

PN-AAT-589

ISA 41674

*1/200 for
new names w/6/8/81*

**UNITED STATES AGENCY
FOR
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

000035

21

**PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON VOLUNTARY
FOREIGN AID**

December 9 & 10, 1980

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Meeting

The Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid (Committee), of the Agency for International Development (AID), met on December 9 and 10, 1980 at the Sheraton-Washington Hotel in Washington, D.C. This was the fourth in a series of meetings for fiscal year 1980.

Prior to the Washington, D.C. meeting, participants discussed the importance of community involvement at a conference held in September, 1980, in Los Angeles. There, during the workshop session, "Development Education," Tom Fox, of AID, discussed AID's plan to sponsor, in collaboration with the PVO community, some public forums for enhancing citizen understanding of development issues. These meetings, reported Fox, would include national and community leaders as well as those knowledgeable in international relations and development. Workshop participants provided suggestions for increasing the impact and effectiveness of such a program, and discussed the roles of PVOs and Government in educating the public about development. These suggestions and recommendations can be found in the Los Angeles Committee Report, October, 1980.

In light of the discussions and recommendations emanating from the Los Angeles Development Education Workshop, the Committee devoted its entire December Conference to development education issues. Hence, during this conference, the Committee, along with private voluntary agencies, reviewed the work and accomplishments of some PVOs in the development education field, analyzed the issues and problems in the field, and planned its future direction for development education.

Purpose

The purpose of this Committee meeting was to address the following concerns:

1. PVO and Government activities in development education and their roles during the next decade in development education;

2. The problems of and potential achievements in the design and administration of a public education program about international relations;
3. Reactions to development education proposals and other research conducted by development specialists (i.e., Irene Pinkau, Janet Tuthill, Marina Fanning-Firfer, and Charles MacCormack, etc.);
4. Suggestions for strategies and activities that will enhance public understanding of and increase financial support for development education;
5. Suggestions for a 1981 development education agenda.

A principal recurring theme throughout the proceedings was the crucial need for collaborative efforts among PVOs and between Government and the PVO community to assist American citizens in understanding the impact of the developing Third World on United States economic and political conditions.

Overview of the Agenda

The agenda of the December 9 and 10, 1980, Committee Conference guided the discussion of four major topics: (1) new world conditions that affect relations between the United States and Third World countries; (2) the need for Americans to understand the interdependence between developed countries and less-developed countries; (3) concepts and program recommendations for private sector initiatives and processes in public education, and (4) ways to establish a joint work process, among PVOs and between Government and PVOs, to better educate American citizens about a complex world.

During the morning plenary session, on December 9, three panelists presented their views of the topic, "Helping Relations Under New World Conditions:"

1. John Sewell discussed the impact of the developing Third World on United States economy and social conditions.
2. Stephen Hayes discussed the philosophy, activities and achievements of the YMCA and other private voluntary agencies in development.

3. Norman Sherman questioned the role of PVOs in development education, and gave a review of problems facing PVOs and Government with regard to the process and design of an international education program.

During the afternoon plenary session, three additional panelists discussed "Learning About a Complex World--Concepts and Experience:"

1. Charles MacCormack provided a comprehensive overview of the problems of and possible approaches to the design and process of development education.
2. Robert Harlan discussed certain organizational strategies that influence the design and administration of an international education program.
3. Mildred Marcy discussed the roles of the United States International Communications Agency and women in development education.

An extensive question and answer session resulted from these presentations, followed by workshop sessions where participants addressed two topics: (1) concepts and program recommendations for private sector initiatives and processes, and (2) ways to establish a joint work process.

Proceedings of December 10, involved a report of the workshop sessions, presented by Dr. Joseph Kennedy, and two panelists who further addressed, "learning about a complex world:"

1. Phillips Ruopp stressed the changing economic and political conditions, worldwide, under which PVOs and Government must continue development service, and explained that they must "do better with less."
2. Richard Celeste discussed ways PVOs and Government can accomplish more with less.

Various speakers representing AID, PVOs, and the Committee, suggested future directions, activities, and content for development education design and administration in 1981.

PROCEEDINGS OF DECEMBER 9, 1980

Morning Plenary Session: "Helping Relations Under New World Conditions"

This panel was chaired by John Sewell, President of the Overseas Development Council (ODC). Sewell presented the primary address followed by discussants Stephen Hayes of the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) and Norman Sherman of the Office of Public Affairs of the Agency for International Development (AID).

Summaries of Speeches

John Sewell

Sewell's speech focused on the impact of three factors on United States and Third World relationships during the course of three decades: (1) the growing economic importance of the Third World, (2) the soaring political assertiveness of developing countries throughout the world, and (3) certain common challenges that face both rich and poor countries within this century.

According to Sewell, economists and development specialists in the 1950s declared that prospects for Third World economic development, either in the absolute sense or in terms of progress, were not favorable. Contrary to this economic speculation, development specialists witnessed from the 1950s to the 1980s a phenomenal rate of "aggregate" development in the Third World. It seems, according to Sewell, that Third World aggregate progress occurred faster in the last thirty years than at any other period in history. Sewell further explained that "even during the troubled decade of the 1970s when we, the industrial countries, were having a great deal of difficulty with our economies, the Third World, in the aggregate, grew much faster than we did. It still is, as a matter of fact."

Along with Third World economic progress, social development also has exceeded the prospects of development specialists and economists. Two indicators of social progress are the eradication of disease (i.e., smallpox) and increased life

expectancy. Hence, from the perspective of aggregate development, Third World countries have exceeded world expectation in the social and economic realms.

However, "aggregate" development progress reveals little about the actual conditions of individual developing countries. Concurrent with this remarkable aggregate economic progress has been a worsening of the human condition and relations within countries, a growing differentiation between countries, and the persistence of an unconscionable amount of global poverty and human misery. These specific conditions, declared Sewell, will prevail into the 1990s.

Sewell further asserted that because economic disparities within the Third World are so great, the labels "less-developed" or "more-developed" countries do not describe the levels of economic progress existing throughout the Third World. Sewell proposed an alternate set of categories describing the level of development:

1. The oil exporters who are the advanced developing countries;
2. The new industrializing countries who are now proving to be very strong competitors with the traditional industrial economy;
3. The middle-income countries who should continue to function reasonably well as long as the world economy functions adequately;
4. The low-income countries which pose a development challenge of the 1980s and 1990s. They will not do well unless there are some massive shifts, both in international policies and their own domestic priorities.

This "aggregate" development progress results in economic conditions in developing countries which affect economic and social well-being of more developed countries. Sewell suggested that this Third World economic transformation behooves the United States and other developed countries to acknowledge the growing economic importance of the Third World.

In support of his thesis, Sewell cited the area of trade as an example of Third World impact. The developing Third World, in the aggregate, is the United States' fastest growing export market and our major competitor. More specifically, "non-oil exporting developing countries now buy more from us than Europe and the Soviet Union combined." Although economists are talking about "reindustrializing" the United States, they would be wiser not to isolate United States "reindustrialization" from aggregate Third World development.

The second factor which has altered United States and Third World relationships is the growing political assertiveness among Third World countries evident since the 1970s. Sewell added that a consensus exists among Third World countries that the "post-World War II International Economic Order: (1) was created without their participation; (2) does not afford them equal voice in participation; and (3) does not provide them with an equitable share of the benefits of the results of that system." Consequently, Third World countries:

1. agree that they want the system changed;
2. agree upon a set of proposals for a New International Economic Order;
3. agree to promulgate those proposals in every international public and private forum. "You saw this...at the special session of the United Nations in September. You see it in a different manifestation in UNESCO. We saw it at the Women's Conference in Copenhagen, and you will see it again...where the developing countries, as a group, exhibiting an arbitral cohesion, given their differentiation, want participation and a greater share of the benefits in the existing International Economic Order."

Sewell said that since this Third World proposal for a New International Economic Order marks a massive change in the world economic system, leaders in the existing International Economic Order must now acknowledge the emerging Third World powers and

accommodate their interests. Failure to acknowledge the emergence of Third World powers today would be analogous to the world economic system's failure to recognize the emergence of Germany and Japan as major powers in the late 19th and 20th centuries. The failure of the international economic system to accommodate these two new participants resulted in two world wars, a local depression, social disruption, and loss of human lives beyond calculation.

While Sewell does not suggest that the inability of the current world economic system to accommodate emerging Third World Powers will result in World War III, he does suggest that a continued disregard for Third World conditions will result in much stress and strain on the United States and other industrialized countries.

The third factor affecting United States and Third World relationships is a commonality of problems and challenges. As Sewell said, "both sides, North and South, rich and poor, face a set of common problems, common challenges, which unless dealt with, are going to bring long-term costs." The common challenges, according to Sewell, are discussed extensively in reports developed by a variety of national and international groups during the past 15 months, namely:

1. The Brandt Commission Report;
2. The Global 2000 Report;
3. The Presidential Commission on World Hunger Report;
4. The Overseas Development Council (ODC) Agenda.

