Global Change

Several stories in this issue of the Courier report on the Stanley Foundation’s 31st Strategy for Peace Conference held last year. As you will note, all four discussions were heavily influenced by the enormous changes that have occurred on the world political stage in the past year and a half.

It has been helpful for us to think back to the foundation’s 30th Strategy for Peace Conference in October, 1989, and remember that in the year between it and the 31st conference the Berlin Wall fell and the East bloc essentially disintegrated. With them, the organizing principle of international relations for more than four decades all but disappeared.

All of the programs reported on in this issue of the Courier reflect the foundation’s ongoing focus on the enormity of global change.

-Editor

Foreign Policy: Diverse Influences

The United States is entering a new era in which ethnic diversity will more heavily influence foreign policy. That influence can either enrich policymaking or, if not handled properly, become divisive. Those assertions are contained in the report from an ethnically diverse group that met to discuss, “The Growing Impact of Ethnic and Geographic Diversity on US Foreign Policy.” The meeting was part of the Stanley Foundation’s 31st Strategy for Peace Conference.

The discussion was chaired by Michael Clough, senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations. The group included African-Americans, Hispanic-Americans, Arab-Americans, and Asian-Americans, among others. The possible influence of ethnic groups in foreign policy development has become a timely subject because the end of the Cold War has opened up US foreign policy to redefinition.

Three factors contribute to the prospect for greater ethnic representation in foreign policymaking. First, the ethnic composition of the country has been changing dramatically, especially since 1960. The greatest number of immigrants no longer come from Europe, but instead arrive from Latin America and Asia. The political influence of these groups is very high because their populations are centered in a relatively few states.

Second, these ethnic groups are mobilizing to increase their influence on policy. Some of the participants saw value in penetrating the foreign policy establishment regardless of whether they could directly change a policy position. Others saw benefit in getting more heavily involved in order to influence policy toward their country of origin.

The third factor involves the increased participation of states and localities in shaping foreign policy. This provides more opportunities for ethnic groups to influence policy. State and local interests may no longer coincide with national interests. States, for example, are becoming more aggressive in developing trade links with foreign coun-

(Continued on page 2)
Several have established trade missions in Tokyo. In some cases, ethnic minorities can help foster direct links at the nongovernmental level through such things as personal ties to relatives abroad. Increased grassroots involvement of citizens through cultural exchanges also is influencing policy.

**Ethnic Mobilization**
The approaches and experiences of different ethnic groups vary widely. Jewish Americans are not, strictly speaking, an ethnic group but their influence on foreign policy is seen as very effective. Reasons for this include: a history of persecution which reinforces religious identity, the Holocaust as a symbol around which to mobilize, a clear objective of ensuring support for Israel, and relative affluence and high political participation.

African-Americans have ethnic solidarity based on their background of slavery, but that legacy of slavery has also left the group at an economic and political disadvantage. Economic superpower boosted the self-image of Japanese-Americans. Immigration policy is one of the top concerns for Asian-Americans.

Hispanic-Americans are comprised mostly of people from Mexico, Cuba, and Puerto Rico. The diverse backgrounds inhibit mobilization around foreign policy issues as each group tends to have its own top priority subject of interest. Also, there are wide gaps in the economic status of Hispanics with Cuban-Americans being the most prosperous.

A similar situation is faced by Arab-Americans. They also come from several countries in the Middle East and North Africa and have varying degrees of ties to their country of origin. This makes it nearly impossible to articulate a clear Arab-American foreign policy agenda. It is also true that many Arabs who have lived in the United States for some time are highly assimilated.

As the report from the conference observed, "The picture that emerged...was of diverse sets of groups, each with its own strengths and weaknesses, and each with a different base for mobilizing around foreign policy issues...This reality makes it extremely difficult to create a coherent, consistent, integrated foreign policy."

