Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi. Common Ground uncovers the roots of the nationalism movement and examines why Viagra is more popular than birth control pills in Japan. 7/01
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The Soviet Union collapsed ten years ago. Since then the mainstream American media has paid a great deal of attention to formal US-Russia relations. But there has been much less coverage of the way this historic event has changed the lives of ordinary Russians.

To address this, the Stanley Foundation has created the Russia Project—two one-hour public radio documentaries and a Web site devoted to life in Russia a decade after the Soviet Union. The radio documentaries are hosted by legendary broadcaster Walter Cronkite and produced by Reese Erlich in association with KQED Public Radio in San Francisco.

In 1990 Erlich interviewed a series of ordinary Russians. In the first hour of the Russia Project, listeners meet those same people ten years later to see how their lives have paralleled the ups and downs of the new Russia. Hour two explores a number of policy issues with serious repercussions for Russia’s fledgling democracy. Listeners will also learn what happened to the famous Soviet dissidents after the Cold War ended.

In addition to hosting these programs, Cronkite shares his remembrances of life as an American correspondent in Moscow. And he compares press freedom in the United States and Russia with noted Russian journalist Vladimir Pozner.

Keith Porter and Kristin McHugh, co-hosts of the Stanley Foundation’s weekly radio program on world affairs, Common Ground, are among the reporters providing stories for the Russia Project. In December the Russia Project will be made available free of charge to radio broadcasters around the world. Contact your local public radio station for exact airtimes.

The Web site www.russiaproject.org will feature unique in-depth reporting, original photojournalism, and background material on several of the radio stories. The full audio and transcripts of the radio documentaries will also be on the Web site when launched in December.

—Keith Porter

Walter Cronkite, Host

Documentary Focuses on Change in Russia

Profiles of Ordinary Russians
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