The concurrent assertion among these reports is that a program of international cooperation is essential to the alleviation of major problems, "common challenges," facing both rich and poor countries. These "common challenges" include:

1. world hunger and "absolute poverty;"
2. population growth which exceeds the availability of food and water;
3. decreasing natural resources;

4. soaring food and energy prices;
5. natural disasters;
6. political unrest in LDC's and the United States.

Sewell noted that the United States is approaching the "critical threshold" of treating "absolute poverty" as a serious international issue. He compared United States progress in the abolition of poverty to United States progress in the abolition of slavery.

"...In the 19th century the idea of the abolition of slavery approached a critical moral impression that, at some point in the middle of the last century, all of those "long-haired nuts and kooks" who started the abolitionist movement were taken seriously. What was considered to be an idea whose time would never arrive--because of...the entrenched economic, political, and social interests in the maintenance of slavery--came about (to the contrary). In terms of the abolition of absolute poverty, I think, we will approach that (the critical threshold) point sometime within the next ten to twenty years."

Sewell said we have reached a point in the 1980s where ignoring the intricate relationships between the United States and the Third World will result in long-term costs. He argued that both the public and private sector, development-related organizations, the media, the Government and Congress give too little attention to the relationship of conditions in Third World countries to problems in the United States. In this respect, Sewell compared the United States with the United Kingdom, which, he said, has been "remarkable" in recognizing the economic and social importance of the Third World. For example, the Brandt Commission Report prompted in two Parliamentary debates, a series of newspaper articles, and debates among journalists in the United Kingdom.

In the interest of national security, Sewell urged the United States to reorder the issue of its relationships with the Third World to the "high agenda of policy discussion". He said:

"We...pay much more attention to relationships with our...industrial allies within the OECD,* and certainly pay more attention to relationships between the United States and the Soviet Union in the name of national security, than we do to the relationships with developing countries....Were the Soviet Union to disappear tomorrow, literally or figuratively, we would still face an equally important set of threats to our national security, over the next two decades, that have to be dealt with, largely between the United States and the Third World, than anything we face in the realm of military security."

Sewell also discussed the role of the Overseas Development Council (ODC) in developing countries. ODC, a Washington-based research center, was formed eleven years ago by persons from the public and private sectors to study American relations with developing countries. ODC's research and policy education divisions produce and disseminate information for use by government and private policy makers, Congress, the media, and the PVO community.

Sewell suggested that "major" public and private organizations consider three development-related needs when organizing their programs: political action, policy education, and development education.

Regarding political action, Sewell briefly stated a need for political organization from a development policy and procedures standpoint. Political action by the public may influence the Legislative and Executive Branches in the area of development.

The need for information analysis in "policy education" is significant because the American public knows too little about the international economic relationships between the United States and the Third World. Additionally, development specialists need to assess and monitor the development interrelationships between public and private lives in the United States and the Third World.

*Organization of Economic Cooperative Development

Equally important is the need for education of the American public about Third World development. Sewell discussed certain manifestations of Americans' interest in development education. They are:

1. the widespread U.S. public interest in the Brandt Report;
2. the Advisory Committee "Agenda for Action--1979" which called for development and policy education, involving the media, business and the PVO community in the process of educating the public;
3. John Sommer's book, Beyond Charity, which analyzes the history and role of the private voluntary organizations in development overseas and in education of the U.S. public;
4. the involvement of ODC and other voluntary agencies in community education and a variety of development education activities.

Sewell said that changes in United States Government policies are usually made as a result of outside inducement. One example cited was the Civil Rights legislation which was enacted by a conservative congress. Public pressure (e.g., the 1963 Civil Rights March on Washington) created conditions that induced Congress to recognize the prudence of passing federal civil rights legislation. Similarly, Sewell posited, significant changes in United States development policies will result from external pressure exerted by the Advisory Committee and particularly voluntary agencies.

Stephen Hayes

Stephen Hayes discussed the philosophy, activities, and achievements of the YMCA in development education since 1974. Hayes is Director of Peace Development and Education at the International Division of the YMCA.

Although the YMCA, according to Hayes, has a history of involvement in education for programs overseas, its involvement in development education in 1974 ensued the World Food Conference

held in Rome. Hayes defined development education, in accordance with the YMCA's philosophy, as knowledge of the relationship of structural problems in the developing nations to the structural problems in more developed nations.

Hayes noted that during the World Food Conference, development specialists observed that private voluntary agencies were (1) not jointly working, (2) not affecting the changing American policy toward world food problems, and (3) not in contact with their constituents. These situations indicated a need for collaborative effort among private and voluntary agencies to enhance development education through mobilization, organization and action of the American public around development-related issues.

As Hayes pointed out, the culmination of the Vietnam War and the prevalence of the OPEC* cartel in 1974 marked the mid-1970s as the appropriate period to effect changes in American attitudes towards developing nations. Effecting such changes, however, required development specialists to establish a community-based network:

1. to mobilize a large portion of the American public;
2. to insure that information about the "trickle down theory" was reaching intended targets--those people beyond the corridors of New York and Washington;
3. to arrange for interchange between developing nations and local communities throughout the United States.

Accordingly, the YMCA was considered the appropriate organization because, as Hayes explained:

1. it operates in 1800 communities in the United States;
2. it has most of the Fortune 500 corporations on its Boards throughout the country;
3. it has a capable staff of 10,000.

*Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries.

Moreover, the YMCA was one of the few organizations where both the left, the right, non-business and business could assemble. Hayes added, "We couldn't really find other organizations that had the same institutional, built-in inroads into the community...."

Once the YMCA was designated the appropriate mobilizing vehicle, regional conferences were organized to increase the participation of diverse community organizations and other American citizens in development education discussions. This process began at major geographic centers where institutions, particularly the YMCA, "had credibility with the big business community, the progressive community, and neighborhood groups".

Hayes reported that by 1978, the Seattle YMCA was the first regional base to organize development education activities. Two factors were in its favor. First, its board was composed of representatives of Boeing Airlines, Weyerhaeuser, and several prominent banks. Second, it had established tremendous innovative social programming in key areas such as (1) low-cost energy programs for the poor of Seattle, and (2) half-way houses for divorced men. In fact, a cross-section of innovative programming enhanced its credibility on the right and left.

Thus, a Seattle YMCA development education task force was convened and included several community organizations; Angus Archer, a representative of the United Nations; and Stephen Hayes, himself, to address the concept of establishing direct ties between developing countries and local American communities.

Following the efforts of this group, eighty Seattle organizations convened to plan a three-day, Pacific Northwest Conference and a program for nationwide expansion. With the YMCA as the community base, committees were established in Vancouver, British Columbia; Spokane, Washington; Boise, Idaho; Portland and Eugene, Oregon; and other major cities. Hayes added,

"whenever possible we used the YMCA as base unless the Y was resistant to this particular type of program, and then we found other organizations that we could" (use as a base).

Hayes said the United Nations Organization has heightened the "remarkable" solidarity of developing nations which represent 80 percent of the world's population. Consequently, the United Nations, itself, has become the base for reaching people and leaders in developing countries. Twenty-six international leaders from the United Nations spent, at different times, a week in the Pacific Northwest communicating with local organizations about issues related to developing countries.

Helvi Sipila's one-day marathon in the Pacific Northwest is an example of the diligence and dedication of United Nations leaders to the YMCA development education project. Within one day, Sipila spoke to a cross-section of community groups in Minneapolis; to a group at the airport in Portland, Oregon; in Corvallis, he spoke to Zonta International, and a group at Oregon State University. He later returned to Portland where he spoke to another group and participated in a television interview at 10:00 p.m., and participated in a second interview at midnight, in Seattle, Washington.

Another example of a United Nations leaders' diligence is the contribution of Noel Brown, Director of the United Nations Environmental Program. Brown spent a week speaking to environmental groups throughout the Pacific Northwest about the relationship of the "New International Economic Order" to specific United States cities, and United States social and economic conditions, in general.

Hayes noted that the collaborative efforts of community organizations and the cooperation of United Nations leaders provided the bases for two regional conferences--the first in Seattle, and the second in Minneapolis. This type of cooperation for the three-day Seattle conference resulted in the attendance

of a thousand people from the Pacific Northwest region. Hayes further noted that former Secretary of State Vance, one of the conference speakers, commended the level of sophistication of the participants' development-related queries.

Hayes explained that the Seattle conference model was implemented in Minneapolis and Atlanta, and is currently operating in Denver. The goal by 1983 is to identify major community leaders nationwide.

Because of the plan's ingenuity in bringing together diverse organizations, approximately 200 to 300 groups were involved in the Pacific Northwest project. Three major committees--Finance, Program and Policy--along with seven or eight sub-committees were established during the various conferences.