**An Opening**
The end of the Cold War provides an opportunity for giving US foreign policy new direction. Whether and how ethnic groups will capitalize on that opportunity depends on a variety of factors. One is the manner in which they seek to influence the predominantly white, male foreign policy establishment. The participants discussed the pros and cons of two approaches—lobbying the establishment or trying to become a part of it. Inclusion of minorities within the establishment might broaden the foreign policy agenda. But that might not happen if the people who become part of the establishment hold traditional views.

Some of the participants saw danger in greater ethnic mobilization around foreign policy issues. There is a possibility that conflicting interests among the groups might develop into an unhealthy competition for limited resources and influence. Again, the absence of the Cold War as an organizing principle for foreign policy increases the danger.

The report of the conference notes a consensus in the group, "...that the inclusion of new faces into the foreign policy community could enhance the United States' ability to play a leadership role in the post-Cold War world. However, for that to happen, there needs to be a broader vision of the US role in the world that would recognize the paramountcy of common interests over parochial interests." Absent that vision, the report concludes, ethnic competition and mobilization could become divisive.

-Jeffrey Martin

(See the resource list on page 11 for a copy of the report from this conference.)
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The US Role in Soviet Reform

The United States should quickly do what it can to promote further reform in the Soviet Union. This is the main thrust of a report from the group discussing “Perestroika and Political Decentralization: Options for US Policy” at the Stanley Foundation’s 31st Strategy for Peace Conference. Blair Ruble of the Woodrow Wilson Center for International Scholars chaired the panel of academic, business, and policy experts.

The participants agreed that a more benign Soviet Union “lies squarely within the US national interest.” While the US may have little influence over events in the Soviet Union, opportunities to promote change do exist. The group did not encourage direct financial aid which could be misused to support the existing system and “postpone necessary but painful reforms.” Instead, the report suggests the US could promote change by “accelerating nuclear arms negotiations, encouraging private-sector investment in the Soviet Union, and launching ongoing exchanges with a wide variety of Soviet citizens.”

Talk of Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev’s plans and power dominated much of the group’s discussion. Participants agreed that Gorbachev saw the need to stop the country’s economic deterioration when he took office as general secretary of the Communist Party in March 1985. His initial attempts at reform failed, and by 1987 he saw the need to launch his programs of perestroika, glasnost, and democratization. In addition, he made drastic changes in foreign policy resulting in Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan and an Intermediate Nuclear Forces treaty that did not challenge the Strategic Defense Initiative. But the group disagreed over how much of this change was planned by Gorbachev or how much of it was the result of forces that had spun out of his control.

Gorbachev’s Future
Opinions concerning the present and future strength of Gorbachev also divided participants. One predicted an ultimate take-over by conservative forces after radical reformers such as Boris Yeltsin overthrow Gorbachev. But another participant said the leader, having assumed new powers, is now stronger than ever. Most in the group, though, thought the increase in Gorbachev’s formal powers was offset by a loss in his actual authority, especially since the public perceives him as weaker.

All of this aside, the group still believed Gorbachev to be “irreplaceable,” saying that he is the only one who can talk with groups on the Right and Left as well as the military and KGB.

US Interests
The United States has several policy interests in the events taking place in the Soviet Union. First, democratization and decentralization are in the US interest because they would promote a less aggressive foreign policy.

Because of the Soviets’ large nuclear arsenal, the group was much more worried about the potential for decentralization leading to a chaotic breakup of the nation. Participants agreed that accelerated arms control negotiations could only make the world safer.

Another goal of US policy should be integration of the Soviet Union into global economic organizations like the World Bank and the GATT. This would counter the Soviets’ “long-held sense of isolation and encirclement by hostile forces.”

While not providing massive amounts of foreign aid to the Soviet Union, the United States can provide advice and information on economic modernization and democratization. The group recommended that the US set up a $1.5 to $2 billion ongoing program to give advice and exchange information with officials at many levels in the Soviet system.

Finally, the group said investments by US companies are “critically important in transferring Western managerial know-how and labor skills and practices.” The report said, “In short, investments provide a model of the benefits of the market economy.” However, this will require that the US government provide investment credits to US companies that may be daunted by the risks of investing in the Soviet Union.

Participants reiterated their belief that the “US can only play a marginal role in affecting developments inside the Soviet Union.” But, they agreed that the Soviets deserve whatever limited aid the US can provide because of their huge “nuclear and geopolitical importance.”

-Keith Porter

(See the resource list on page 10 for a copy of the report from this conference.)
Communications:
New Policy Challenges

Appointment of a cabinet-level post for communications and the convening of an international communications conference are among the recommendations of communications experts who met at the Stanley Foundation’s 31st Strategy for Peace Conference. The group, chaired by Leonard Sussman, senior scholar in International Communications at Freedom House, met to discuss “International Communications: How to Regulate Without Censorship.”

The conference was convened to consider policy options at a time when communications and computer technology is developing at a dizzying rate. As the report from the conference notes, “All of the group’s discussions took place within the context of the realization that we are in the midst of a communications explosion in terms of the rapidity of new technological developments; that there is also an explosive convergence of telecommunications, broadcasting, and computer technologies; that these are enabling greater interactions not only from technology to technology, but between and amongst peoples and subject to less and less control by authorities and governments.”

The group foresaw in the next decade or two further large increases in the volume and diversity of messages that will be exchanged. Networks that link technologies ranging from computers to telephones to television will proliferate. That will require national and international regulation in order to prevent chaos. However, regulation offers the opportunity for new forms of censorship. The challenge for policymakers is how to maximize the benefits of the new technological developments and minimize the disadvantages.

Problem Areas
Several major problems were noted. First, the panel said that US foreign policy, again in the words of the report, “does not reflect the importance of telecommunications to our business interests, our citizens’ welfare, or our development policy.” Furthermore, the US does not appear to have a cohesive strategy for international communications issues.

Economically, the US lags behind Japan and Europe in financing research and development, putting the country at a competitive disadvantage. Antitrust legislation and lack of tax incentives were cited as obstacles to progress in this area.

Internationally, there is a widening telecommunications gap between developed and developing countries. The conference saw the potential for communications to be a major stimulant to developing country economies. However, two problems present themselves. First, extending communications to remote areas is not profitable and requires public financing which is in short supply. Second, many countries own telecommunications monopolies which are resistant to new, less centralized technologies.

The increased flow of television signals via satellite from program producing countries to recipient nations increases the prospects of introducing cultural values not desired by the receiving country. This phenomenon raises charges of “cultural imperialism.” The problem is compounded by the fact that little material which is produced in other parts of the world finds its way onto US television. As one participant said, “We are a protected and utterly parochial society.”

Recommendations
The United States needs a cabinet-level post, according to this panel, to better coordinate domestic and international communications policy. An alternative would be to have a White House advisor for communications. The group also called for the development of more communications specialists in US government who can represent the country well in international meetings.

The call for an international conference was prompted by the need to deal with such issues as transborder dataflow, standards setting, and integrated planning. The conference would also heighten international awareness of the importance of communications to development.

Other recommendations include: more education, increased foreign aid directed toward communications development, and for the United States to re-enter the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

—Jeffrey Martin
As a new world order continues to evolve, the US foreign aid program needs a refocused mission. The Cold War dictated that foreign aid be allocated on the basis of national security requirements, which generally meant containment of the Soviet Union. Now Congress and the administration face a multipolar world with nations at widely different levels of economic development.

These challenges are spelled out in a report from the "Foreign Aid Beyond the Cold War" discussion group at the Stanley Foundation's 31st Strategy for Peace Conference. Participants spoke of a "robust alliance of security and development concerns in Washington that shaped allocation of US foreign aid for forty years." Aid levels have remained roughly the same during the post-Cold War transition but "are now allocated to serve a wider variety of purposes," including helping to rebuild Eastern Europe.

**US Foreign Assistance**

Currently, the Agency for International Development, also known as USAID, is a main channel for US assistance going overseas. In addition, many other federal agencies are involved in transferring resources overseas. The US also provides assistance through a number of multilateral organizations and private voluntary organizations.