Outcomes of the conferences are bright and manifold. One result is increased development education funds. Hayes said that the Seattle project refuted the myth that no interest exists in raising funds for international programs. The Seattle YMCA contributes \$13,000 yearly to the YMCA International Division. However, at the end of the 1978 development education conference year Seattle had raised \$250,000 regionally and locally for the development education process. This excludes any money from the YMCA International Division, other organizations or from the United Nations. Additionally, the upper midwest raised \$150,000.

A second outstanding result was the successful mobilization of important diverse groups. Hayes noted that this YMCA project, perhaps, is one way to establish communication among diverse groups and organizations, rather than risk social and political polarization in the United States, particularly in this decade.

A third significant result was the exposure of the conference participants to development-related resources and activities based directly in their regional communities. Each regional

conference focused on a development-related matter that affected the specific United States region. For instance, food was emphasized at the Minneapolis Conference because Cargill Grain operates through Minneapolis. Hayes explained that "Cargill Grain, a private corporation, estimated to be larger than General Motors, had not come out in the public until this conference." Their participation was a major step, according to Hayes.

A fourth outcome of the Seattle Conference is the unprecedented interest in and knowledge about international relations as manifested by Seattle organizations and institutions. Indicators of this interest and knowledge are:

1. A local committee's plans to organize the Pacific rim nations this spring to discuss appropriate technology in energy as it applies to both developing countries and local areas in the United States Pacific Northwest;
2. The Seattle School System's incorporation of an international education unit at the junior and senior high school levels;
3. The results of a United Nations Association study poll showing that the Pacific Northwest has greater understanding of international relations than any other area in the United States, including the Northeast.

(Although this assessment occurred subsequent to the Seattle conference, Hayes indicated uncertainty regarding the credibility of the YMCA Development Education Project in advancing knowledge about international relations to this extent. "Whether or not this had anything to do with the massive programming that we did in the Pacific Northwest, I am not sure, but I would like to think so.");

4. The Seattle YMCA Development Project Poll which indicates that 80 percent of the population in the Pacific Northwest had exposure to the content and purpose of the New International Economic Order agendas.

Based on these outcomes, Hayes ended his presentation with bright prospects for development education in the United States. He expressed interest in maintaining a process of mobilization

and involvement. However, as Hayes asserted, affirmative steps on the part of the American public to advance education about developing countries is also needed.

Norman Sherman

Norman Sherman, of the Public Affairs Office of AID, presented a critical analysis of PVOs' development education approaches and activities in America. He contended that the necessity to educate the public about development in Third World Countries exceeds the resources and scope of the PVO community, in general, although a few PVOs have histories of success in development education. Inasmuch as his career with AID has been brief, Sherman noted that his conclusions are based on his omnivorous perusal of "surveys, studies, transnational dialogues... and ten years" of reports of Committee proceedings.

Sherman, in his commentary, delineated problems which weaken PVOs' approaches to development education. He listed those problems as:

1. inconsistency in terminology or labels;
2. failure of PVOs to clarify the definition, content, and process of development education;
3. inadequate personnel, resources, and experience to design and implement a unified development education program;
4. inevitable difficulties arising from auditing and monitoring such an educational project.

He noted that label changes are apparent throughout the literature and discussions about development education. Therefore, such inconsistent terminology makes it difficult for the public to grasp the substance and intent of development education. Regarding the various labels, Sherman said:

"At one meeting it's public education. At another meeting it's constituent education. Ultimately it blends community education and it shifts. Now it is global education."

PVOs, AID, and other development specialists agree that development education is crucial to Americans' understanding of the relationship of developing countries to United States economic conditions. To illustrate the persistence of this belief, Sherman read a statement written by George Marshall in 1947:

"I need not tell you that the world situation is very serious. That must be apparent to all intelligent people. I think one difficulty is that the problem is of such enormous complexity that the very massive facts presented to the public make it exceedingly difficult for the man on the street to reach a clear appraisal of the situation. Furthermore, the people of this country are distant from the troubled areas of the earth, and it is hard for them to comprehend the plight and the consequent reactions of long-suffering people, and the effect on their government. An essential part of any successful action on the part of the United States is an understanding on the part of the people of America of the character of the problem, and the remedies to be applied. Political passions and prejudice should have no part. With foresight and a willingness on the part of our people to face up to this vast responsibility which history has clearly placed upon our country, the difficulties I have outlined, can and will be overcome."

Marshall's statement, according to Sherman, represents "the earliest plea for public education," and it has prevailed for nearly four decades. Despite the persistence of this belief, argued Sherman, "I do not think that you, your predecessors, or my predecessors can" define the content and process of development education. Therefore, concluded Sherman, PVOs should continue those activities which they "do well"--voluntary relief and development improvement overseas.

Sherman went on to criticize the Biden-Pell Amendment as "a disaster in the making". The purpose, according to Sherman, is to authorize development funds--not operating funds--which could be channeled to PVOs for public education. Sherman argued that

the Biden-Pell concept promotes a program that is not quantifiable. Because monetary input into public education cannot be justified by knowledge output, PVOs should not become involved in development projects which are not measurable by AID "oversight" standards. Sherman reminded the audience of existing AID/PVO difficulties in auditing and monitoring overseas development education projects would only exacerbate existing AID/PVO differences. Attendant with budget complications are the complexities of establishing leadership, education policy, and decision-making authority in the field of international education.

Sherman denied the assumption that the amount of AID appropriation for development education is directly related to the increase in public support. He specifically said, "some PVOs believe that if we better educate people, and have broader support across this country, we will get more money for development." Actually, Sherman asserted, if the United States President wants AID to increase appropriations for development education, he is capable of acquiring vast increases without support from 50 to 80 percent of American people. Quoting Harry S. Truman, Sherman maintained that "The role of the President is to persuade people to do things they shouldn't have to be persuaded to do."

Sherman urged PVOs to use political action to acquire increased funds, as there are greater advantages to lobbying as opposed to "talking" about ways to increase education funds. Thus, presidential persistence and political action by PVOs and the committee can incur substantial increases in AID's appropriation of funds for development education.

By indulging in dialogue about the new economic world order and other related conflicts, the PVO community and Advisory Committee, Sherman contended, exceed their responsibility and experience. Instead, he suggested, since PVOs perform well in the areas of relief and development improvement overseas, they should confine their work to those aspects.

Sherman maintained is that development education should take place predominantly in public schools. He suggested an education plan which:

1. urges public school social studies teachers to be responsible for global education;
2. provides a central depository for slide shows, films, and other development-related media;
3. starts at the 12th grade and works down to the fourth grade.

The results of this plan, Sherman predicted, will be a "global 2,000 education" program in the United States, rather than a "quick fix" approach which carries with it "mystical language that appeals to politicians...."

Finally, as Sherman explained, since information to the public is limited, PVOs need to talk extensively with their constituents to clarify their interests, determine what they actually doing, and decide where they wish to go in the area of development services. He concluded that mobilization and organization around development services for relief, financial assistance, alleviation of world hunger and poverty and other social and economic disasters will effect a change in Americans' attitude toward developing countries.

Afternoon Plenary Session: "Learning About a Complex World--
Concepts and Experience"

The lead speaker at the afternoon plenary session was Charles MacCormack of the Experiment in International Living. The panelists were Robert Harlan, Executive Vice President of Independent Sector; and Mildren Marcy, Director of the Office of Institutional Relations of the International Communications Agency.

Summaries of Speeches

Charles MacCormack

MacCormack's speech provided a comprehensive overview of the problems and potential of development education concerns

from past and current analyses. After noting the acute importance of development education and the compelling need for expanded interest, MacCormack responded to questions resulting from Sherman's commentary. He then discussed the current state of the development education process, and later summarized seven recommendations resulting from current papers on development education. MacCormack then briefly recounted the obstacles to managing an effective education program in development. He suggested ways to expand existing effort despite those obstacles and despite the inevitable complexity of combining development service and the educational process.

MacCormack contended that development education is crucial for several reasons. One reason involves important issues raised by the Brandt Report, the Presidential Commission on World Hunger and the Global 2,000 Report. Their indication of a 600 percent world population increase in one century, and their prediction of rapid deforestation are examples of phenomena that affect the world and must be resolved through public and political action. He further stated that trade wars, depression, inflation, illegal immigration, refugee crisis and other economic and social disorders strongly suggest a need for development education in the United States.

Additionally, development education is crucial because a tremendous gap exists between the United States public's perception and the reality of global social and economic disorders. MacCormack said "current survey data on the state of public knowledge about global conditions indicate that a majority of the American population think that we are independent in terms of our energy supplies, and that a majority of high school students believe that Israel is an Arab country." Therefore, the gap between reality and public perception is a crucial problem that needs to be resolved.