Participants said support for foreign aid comes from a variety of sources. The White House is still the "...major constituent for foreign aid funding." However, the Reagan and Bush administrations have ignored congressional pressures to refocus US aid. A few powerful members of Congress defend particular aid expenditures. Likewise, some ethnic lobbying groups push for aid to countries such as Greece and Israel. The report suggests that the White House and Congress may find it easier to shift money from defense to foreign aid rather than trying to reallocate existing funds in the aid budget. This may become even more necessary as new ethically based lobbying groups demand aid for Eastern Europe.

**New Directions**

According to the participants, Americans need to better understand why US foreign aid is important. Many in the group felt that a presidential initiative on aid is necessary to build public support for assistance. This initiative would require a refocusing of aid around "...a set of core values that wins support at home and directs US aid efforts to meet the exigencies of the post-Cold War world and to further US interests."

Linking democracy with development and economic growth could be part of this "set of core values." However, some participants cautioned that this could raise definitional problems as US agencies try to judge which countries are advancing toward democracy and which are backsliding. In addition, aid would have to be cut when conditions are not met in order to preserve the program's credibility.

The environment is also a potential focus for US aid. The report says this could be "...broadly defined to include global health issues, urban and rural poverty conditions that give rise to pollution and environmental degradation, as well as general ecosystems issues and industrialized country abuses." Participants cautioned, though, that these are complex issues. For example, "poor populations do often degrade their local environment to stay alive...."

The report concludes that global changes are causing the US aid community to react without a clear rationale to many new demands on its resources. Until the president strongly defines the mission of foreign assistance and advocates an increase in aid levels, US aid will continue to operate in this reactive and fragmented manner.

*Keith Porter*
Saving the CHILDREN

This past September, the United Nations hosted an unprecedented gathering of seventy-one world leaders at UN headquarters in New York. The occasion was the first-ever World Summit for Children sponsored by the United Nations Children's Fund, or UNICEF. The Stanley Foundation covered the summit for its radio series, “Common Ground.” Heads of states and children’s advocates were interviewed for the radio program. The following are highlights from the two-part series, #9049050, which is available on audio cassette for $7.

“Our job here today is to ensure that when the children assume positions of leadership in their own nations and around the world, they don’t face the same problems of poverty and suffering that prevail in so many countries, bringing us all so much tragedy and loss. ...Today may represent the beginning of a change in the lives of the world’s children. Today, in this hall, the children may have found the voices and the friends they have long been seeking.”

Brian Mulroney, Prime Minister, Canada

“It’s a question of giving priority to children. When we have had budget cuts, which is the case in most countries during the last few years, often the social sector has been the first to be cut, which means that children cannot go to school. Children don’t have health services, or children don’t get enough food. ...We calculate that at a very low cost, two-thirds of those [40,000 children who die daily] could be saved. And this is due to the fact that we have vaccines against measles, whooping cough, tetanus, and other diseases that can, at a very low cost, save children’s lives. We also know that one-third of those dying die because of diarrhea, and this can be prevented through better hygiene, and the effects can be eliminated using oral rehydration therapy...which will make it possible to avoid dehydration. ...We know that the vaccine costs only $1.50 per child, or that one treatment with oral rehydration could be as low as ten cents. We are talking maybe about a few billion dollars a year to save these children, and this is still a miniscule amount compared to what is spent on arms...”

Bjorn Oldeus, Director, Programme Funding Office, UNICEF

“I hope that this summit will pay more attention to the children because their human rights are not being respected, and I want that to be of more concern to the presidents of the world.”

Oscar Ramos, ten years old, Peru

“If we don’t do better with the children than we do today, I think we will have a pretty bad future for all mankind. ...The rich countries have a responsibility to transfer resources to the South, that is to the poor countries. ...We know that we could save the lives of many of the children who die today. We have the knowledge, and honestly we have the resources to do that. ...The Third World could do a lot themselves. Many of these countries put too much money on arms, the military sector. Now, with the new developments in the world, with Iraq as an exception, there is a chance for better understanding....”

Ingvar Carlsson, Prime Minister, Sweden
“There are a lot of children who are unhappy because their parents are in war and they can’t go to school. They have problems with malnutrition and diseases. I would like UNICEF to help these children...”

Merritt Michael, fourteen years old, Eritrea

“How much evil has already been committed in the name of children. But I have also experienced something different... I have experienced a beautiful revolt of children against the lie that their parents had served allegedly in the interests of those very children. Our antitalitarian revolution was at least in the very beginning a children’s revolution... They marched and their parents were afraid... Then they [the parents] started marching in the streets with them [the children]. The children evoked in their parents their better selves. They convicted them of lying and forced them to take a stand on the side of truth.”

Vaclav Havel, President, Czechoslovakia

“...So let us affirm in this historic summit that these children can be saved. They can be saved when we live up to our responsibilities, not just as an assembly of governments but as a world community of adults, of parents. ...I’ve learned that our children are a mirror—an honest reflection of their parents and their world.”

George Bush, President, USA

“The fact is America is not competitive with other nations on certain basic protections for children. We are, along with South Africa, probably the only wealthy industrialized nations who do not provide a floor of health decency for our children. Our infant mortality rates lag behind many of our industrialized peers. ...I’m ashamed that as UNICEF is making significant progress in immunizing Third World children, we’re having measles epidemics breaking out. ...It’s really time for our political leaders of both parties to begin to put children first, rather than last.... If the president and the Congress don’t begin to give children first call on the most basic investments in health, in child care, in education, and in nutrition, we’re not going to have a strong, competitive work force in the 1990s. It’s a bottom-line issue. Our question isn’t... about how to save children. The issue is why aren’t we saving them.”

Marian Wright Edelman, President, Children’s Defense Fund

“The fact that this is occurring is one of the great moments in history.... Because the future is children, and we are at the turning point, not only in history but in human evolution where we are now cognizant of what are the most important natural resources, and these are humans, and they are children.”

Jonas Salk, Developer, Salk vaccine against polio

---

CAUSES OF CHILD DEATHS

- Diarrhoeal disease: 4 million (28%)
- Pneumonia: 2.2 million (15%)
- Measles: 2.8 million (21%)
- Tetanus: 1 million (7%)
- Whooping Cough: 4.2 million (23%)
- Other causes

ANNUAL DEATHS OF CHILDREN UNDER FIVE

PREVENTION: 10 cents will buy one sachet of Oral Rehydration Salts for protecting children against dehydration, which makes diarrhoea the biggest killer.

PREVENTION: $1 will buy one course of antibiotics which can prevent most child deaths from pneumonia.

PREVENTION: $1.50 will buy one child vaccines for protection against three major killers: whooping cough, tetanus and diphtheria.
Understanding Perestroika

“T”here wouldn’t be glasnost and perestroika if something had not gone wrong. [That’s why] the United States likes to hear about the Soviet Union—because they think they’ve won.” That was the comment of Joseph Diescho, a Namibian author and graduate student who spoke recently at a three-day seminar on global changes sponsored in part by the Stanley Foundation.

The meeting featured presentations from members of the diplomatic, church, and grassroots communities including Bishop Herbert Chilstrom, head of the ELCA. The 150 participants also had opportunities to explore their own ideas in small group discussions with topics ranging from the conflict in the Middle East to the role of the churches in the revolution in East Germany.

Soviet Restructuring
Keynote speaker Alexandre Avanesov, first secretary of the Soviet mission to the United Nations, outlined his government’s plans for restructuring the Soviets’ centralized economy into a market-oriented economy. He also commented on the Soviet Union’s plans for integration into the world economy. Because of the current financial drain on the Soviet system, he said the government is reconsidering its foreign aid. “As for the Third World,” he continued, “no doubt we will continue to aid them. As for the middle-income developing countries, we will reconsider, drastically our aid. We don’t know if it has been an effective deal for us.”

Avanesov also addressed the Soviets’ newfound interest in the use of multilateral institutions such as the United Nations. “Before, we praised the organization, but those were only words...” he said. “Now [the UN is] trying to achieve real deeds. ...The United Nations played a substantial role in the Afghanistan agreement, Nicaragua, Namibia, South Africa, and now, I hope, in the Persian Gulf. We’re happy we have this organization now and can use it to hopefully resolve this crisis of the Persian Gulf. ...I do believe wisdom will win.”