Contrary to Norman Sherman's suggestion that PVOs should vacate the education field since they lack adequate resources, MacCormack urged PVOs to use every practical and realistic lever to advance development and international affairs education. However, as MacCormack stated, this is not to deny PVOs' unreadiness to manage development education, but it is an acknowledgment of the need for development education in the United States.

MacCormack said that at the same time PVOs acknowledge the need for development education, they confront the difficulty of acquiring the funding necessary to administer effective development education programs. However, this is not solely a PVO or government problem. The funding problem is widespread, demanding the attention of corporations, foundations, and individual donors. Despite the funding problems, however, and PVOs' unreadiness to manage the education process, MacCormack urged PVOs and development specialists to offer support in enhancing citizen, Congressional and Presidential support for development education.

After MacCormack acknowledged the need for and problems of development or global education, he described six types of existing global education "systems or subsystems" of organizations with records of effective development education activities.

These "systems and subsystems" include:

1. The "general citizen awareness" system which focuses on enhancing citizen knowledge of development issues in the "broadest macro-strategic sense" (i.e., the United Nations Association, Foreign Policy Association, Overseas Development Council, and TROT, a hunger project).
2. The "specific-issue-focused" system which is concerned with the relationship of global development issues (i.e., population, the environment, arms limitation, etc.) to their sector. This system includes two hundred or more organizations (i.e., the Population Council, Environment and Development, World Wildlife Federation, etc.) who manage citizen awareness through conferences, publications, and mobilization of their constituents.

3. The "international educational exchange-based" system which manages, yearly, \$100 to \$200 million international educational activities in the "people-to-people side". Examples of organizations in this system are: the Institute of International Education, the Latin American Scholarship Program of American Universities, and the American Field Service. Also, in this field are a sub-system of organizations that deal specifically with development service exchanges (Volunteers from the United States, Western Europe, and Japan work in development projects in Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia. When volunteers return home, they continue to serve in development education functions). This sub-system includes organizations such as the Experiment in International Living, Stanford in Asia, American Friends Service Committee, Menonite Central Committee, and several colleges and universities.
4. The "citizen mobilization" system which deals with citizen awareness of development issues and world hunger. Organizations included in this system are the Bread for the World and the Inter-religious Task Force on United States Food Policy.
5. The "multi-purpose" development education system which combines development service and development education. More specifically, this system includes organizations that deal with people-to-people development education, citizen mobilization, exchange-base development education and mass media. The organizations in this category are the Experiment for International Living, the American Friends Service Committee, and the International Division of the YMCA.
6. The "constituency education for development" system which deals with building and informing constituencies about the larger issues of development. Most of the mainstream field-oriented PVOs are found in this field (i.e., Save the Children, CARE, Foster Parents' Plan, and the United States Committee for UNICEF).

MacCormack's descriptions illustrated the existence of a large, complex and diverse field of organizations which are managing the development education phenomenon.

MacCormack pointed out, primarily to the PVO community, additional organizations which are attempting to "create order out of chaos". The Presidential Council on Foreign Languages and International Studies directs and exchanges information regarding

citizen education and student education on international affairs. Additionally, the Consortium on International Citizen Exchange, consisting of "the eight largest" community-based exchange organizations provides an information exchange network. Included in the Consortium are the Experiment for International Living, the American Friends Service Committee, Inc., the Partners of the Americas, the Sister Cities, and the Peoplet-to-People Health Foundation (Project HOPE). Finally, there is the Overseas Liaison Committee of the American Council on Education which consists of the seventeen largest international educational exchange organizations (i.e., the American Council on Education, the Institute of International Education, Inc., etc.). Each organization, to some extent, has designed and administered "citizen education" programs on international affairs.

MacCormack suggested that instead of seeking a complicated educational design and, thereby, exacerbate existing problems of development education, the PVO community should analyze and expand existing development education programs. Moreover, PVOs new in the development education field can emulate other community-based organizations that have designed programs around citizen mobilization, organization, and education about development and international affairs.

Five governmental agencies are currently involved in community education about international affairs. They are the International Communications Agency, the International Education Division of the Department of Education, the National Endowment for Humanities, the Peace Corps, and the Agency for International Development. Thus, along with the complexities of the private and voluntary sector are additional complexities in the public sector. Considering the manifold complications, MacCormack felt that requests to Congress for additional development education funding would prompt questions that PVOs and governmental agencies cannot answer in the area of development education.

This led to MacCormack's analysis of the current status of the development education field. First, he observed the absence of a rationale regarding strategy. The various programs are either exchange-based, media-based, university-based, PVO-based, K-12-based, community-based, or national-based. As a consequence of these diverse program strategies, there is no consensual rationale for strategy, nor is there a common knowledge base among the different practitioners.

MacCormack agreed with John Sewell who, during the morning session, stressed the need for public policy regarding development education. The fact that some leaders in the voluntary and public sectors have met to discuss public policy in development education is evident of private and public acknowledgement of an effort to establish public policy in international education. MacCormack suggested that the Advisory Committee recommend the continuation of the Inter-agency Liaison Group on Development and Global Education. This group, according to MacCormack, represents a "coherent public response" which is essential to a "coherent voluntary response".

Third, MacCormack recognized the absence of effective communications channels. He maintained further that "the field of voluntary international education continues to function without a way for organizations to know what each is doing, and there is little opportunity for coordination and cooperation among them; although groups like the Consortium on International Citizen Exchange, the Council on Foreign Languages and International Studies, and the Liaison Group on Development and Global Education are steps in the right direction." He added that the future of PVOs in global education will be strengthened to the extent that the diverse PVO community can discern a common or mutual sense of direction.

Following his analysis of development education in the United States, MacCormack read seven recommendations which

emanate from various development education research papers distributed to the conference participants.¹ The recommendations are:

1. That each PVO conduct a needs and resources assessment of its potential role in development education;
2. That each PVO consider the concept of community awareness in its assessment. That a vehicle be created, similar to the Columbus-in-the-World Project,² to help communities observe international phenomenon occurring in their own communities;
3. That there be more community action programs, similar to the Pacific Northwest International YMCA Program. That a more educational and responsive approach be taken to the refugee situation in the United States;
4. That there be more community-based international exchange programs involving two-way exchanges between United States and overseas institutions and organizations;
5. That there be a form of community resource development activity which pays community people to coordinate community-based international activities, manage fund-raising, conduct training, and follow-up on the initial, community-based development activities;
6. That there be more development service learning programs, similar to the American Friends Service Committee and the Mennonite Central Committee, and more university programs which allow college and university students to participate in the process of international development;
7. That more use be made of mass media in development education. Studies show that present educational design in international affairs is geared more to people-to-people activities with limited use of mass media.

In MacCormack's view, these development education recommendations represent the agenda for a decade rather than a day. In this regard, he predicted that by 1990 the PVO community will be either fortified or devitalized in terms of its principal purpose and design of international development education. He further suggested that current minimal funding and dim prospects for

increased funding make it crucial for the PVO community to create both a citizen and political base for building effective development education programs.

However, as Norman Sherman suggested in his commentary, and MacCormack reiterated, there are obstacles to mobilizing community, corporate, foundation, and political support for development education. One hindrance to this type of mobilization is that it adds additional organizational focus to the established purpose of most private and voluntary organizations. For example, in addition to providing development service programs in the field--which is a mind-boggling task--PVOs would have to mobilize political and public opinion in the United States, another mind-boggling task. Moreover, experience has shown that neither the government, corporate donors, some PVOs, foundations, nor individual donors are interested in designing and implementing development education programs. Organizations with histories in this field (i.e., the United Nations Association, the Experiment in International Living, the American Friends Service Committee, etc.), expend a lot of money to sustain their efforts in this area. For most field-oriented PVOs, a repositioning of their organizations vis-a-vis their constituencies is required to build a funding base. Presently, the funding base does not exist for managing development education programs that work.

Because MacCormack perceives a dire need for development education, he urged PVOs to continue their involvement in public education, and he suggested ways to accelerate and expand effort in this area, MacCormack said PVOs should:

1. consider the course of action outlined by Irene Pinkau;³
2. study the report of the Presidential Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies;
3. review the study done by the Academy for Educational Development⁴ which describes the 150-200 voluntary organizations that are already working full time in the area of international education;

4. provide a forum where the ten active development education voluntary organizations can exchange information about their work in this area;
5. organize conferences for the public and PVOs who are interested in becoming involved;
6. provide an annual publication that describes the purpose, process, activities, and progress of development education in the United States.

Finally, MacCormack noted that these activities would provide a vehicle for the voluntary international affairs community for giving more consideration to public policy and, thus, enhance public support and funding for development education.

Robert Harlan

In accord with previous conference speeches, particularly those of Stephen Hayes and Charles MacCormack, Robert Harlan supported the contention that an important task of PVOs is to educate Americans about international affairs (Harlan called it "internationalizing" Americans), and that collaboration among PVOs is crucial to accomplishing this task. Harlan also discussed certain organizational strategies that influence the design and administration of an international education program.