An African Perspective
Joseph Diescho of Namibia responded to the changes outlined by Avanesov. Diescho is currently a Fulbright scholar at Columbia University and is the author of Born of the Sun. In reference to the end of the Cold War and the increasing importance of economic power, Diescho said: “We in the Third World are watching patiently. What we see is that[powerful nations] discuss issues the same way they did in 1880 at the Berlin conference when they carved up Africa. We see not their sensitivity and concern to Africa, but to be on top. ...When we talk about a new world order, we should look beyond economic issues and look at people. What makes some countries powerful and strong and great is exactly what keeps us down. ...One of the fundamental mistakes in the world order is that certain voices were not listened to. ...The new rapprochement between East and West is not necessarily a positive event in terms of our struggle to self-determination.”

In summing up the effectiveness of the event, Jack Smith quoted a participant who said, “...I go home more determined than ever to pursue peace and justice issues.”

-Mary Gray
Responding to a Changing World

In response to the magnitude and pace of global change, the Stanley Foundation has initiated new programming in the form of one-day meetings. This allows the foundation to experiment with and develop ideas for longer conferences or for other programming. At the same time, participants are provided valuable information and planning opportunities.

Two of these day-long discussion sessions were held last fall. The following brief narrative on their objectives and outcomes was written by Stanley Foundation Vice President David Doerge who organized both meetings.

Global Change Forum
It has almost become a cliché to say that the world is undergoing a series of rapid, fundamental changes and that US policy, as a result, needs to be transformed. But are the experts adequately prepared to understand and respond to these changes? Our objective with the Global Change Forum was to create the opportunity for an open-ended, concrete discussion focused on developing the intellectual capital necessary for a new era.

As with any endeavor to generate original thinking, its success depended on those who participated. Fortunately, former Senator Dick Clark agreed to chair the meeting. Participants included an impressive array of policymakers, international scholars, and journalists.

This meeting was not convened as merely an intellectual exercise. Events have overtaken policy thinking and represent a rare opportunity in history to focus on first principles and to consider how we might shape our future. Consequently, six questions were developed to serve as the agenda for the meeting. Topics ranged from the erosion of the nation-state system, to the role of international institutions in a post-Cold War environment, to the leadership of the United States in organizing a new international order.

We achieved our main goal by beginning a dialogue among a group of thoughtful individuals, each an expert on some portion of a passing era, each with the vision to contemplate a future none of us could have ever predicted. The dialogue was rich and honest, and most participants wanted to continue and expand it. We are now considering ways to effectively meet that challenge.

Nuclear Nonproliferation Forum
The second meeting focused on nuclear proliferation. Chaired by Professor Albert Carnesale, dean of the Kennedy School, Harvard University, it was convened to generate and elucidate a fresh agenda for research and, where appropriate, action on this increasingly important issue.

The problem of nuclear proliferation has been present and has been discussed for some time. What made this meeting different was the combination of two factors: the unpredictability of a post-Cold War environment coupled with a new approach to the problem. The bulk of the nuclear nonproliferation discussion continues to focus on preventing the spread of nuclear weapons and their related technologies. Remarkably little effort has gone into studying and planning for "managing" the proliferation problem. As Professor Carnesale put it when we first discussed the possibility of a new approach, "Ten years from now, what will we wish we had done about proliferation in addition to trying to stop it?"

Together we were able to organize a one-day meeting to discuss this new approach to nuclear proliferation. A wide range of influential policy-makers and experts in the field attended, including four with service on the National Security Council.

One of our main goals was to get as many ideas on the table as possible. Topics included likely future problem areas, the role of arms control, and the possibility of an expanded Defense Department role if "managing" nuclear proliferation becomes necessary. The dialogue was wide-ranging and identified several areas for future research, analysis, and discussion.

Beyond Alliances
The Strategic Affairs Seminar '90 in October brought a dozen military and industry experts to Minot, North Dakota. Maj. Gen. Harold "Pete" Todd (USAF, Ret.), moderated round-table discussions of a new report called Beyond Alliances: Global Security Through Focused Partnerships ("one of the first efforts to assess the long-run significance of the declining Soviet threat and to offer a new framework for US global strategy in the post-Cold War era"). Public sessions featured interaction with officers from the local Strategic Air Command base. The main organizer was Kenneth Robertson, Jr., president of the Joint Studies Center in Minot. Other sponsors were the local Chamber of Commerce, the David C. Jones Chapter of the Air Force Association, and the Stanley Foundation. Beyond Alliances is available without charge from the Wexler Group, 202-638-2121.
Regional Issues

☆ 9106—Beyond the Killing Fields (February 1991). A conversation with Cambodian holocaust survivor Dith Pran about the future for peace in his homeland. ($7 cassette)

☆ 9101—The Tragedy of Northern Ireland (January 1991). Nobel Peace Prize recipient Mairead Corrigan Maguire discusses her work to end the violence in Northern Ireland. ($7 cassette)


☆ Global Change and Africa: Implications for US Policy. This report examines the impact of the Cold War’s end on Africa and the challenge of developing new ways of understanding and addressing the continent’s problems. October 1989, 16pp.

☆ Debt and Democracy in Latin America. This report examines the relationship between the region’s debt crisis and political and economic developments. October 1989, 20pp.


☆ Soviet Economic Reform: Socialism and Property. Consideration of these issues by conference participants clarifies the range of options open to Gorbachev and the constraints under which he operates. October 1989, 16pp.

United Nations

☆ 9015—UNESCO Today (September 1990). UNESCO Director-General Frederico Mayor on why the United States should rejoin the organization. ($7 cassette)


☆ 9006—Reflections on the United Nations (February 1990). An exclusive interview with UN Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar on the role of the UN in a changing world. ($7 cassette)

Environment

☆ 9029—Poverty Versus The Environment (July 1990). Representatives of the North-South debate focus on the difficulties poor countries face in balancing development with environmental protection. ($7 cassette)

☆ 8952—Redefining Progress (December 1989). Self-described philosopher Jeremy Rifkin talks about the environment and his “101 Ways to Prevent Global Warming.” ($7 cassette)

☆ 8948/8941—A World at Risk (October 1989). A two-part series with members of the Brundtland Commission focusing on the landmark report, Our Common Future, and the US role in protecting this fragile planet. ($7 cassette)

☆ Environment and Development: Breaking the Ideological Deadlock lists steps which could be taken to enhance prospects for a successful 1992 World Conference on Environment and Development. (20pp)


Security and Disarmament


☆ Addiction to Arms is a 16-page address by Jack M. Smith, vice president of the Stanley Foundation. It records Smith’s view that definite similarities exist between an addiction to alcohol or drugs and a nation’s addiction to nuclear weapons.

Other Topics of Interest

☆ 9107—Building a New World (February 1991). A broad-ranging discussion with social critic and author Todd Gitlin (The Sixties). ($7 cassette)


☆ 9107—Building a New World (February 1991). A broad-ranging discussion with social critic and author Todd Gitlin (The Sixties). ($7 cassette)
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<td>World Press Review sample</td>
<td>Free*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please enclose payment. (Note $7 cassette charge.)

Make checks payable to:
The Stanley Foundation
216 Sycamore Street, Suite 500
Muscatine, Iowa 52761-3831
319/264-1500

IMPORTANT! Please use order form so that your mailing label is left intact on the reverse side. Please correct your name and address if necessary.

*Quantity Orders
These items are available in quantity for postage and handling charges as follows:
- Individual copies: FREE
- 2–10: $2.00
- 11–25: $4.00
- 26–50: $6.00
- Over 50: Contact the foundation for special pricing.