He contended that an effective international education design can result from the following organizational strategies--

1. Development of a unified national policy:

The PVO community must take on the "unified task of establishing a national policy for world-minded citizenry". Again, collaboration is key to an effective education design.

2. Development of a consensual course of action:

A consensual program strategy should result from the collaborative efforts of PVOs. There are numerous ideas that need to be "synthesized, prioritized, and aggregated" so that the public can grasp the thrust of an international education program.

3. Clarification of PVO and Government roles:

The roles of PVOs and Government in international education should be clarified.

4. Development of adequate corporate planning:

There is a dire need for adequate corporate planning around international thrusts, programs, and priorities.

5. Implementation of bi-lateral planning:

International planning around development services and education should accommodate the interests, needs, and input of the people in developing countries. Otherwise, as experience indicates, uselessness can result from insensitive, unilateral planning.

6. Creation of advocacy activity:

Finally, advocacy activity on the part of international outreach groups is essential. The voice of volunteerism should represent collaboration so that "one voice" about international education is heard by the American public. One of the key elements of advocacy is network building. Networks, first, should be identified so that the appropriate network can be tapped when concerns arise.

Mildred Marcy

In her reaction to the previous speeches, Mildred Marcy discussed:

1. the purpose and rationale of the newly constituted United States International Communications Agency (USICA);
2. the need for cultural diplomacy along with traditional diplomacy;
3. the use of Congressional appropriations for international education;
4. the purpose of the Professional Development Support Group;
5. the role of women and the results of their active involvement in international affairs and education.

The United States International Communications Agency (USICA) was reorganized in 1972 by Executive Order and was given the responsibility for coordinating "all United States Government funded 'exchange of persons' programs." Currently there are

between 35-40 federal agencies operating under legislative mandate and receiving congressionally appropriated funds to assist the exchange of persons.

Actually, USICA's functions encompass the gamut of international communications services, namely: (1) all the functions of the old United States Information Agency, including the Voice of America, the motion picture and television services, the publication service that is used overseas to produce magazines in regional variations around the world; and (2) all the functions of the Department of State's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs which involve administering the Fulbright exchange of scholars, teachers, lecture programs and the former International Visitor Program.

The rationale of USICA, explained Mildred Marcy, is that first-hand experience in another culture builds a facet of intercultural diplomacy which permits a more tolerant view of the customs, traditions, concerns, and beliefs of other peoples. Thus, the exchange of persons is one of the most vital aspects of international diplomacy.

Additionally, the issues and substance of international diplomacy have changed. For instance, until the end of World War II traditional diplomacy (negotiations of trade, commerce, navigation, peace, and the protection of citizens travelling abroad) was conducted by Ministries of Foreign Affairs. Since 1945 the substance of negotiations has expanded to include development services and education.

Marcy said development services and education discussions today include the issues of consumption, industrialization, modernization, education, and additional problems that affect every country's economic, political and social institutions. These issues are the substance of traditional and current political and economic diplomacy. Marcy added, however, that

cultural diplomacy is also crucial to effective foreign policy. Clarifying her concept of cultural diplomacy, Marcy explained,

"By this, I mean culture in the broadest societal sense: knowing what makes countries tick; what their people feel; what their concerns are; what their shared solutions may be, so that sometime, someday, some generation will be able to see a world that is more at peace than the world that we are privileged to live in."

In order to acknowledge government's support of the private sector's efforts to advance development education in the United States, Marcy discussed the activities of five leading government agencies involved in this field: the International Communication Agency, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Peace Corps, the Agency for International Development, and the International Education Division of the Department of Education. She explained that these agencies have allocated portions of their Congressional appropriations for grants to or cooperative agreements with private voluntary agencies and non-governmental organizations involved in education programs congruent with the purposes of each of these agencies. These five agencies have the mandate, according to Marcy, to assist in "enhancing the competence of Americans to deal with the world around them...."

However, the caveat, as Norman Sherman pointed out, is that the Appropriations Committee expects judicious explanations of how taxpayers' money is used in the administration of development education programs. Accordingly, Marcy added, representatives from these five agencies formed the Professional Development Support Group which is responsible for conducting a pre-subgrant assessment of each voluntary organization's potential and leadership capacity in order to execute a planned project in development education. Although monitoring and auditing may involve inevitable complications, the process is crucial in a constitutional government to determine whether taxpayers receive returns

in terms of "helping United States citizens adjust to the changes that are increasingly being caused by the inter-connectiveness of the world's peoples."

Rather than maintain a donor/client relationship with the private voluntary sector, USICA sought to build a partnership with the private sector. Such a partnership, said Marcy, represented USICA's effort to "unify, coalesce, organize and coordinate the best diversity of non-governmental and private voluntary organizations in this country."

Finally, Marcy gave tribute to the active role women have played in the past ten years in foreign policy and international education. She, along with Margaret Pinion and Willy Campbell, provided a plethora of information about the role of women and the results of their active involvement in international affairs. These are highlighted below:

1. The U.N. General Assembly declared a U.N. Decade for Women in 1975;
2. A Presidential Commission on the Observance of the International Women's Year was appointed and mandated to provide, in 50 states and six territories, public forums on issues that affect women in various areas (i.e., health, employment, education, international affairs, etc.);
3. The U.N. Mid-decade Conference was held in Copenhagen, in July, 1979, with official delegations from over 140 countries. Separate from the official conference was a "non-governmental forum" which permitted Third World women to discuss with U.S. women their status, aspirations and perceptions as Third World women, in general, and specifically as women in the Moslem societies;
4. Finally, to enhance the ability of U.S. women to understand Third World women, the Overseas Educational Fund, through a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, supports the conduct of regional conferences involving an ethnic and socioeconomic cross section of women who discuss issues that concern them. These concerns are then paralleled with the concerns of Third World women to show the "interconnectiveness" of U.S. women's concerns with those of Third World women.

Accordingly, follow-up activities are planned in terms of advocacy roles, use of the media, public education, and network building.

A question and answer session followed the afternoon panel discussions. Prior to the question/answer session, Margaret Hickey read the following passage from Harry S. Truman's inauguration address of 1949:

"We must embark on a bold, new program on making the benefits of our scientific advances, and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas.

More than half of the people of the world are living in conditions approaching misery. Their food is inadequate. They are victims of disease. Their economic life is primitive and stagnant. Their policy is a handicap, and a threat, both to them, and to more prosperous areas. For the first time in history, humanity possesses the knowledge, and the skill to relieve the sufferings of these people.

Summary of December 9th Plenary Sessions

John Sewell summarized the four major points which emanated from the morning and afternoon discussions.

1. Although there is much disagreement on policy and priority issues, the modes of education, and the focus and responsibility for international/global education, there is consensus on the importance of international education to the social and economic conditions in the United States.
2. As represented by the various speeches and discussions, a richness of experience in international education is prevalent. Organizations, particularly certain private voluntary organizations, have a history of accomplishments in this field.
3. Although there is a great deal of dissatisfaction regarding the degree and level of collaboration among voluntary agencies, organizations--private and governmental--are cooperatively building unified and effective development education programs.
4. Finally, permeating each discussion were concerns regarding the need for (a) better organizational coordination, (b) increased public support and participation, and (c) adequate funding to expand and accelerate existing efforts to "internationalize" Americans.

PROCEEDINGS OF DECEMBER 10, 1980

Morning Plenary Session: "Learning About A Complex World--Concepts and Experiences"

Panelists, during the conference proceedings on December 10th continued to address the theme, "Learning About A Complex World." The speakers were Phillips Ruopp of Charles F. Kettering Foundation, and Richard F. Celeste, Director of United States Peace Corps. Joseph Kennedy presented a summary of the workshop sessions.

Report of Workshop Sessions

Workshops were divided into three groups that discussed:

1. Concepts and program recommendations for private sector initiatives and processes.
2. Movement toward a joint work process.

These issues emanated from Irene Pinkau's paper, "Understanding our Role in the World: A Working Paper on Private Sector Initiatives and Processes." Pinkau's paper proposes "a joint work process between the private sector and government as part of an effort to develop a common vision and national policy to provide opportunities for the American citizenry to gain insight into world conditions and participate in international relations."⁵

The purpose of the joint work process is:

1. "to develop a common basis for collaboration in public global learning among a diverse group of private sector institutions and organizations, and with government responsible for such policies and programs;
2. to agree on program priorities in which the private sector would play a leading role;
3. to prepare the implementation of programs."⁶

During the workshop, "Toward a Joint Work Process," participants discussed Pinkau's recommendations; addressed three major development education issues which emanate from Pinkau's paper; and made recommendations regarding the "joint work process" proposal.

One issue was the need for leadership in the administration of development education programs. Participants contended that since PVOs are major non-governmental participants in development efforts they should, at least, participate in the development education process, either as resources or disseminators or development information. Some participants expressed a preference for PVO leadership in development education.

A second issue was the need to define controversial terms before implementing any development education programs. Although a consensus on definitions is difficult to acquire, some PVOs are prohibited from participating in development education efforts unless the definition of development education is consistent with the values and beliefs of their constituents. However, Pinkau's "joint work process" proposes to focus on commonalities, not differences.

A third issue was the importance of studying development education models in other countries where the government appropriates public funds for and advocates non-governmental organizations' (NGOs) NGO's administration of development education. Observation of other models is an idea which derives from research conducted by Tuthill and Fanning-Firfer and reported in Development Education and the U.S. PVO Community: A Focus on the Issues. They report that:

"The governments of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France Germany, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and the United Kingdom all co-fund their NGOs to carry out development education programs. Last year their co-financing of NGO-sponsored development education programs totalled well over \$15 million. While each of these countries also has an official public information program, operated by a government agency to make the public more aware of the importance of development assistance, all of these countries consider NGOs important and effective institutions to inform the public on development issues.

The funding of NGO development education programs is seen by these governments as completely appropriate, both to increase their citizens' knowledge about the developing world, and to develop public support for state-funded programs of development assistance to the Third World."7

Accordingly, the workshop participants suggested that the Committee study European countries' efforts in the area of development. It would be beneficial to know about the successes and/or failures of other countries that (a) contribute more of a percentage of their GNP to development education and/or (b) contribute more to development education than the United States. Although it is often difficult to relate experiences of one country to another, as further suggested, the United States can learn from the overall experiences of other countries.

Workshop participants agreed that, leadership is important to funding, however support of a leader is no guarantee to adequate funding. Thus, resolution of the leadership question does not necessarily resolve financial questions.

Recommendations from this workshop are:

1. That a work group be established to determine joint network building efforts.
2. That a development education workshop be held within ninety days.
3. That, prior to the workshop, each organizational representative discuss the development education issues with its constituents.
4. That PVOs, instead of government, make a commitment to finance development education efforts.

Other points the workshop participants forwarded to the Committee were:

1. The Pearl S. Buck Foundation's offer to serve as host for the development education workshop;
2. The Overseas Education Fund of the League of Women Voters' offer, secondarily, to serve as host for the workshop.

Participants in this workshop requested official record of their commendation of Mr. John Ulinski for his service as Executive Director of the Advisory Committee, and their gratitude to the Committee for sponsoring this conference on development education.

In two parallel workshop sessions, participants discussed concepts and program recommendations for private sector initiatives and processes as they relate to their respective organizations. Highlights of those discussions follow.

1. Non-profit and private voluntary agencies need to develop, through collaborative effort, a definition of development education. However, organizations must be careful not to allow processes to become inundated with attempts to develop a unified definition.
2. A collaborative, cohesive coalition is needed to facilitate interested PVO's participation in the mainstream in development education. The fragmented efforts of PVOs need to be coalesced into one unit to clear up public confusion resulting from a diversity of messages about development.
3. Host country peoples as well as the United States public should be educated about international relations. The purpose of development education is to help peoples of the United States and the Third World grasp the reality of their interdependence. Paternalism, as denoted by the donor-recipient concept, is delusive and ultimately self-defeating. In fact, cultural exchange should be a vital part of development education in the United States.
4. Although commitment on a national level is crucial to effective global education and financial sustenance, most PVOs have placed too much emphasis on securing vast public funding before their program potential is evident to the public. PVOs having records of accomplishments, over 40 to 50 years, in education depended upon their performance to generate support. The educational process should be a part of fundraising efforts.

Additionally, too many PVOs are dependent on AID funding, though they are in a better position to generate adequate funding through their national and international constituents. Moreover, if PVOs make a formal designation of funds to development education, perhaps AID and congressional financial support will increase.

5. PVOs experience in development service and education shows that the public is more inclined to provide generous support for short-term efforts (e.g., disaster relief after the Italian earthquake) than for long-term development efforts such as global or international education. Although payoff is usually remote, incremental achievements should be studied and presented to the public as potential success.
6. International or global education should begin with young people--through churches, schools, youth-oriented organizations, and even holiday celebrations. For instance, Thanksgiving Week could be used to concentrate on economic development through a religious forum.
7. Advertising surveys have established that media coverage does not change existing views, because it attracts the audience it originally influenced. Thus, community-based organizations and institutions seem to be more effective instruments of change in the area of development service and education. However, this does not diminish the effect of a steady, positive media approach to development education.
8. An enlightened public is of mutual benefit to PVOs, AID, Government, and the nation in general. Therefore, PVOs should make special effort to educate their constituents about development. The net effect of well-informed constituencies is manifold. Some effects are (1) constituents can lobby; (2) they can influence other non-profit domestic sectors to unify and organize around common themes and issues; (3) they can initiate and manage fund-raising activities; and (4) they can advance the concepts of volunteerism and advocacy.
9. Some PVOs contend that "development" cannot be taught, but that there is a way to focus on issues such as the tensions that result in the world (1) when inadequate supplies of food are produced and distributed; (2) when actual grinding poverty is increasing rather than lessening, and (3) when the population, unchecked throughout the world, brings horrendous problems for every single country and their economic, political, and social institutions.

Recommendations from these workshops are:

1. That the Advisory Committee continue to study the Los Angeles recommendations regarding development education.

2. That the Committee assign a task force to develop a statement to the public about PVOs' collective effort in the field of development education.
3. That PVOs continue action-oriented efforts to advance development education.
4. That PVOs be brought in at the highest level (i.e., a White House Conference) for a discussion of the United States' role in international development due to this critical point in history. United States involvement, however, should extend beyond PVOs and include other private organizations, businesses and individuals.
5. That, accordingly, an International Development Council be established.

In sum, three assumptions resulted from the workshop participants' discussions:

1. The work process of the PVO community in the field of development education should be non-governmental;
2. The development education process should be collective; and
3. The PVO community should consider the audiences to be reached.

Summaries of Speeches

Phillips Ruopp

The theme of Ruopp's discussion was that learning about a complex world will have to occur under certain world-wide economic and political conditions which cannot be altered. Those conditions are that:

1. An inflation solution is not in sight for the next four years;
2. The world economy is not going to improve substantially unless there is a higher level of political mobilization;
3. Public opinion is ambivalent, and skepticism about official aid is pronounced. The public is more hospitable to private aid which is viewed as charitable. Although there is much concern about hunger, the public has difficulty grasping the magnitude of development problems. So, ambivalence prevails.
4. The emerging political climate, among Third World countries, demands priority status in the United States Government's foreign policy.

5. Finally, there has been a change, over the development decades, in the attitudes of Third World countries, toward development assistance and toward self-anointed change agents from the outside.

In accordance with these conditions, Ruopp discussed their impact on (1) the role of the PVO community in development; (2) the ability of PVOs to "do better with less," and (3) the future of PVOs in development.

Ruopp maintained that PVOs must take different approaches to development in view of these new conditions. Up to now, the primary beneficiaries in voluntary development assistance programs have been the Americans involved, despite the intent or the rhetoric. Paternalism has no place in the present international relations arena where the real order is interdependence.

In this light, Ruopp presented his view of PVOs' role in development.

1. The primary responsibility of American PVOs is to help Americans understand underdevelopment and its causes, and to influence American policies relative to the needs and aspirations of peoples in developing nations.
2. The primary task confronting PVOs is to make their experience count in shaping future American public sentiments and public policies, and to make United States roles, as outsiders in developing countries, credible under a new set of conditions.

As Ruopp further explained, within the context of a new set of conditions, PVOs, government, cities, foundations, individual families will have to "do better with less." This means changing the emphasis in three areas.

First, "doing better with less" means emphasizing long-range goals of development assistance--which is strategically effective. In this new period of private development assistance, PVOs need to reexamine their assumptions and goals. Ruopp suggested that the future workshop might be approached from the perspective of developing new ideas for action that are congruent with the new

set of world conditions. He explained, "PVO effectiveness in development begins when host country nationals and Americans participate in common activities as equals."

Second, "doing better with less" denotes strengthening the collaborative processes of needs assessment, priority setting, and field organizing. In fact, the collaborative processes should involve Third World organizations and American PVOs. National and international collaboration is crucial to effective problem solving in development services and education.

Third, "doing better with less" means building public support through inter-organizational cooperation. Increased public support comes from an enlightened public. Although constituency education is beneficial, a broad educational endeavor will contribute to an enlightened public. The scarcity of money for development education demands coordinated programs supported and enforced by the authority of groups of PVOs, not individual, fragmented PVO efforts.

Finally, Ruopp maintained that a coordinated development educational process should involve not only discussions, but a range of activities which will assist the general public, government, Congress and PVOs in viewing situations in developing countries. According to Ruopp, a highly selected strategy focused largely on selected geographic areas, selected audiences and selected activities is needed. This strategy can be executed cooperatively and, thereby, contribute substantially to development education in the United States.