---

*☆9047—Understanding Fundamentalism* (November 1990). Theologian and scholar Martin Marty presents the results of an international project he is directing on the impact of religious fundamentalism on the modern world. ($7 cassette)

*☆9045—Democracy is Something We Do* (November 1990). Frances Moore Lappe (*Die for a Small Planet*) discusses her latest project called Building Citizen Democracy. ($7 cassette)


◆ Foreign Aid Beyond the Cold War. This report summarizes a discussion on the need for a new foreign aid rationale. October 1990, 20pp.


☆8942—A Socialist Vision (October 1989). One of the final interviews with the late Michael Harrington on socialism in the US and abroad. ($7 cassette)

☆8914—To Bear Witness (April 1989). A wide-ranging interview with Nobel Peace Prize-winner Elie Wiesel including his views on events in Israel today. ($7 cassette)

---

World Press Review
The foundation's monthly magazine features excerpts from the press outside the United States and interviews with prominent international specialists on a wide range of issues. Subscriptions are placed through a New York City office, but you may order a sample copy from the foundation using the order form to the right.
Getting Ready for Rio

Hilda Rwabazera Paqui serves with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Looking toward an upcoming major world conference on environment and development, the Stanley Foundation arranged for her to address UN Day events in Wichita, St. Louis, and Chicago. The following is condensed from several talks.

As we observe the fortieth anniversary of the UN Development Programme, we look back upon four decades of helping people help themselves. Average life expectancy has increased by sixteen years, adult literacy by 40 percent, per capita nutrition by over 20 percent, and child mortality has been halved. But there's no cause for complacency. Problems abound. The very future of lives on this planet is threatened by environmental degradation. Both rich and poor nations are responsible for this sorry state of affairs.

"Much of the damage can be undone and future damage...averted. But we have to act now, and we have to act in concert. Our foremost challenge is to reorient development to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. This is known as sustainable development.

1992 Conference in Brazil

"The UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) will be held in Rio de Janeiro in June 1992 to create a global blueprint for sustainable development.

"A parallel peoples' congress will gather some twenty thousand persons from nongovernmental organization (NGO) sectors to express their views and to make commitments toward ensuring a sustainable future. Preparations are already in full swing, so I appeal to you to [get involved].... You know best what global actions you need to take in your state and your city. Your government has been asked to prepare a national paper on the problems as well as on what you plan to do about ensuring sustainable development. You have to start working now to ensure that your views, your concerns, your aspirations get put into this paper.

Global Initiatives

"A few weeks ago, the president of the World Bank, the administrator of my organization, UNDP, and the executive director of the UN Environmental Programme jointly called on industrialized countries to set up, as a matter of emergency, a global environment facility. Should the money be forthcoming, the $1 billion fund over a three-year period would support programs to guard against global warming, destruction of biodiversity, and pollution of interterritorial waters.

"Last May UNDP came up with a new yardstick called the Human Development Index, including life expectancy and literacy as well as purchasing power per capita. We [developed] this because nobody should judge the wealth of nations by GNP only. Indeed, the wealth of a nation can be better judged by the situation of its people. People must be at the center of development efforts, not dams, not hospitals. People are both the means and the ends of development.

Productive Women

"The main component of this focus has to be [making] women...more productive...while lessening their burdens. When you educate a man, you educate an individual; when you educate a woman, you educate a nation. Women need more access to credit and land. Their health has to be improved. Sustainable development can only be achieved with full and equal participation by women at all levels from policymaking to program implementation.

In This Together

"We cannot sit here in America comfortably and think, "If those Africans deplete their forests, if the desert overtakes them, it is their problem." They are not as far away as you think. The consequences of those environmental degradations and the resulting poverty will come to haunt you—in terms of more aid being asked of you, in terms of internal strife, in terms of refugees seeking refuge in this country, in Europe, or in any other successful country. So we are in this together."

- excerpted by Dan Clark

For more information on how you can participate in preparation for the 1992 conference, contact: Global Tomorrow Coalition, 1325 G Street, NW, Suite 915, Washington, DC 20005-3104

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

Do Not Forward, Address Correction Requested Return Postage Guaranteed

Nonprofit Org.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Cedar Rapids, IA
Permit 214