Richard Celeste

In the context of (1) PVO coalitions, (2) "doing more with less", (3) getting the right messages to the public, and (4) building public support for development, Richard Celeste discussed:

1. the importance of a message which denotes development for United States national security, and

2. the use of human resources (i.e., the Peace Corps), appropriate audiences, and electronic media to effect a change in Americans' attitude about Third World countries.

Celeste explained that the efforts to coalesce around a common message is important. However, PVO coalitions should have two dimensions: one in the host-country context, and one in our own country's context. In the host-country context, the notion of self-sufficiency is critical not because the United States espouses it or annoints host-countries with the concept, but because we as a nation can understand host-countries by listening to host-country peoples. Understanding and relating to their desire for self-sufficiency in effective and respectable ways is important in United States relations with host countries.

Inasmuch as the notion of self-sufficiency or independence is desirable in the host-country context, national security should be the tenor of discussions in the United States about development. Celeste maintained that the most dangerous fallacy that this nation could adopt is to believe that the United States can assume a military posture that protects the security interests of our country, but does not consider other elements affecting the line between poverty and misery.

Therefore, the kind of collaborative, coordinated message PVOs should impart to the public regarding Third World development, should be within the context of United States national security. Such a message could be more effective in eliciting public support for development than a message which merely addresses the needs and conditions of Third World peoples. Celeste added that there must be an "urgency" in the message that has mutual benefit to developing countries and the United States.

Celeste said that three actions are needed to "accomplish more with less". One is a series of sustained effort to build a clearinghouse of data, information, publications, and people resources. The Peace Corps has the people resources--80,000 former

Peace Corps volunteers--who have built community institutions and have skills which can be relevant to individual PVOs or to sharing tasks at the community level. Thus, PVOs should consider using Peace Corps volunteers in the joint process effort.

Second, leadership training is crucial. Such training should involve a shared education task of organizing people for discussions of broad issues and concerns, not only individual PVO concerns and aspirations.

Third, with limited resources, PVOs must target their audience and use the most appropriate media. Celeste suggested three audiences and media. One is the educational institutions at the secondary level. In this area, PVOs, along with organizations that represent teachers, can jointly determine ways to integrate traditional academic materials with international education.

The second targeted audience should be the multinational corporations. Corporate personnel conducting business in the Third World should be requested to share their experiences with United States citizens and other businesses, particularly in the context of their practices in the Third World.

The third audience or medium is electronic communications--radio and television. Celeste maintained that "MASH", for example, has played a major role in defining the reality of military life. Similarly, PVOs can use television--perhaps creating a "Peace Corps Volunteer MASH"--to communicate or imbed the experiences of development into the American consciousness. Celeste declared that, through television particularly, people can be influenced, and can be persuaded to feel they can make a difference in world hunger, literacy, and many other development issues discussed among voluntary organizations.

Moreover, television is becoming less expensive due to cable television innovation. In fact, in the near future, cable or the satellite system, will make it possible for Americans to communicate from their living rooms with people in Third World

nations. Hence, the electronic media is an important and powerful vehicle from which most Americans can gain exposure to world events. Electronic media can serve as Americans' sources of global knowledge--a knowledge that can be influenced by collaborative efforts of PVOs who have a specific development education message to convey.

Methods of conveying messages to the public are not nearly as important as the messages themselves, Celeste said. Americans need to understand the global nature of our economy; that the refugee issue in the United States stems from political changes in the Third World countries of origin; and that the survival challenges are problems common to developing countries and the United States. Hence, coordinated efforts among PVOs are not needed to focus on development or international education process, direction, substance and strategy.

Building the Agenda for 1981

Following the December 10th plenary session, participants suggested directions and activities for the Committee and PVOs in the development field. Highlights of those suggestions follow.

1. Robert Nathan, an Advisory Committee member, began by commending the outstanding services of Clifford Hope, Jr., Adelaide Gulliver, Martha Emery, Margaret Hickey, and Huntington Harris, whose terms and volunteer services culminate in 1980; and the outstanding contribution of John Ulinski, who was retiring from service as Executive Director of the Committee.

He stressed the importance of PVO leadership in development education and praised the PVO community for its "phenomenal experience of achievement and accomplishment" over the years. In light of this, Nathan further suggested that the Committee, with the PVO leadership, sponsor a meeting of all major organizational systems (i.e., the International Development Council, the Foreign Policy Association of World Councils, the Overseas Development Council, the United Nations Association and the Society for International Development) involved in development education. This meeting would allow PVOs to

evaluate their accomplishments in development education and to discuss their accomplishments, failures, and prospects for future action.

2. Margaret Hickey suggested that in 1981, the Committee continue the fundamental task, as national leader, of convening forums to review the activities and accomplishments of PVOs and government in humanitarian aid and public or international education. She continued to stress the importance of collaborative effort among PVOs and joint effort between the PVO community and government in conveying the "right" message supporting education and accelerating public participation in development services and education.
3. James MacCracken requested that Advisory Committee members who have served longer, share with the PVO community their perception of what PVOs should do in the area of development education; and he suggested that the PVO community or the Committee prepare a proposal for joint effort between the PVO community and government in advancing development services and shaping development education.
4. Robert Marshall suggested that the "Report of Committee Activities and Accomplishments in 1979 and 1980" (to be published soon) will provide future directions for 1981. He added that the present report of panel discussions and workshop sessions also will aid in planning future directions in development education. Finally, Marshall suggested that the Committee:
 - a. convene a meeting to discuss ways to involve PVOs in the total development field;
 - b. invite the United Nations Associations and other major organizations to participate in the discussion;
 - c. determine the appropriate time to view development models in other countries.

In sum, Marshall maintained that a review or an analysis of past meetings and recommendations could provide insight for future directions of PVOs and AID in development.

5. John Ulinski suggested that voluntary agencies should express to the Committee:
 - a. the concerns important to PVOs for future action;
 - b. the role voluntary agencies expect the Committee to play in helping voice PVO concerns;
 - c. methods by which voluntary agencies expect their concerns to be explored.

The conference ended after speakers from the audience provided suggestions for directions and activities in 1981. Highlights of those suggestions follow:

1. Involve youth in development activities.
2. Continue to address procedural difficulties between AID and PVOs.
3. Focus on the immediate development education questions that can be dealt with most effectively.
4. Make development education and a collaborative process the major focus of discussions and activities for 1981.
5. Develop a checklist of development issues and mail them to the Committee for agenda consideration.
6. Encourage PVOs to finance their own development education programs instead of depending on government resources.
7. Emphasize the importance of an AID/PVO partnership throughout the development service process.
8. Continue to involve the Committee in issues which concern the community, in the interrelationship among PVOs, PVOs, and in the partnership between AID and the PVO community.
9. Allow the PVO community to assume leadership in development education: the mobilization and organization of American citizens and dissemination of information.

ENDNOTES

¹List of Papers:

Irene Pinkau, Volunteer Services in the Global Learning Process, ACTION, Washington, D.C. and Charles F. Kettering Foundation, Dayton, Ohio, 1980.

Irene Pinkau, Understanding Our Role in the World, A Working Paper on Private Sector Initiatives and Processes, AID, Washington, D.C. and Charles F. Kettering Foundation, Dayton, Ohio, 1980.

Janet C. Tuthill and Marina Fanning-Firfer, Development Education and the U.S. PVO Community: A Focus on the Issues, Inter-American Development Institute, Washington, D.C., 1980.

²Chadwick F. Alger, The International Relations of Cities: Images of Alternative Presents, Columbus in the World, the World in Columbus, Ohio State University, 1974.

³Irene Pinkau, Understanding Our Role in the World, A Working Paper on Private Sector Initiatives and Processes, AID, Washington, D.C. and Charles F. Kettering Foundation, Dayton, Ohio, 1980.

⁴This study, contracted under the International Communication Agency, was titled "Helping Americans Learn About the World".

⁵Irene Pinkau, ...Understanding Our Role in the World.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Janet C. Tuthill and Marina Fanning-Firfer, op. cit., p. 20.

APPENDIX I

PROGRAM

AID ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON VOLUNTARY AID

December 9 & 10, 1980

Sheraton Washington Hotel
Washington, D.C.

Tuesday, December 9, 1980

8:00 a.m. - 9:00 a.m. Cotillion North	<u>REGISTRATION</u> Continental Breakfast
9:00 a.m. - 10:30 a.m. Cotillion North	<u>PLENARY SESSION</u> "Helping Relations Under New World Conditions" Chairman: John Sewell, President, Overseas Development Council Discussants: Stephen Hayes, YMCA Norman Sherman, Public Affairs, AID
10:30 a.m. - 10:45 a.m.	COFFEE BREAK
10:45 a.m. - 12:45 p.m. Cotillion North	<u>PLENARY SESSION</u> "Learning About A Complex World - Concepts and Experience" Chairman: John Sewell Speaker: Charles MacCormack, Experiment in International Living Discussants: Robert W. Harlan, Executive Vice President, Independent Sector Mildred Marcy, Director, Office of Institutional Relations, International Communications Agency
12:45 p.m. - 2:00 p.m.	LUNCH

AID ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON VOLUNTARY AID

Tuesday, December 9, (continued)

2:00 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.

WORKSHOP SESSIONS

Idaho Room &
Wisconsin Room

I. "Concepts and Program Recommendations for Private Sector Initiatives and Processes"

Kansas Room &
Vermont Room

II. "Toward a Joint Work Process"

3:30 p.m. - 3:45 p.m.

REFRESHMENT BREAK

3:45 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

WORKSHOP SESSIONS (Cont.)

7:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.
Maryland Room

RECEPTION

Wednesday, December 10, 1980

8:00 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.
Washington Room

CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST

9:00 a.m. - 10:15 a.m.

PLENARY SESSION

"Learning About a Complex World,"
Summary of Workshop Reports

Discussants: Richard F. Celeste,
Director, U.S. Peace Corps

Phillips Ruopp, Charles F. Kettering
Foundation

10:15 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.

COFFEE BREAK

10:30 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.
Washington Room

PLENARY SESSION

"Building the Agenda for 1981"

CLOSING REMARKS
ADJOURNMENT

APPENDIX II

MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON
VOLUNTARY FOREIGN AID

1979 - 1980

Benton, Marjorie C.
U.S. Representative to UNICEF
585 Ingleside Place
Evanston, Illinois 60201

Hope, Clifford R., Jr.
Haag, Hope, Mills, Bolin & Collins
607 North Seventh
Garden City, Kansas 67846

Emery, Mrs. Martha E.
1050 George Street, Apt. 7-D
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901

Kawakami, Mr. Keiji
Iolani Sportswear, Ltd.
1218 Kona Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96814

Flores, Patrick F.
(The Most Reverend)
Archbishop of San Antonio
P.O. Box 32648
San Antonio, Texas 78184

Marshall, Dr. Robert, Vice Chairman
Advisory Committee on Voluntary
Foreign Aid
Lutheran World Ministeries
360 Park Avenue South
New York, New York 10010

Gulliver, Adelaide Cromwell
Afro-American Studies Center
Boston University
Brookline, Massachusetts 02146

Nathan, Mr. Robert
Robert R. Nathan Associates, Inc.
1200 18th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

Harris, Mr. Huntington - Chairman
Advisory Committee on Voluntary
Foreign Aid
RFD #1, Box 469
Leesburg, Virginia 22075

RhineSmith, Stephen H.
AFS International/Intercultural
Program
313 East 43rd Street
New York, New York 10017

Hickey, Margaret (Miss)
3940 East Timrod - #207
Tucson, Arizona 85711

Taylor, Carl E. (Dr.) Chairman,
Department of International Health
School of Hygiene and Public Health
The Johns Hopkins University
615 North Wolfe Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21205

MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON VOLUNTARY FOREIGN AID
1979 - 1980

Ulinski, John A., Jr.
Executive Director AID/PVO
AID, Room 1200 SA-8
Washington, DC 20523

Walsh, Ms. Michaela, President
Womens World Banking
Grand Central Station
P.O. Box 1691
New York, New York 10017

Walker, John T.
(The Right Reverend)
Bishop of Episcopal Diocese of
Washington
Episcopal Church House/Mt.St.Alban
Washington, DC 20016

REGISTERED PARTICIPANTS FOR AID/PVO ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING ON
VOLUNTARY AID

December 9 & 10, 1980

Anderson, Sheila
Program & Information Officer
The Salvation Army World
Service Office (SAWSO)
1025 Vermont Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 10005

Arango, Roland
Program Development Specialist
SER - Jobs for Progress, Inc.
109 2nd Street, NE
Washington, DC 20002

Bell, Paul, Associate
Inter-America Research Associates
1555 Wilson Blvd., Suite #600
Rosslyn, Virginia 22209

Bermant, Lili
ARMDI
c/o Robert Nathan Associates, Inc.
1200 18th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Brown, K. E., Jr., Coordinator
Latin American Caribbean Codel, Inc.
79 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10016

Brown, Lucy, Executive Assistant
ANERA
1522 K Street, Suite 202
Washington, DC 20009

Buck, F. A.
Christian Service Corps
8501 Houston Street
Silver Spring, Maryland

Bullard, Edward P., President
Technoserve, Inc.
11 Belden Avenue
Norwalk, Connecticut 06852

Burgess, Mary Ellen, TAICH
American Council of Voluntary
Agencies/Foreign Service
200 Park Avenue South
New York, New York 10003

Campbell, Willie, President
Overseas Education Fund
League of Women Voters
2101 L Street, NW, Suite 916
Washington, DC 20037

Celeste, Richard, Director
U.S. Peace Corps
806 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20525

Charlebois, Rev. Robert L.
Special Assistant
Catholic Relief Services, Inc.
1011 First Avenue
New York, New York 10022

Chin, Ping-sheng, Vice President
International Institute of Rural
Reconstruction
1775 Broadway
New York, New York 10019

Cochran, Jerilyn, PMIP/AID
320 22nd Street, NW
Room 517 SA-12
Washington, DC 20523

REGISTERED PARTICIPANTS FOR AID/PVO ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING ON
VOLUNTARY AID
December 9 & 10, 1980

Collins, Lee
Laubach Literacy
6804 Sorrell
McLean, Virginia 22101

Diamond, Michael
YMCA - International Division
291 Broadway
New York, New York 10007

Conyard, J.W., President
International Educational
Development, Inc.,
815 Second Ave., Suite 1021
New York, New York 10017

Dieterly, John F., Jr.
Regional Director
Heifer Project International
P.O. Box 188
New Windsor, Maryland 21776

Costello, John H.
Associate Director
Helen Keller International
22 West 17th Street
New York, New York 10014

Dillard, James M.
Secretary/Treasurer
Agricultural Development Council
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104

Cronyn, Peggy, Program Analyst
PDC/PVC
Department of State/AID
Washington, DC 20523

Dobyns, Phyllis, Director of Public
Policy
Save the Children
48 Wilton Road
Westport, Connecticut 06830

D'Auria, Shirley A.
Director of Public Affairs
International Institute of Rural
Reconstruction
1775 Broadway
New York, New York 10019

Dutta, Ajit
New TransCentury Foundation
1789 Columbia Road, NW
Washington, DC 20009

Deering, Joseph M.
Executive Director
International Eye Foundation
7801 Norfolk Avenue
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Ekstrom, Jim
Sister Cities International
1625 Eye Street
Washington, DC 20006

Diamond, Mary
Meals for Millions
3475 North Venice
Arlington, Virginia 22207

Ellison, Kenn
Director of Operations
Partnership for Productivity
2441 18th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009

REGISTERED PARTICIPANTS FOR AID/PVO ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING ON
VOLUNTARY AID
December 9 & 10, 1980

Evans, Leon
Department Admin. International
Nat. Rural Elec. Co-op Association
1800 Massachusetts, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Fanning-Firfer, Ms. Marina
Director, Inter-American
Development Institute
1789 Columbia Road, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Farr, Tim, Director
Caribbean Programs
Goodwill Industries of America
9200 Wisconsin Avenue
Washington, DC 20014

Farren, William F.
Director, Marketing
Technoserve, Inc.
11 Belden
Norwalk, Connecticut 06852

Fox, Thomas, Director
Private & Voluntary Cooperation/AID
Room 241 - SA-S
Department of State
Washington, DC 20523

Geib, Ruthann, Admin. Assistant
Summer Institute of Linguistics
1800 K Street, NW, Suite 801
Washington, DC 20006

Gilmore, Judy
Office of Program & Management
Support
Bureau of Private and Development
Cooperation, Room 222 SA-8
Agency for International
Development
Washington, DC 20523

Gubser, Peter, President
ANERA
1522 K Street, NW, Suite 202
Washington, DC 20005

Guyer, David L., President
Save the Children
54 Wilton Road
Westport, Connecticut 06880

Hafiz, Saad
Telacu
5327 Valley Blvd.
Los Angeles, California 90032

Harlan, Robert
Executive Vice President
Independent Sector
1828 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Harper, Barry C., Executive Director
Institute for International
Development, Inc.
360 Maple Avenue, West, Suite F
Vienna, Virginia 22180

Hayes, Stephen, Director of Peace
and Development Education-YMCA
291 Broadway
New York, New York 10007

Height, Dorothy, President
National Council of Negro Women, Inc.
1819 H Street, NW, Suite 900
Washington, DC 20006

Heyman, Austin, Deputy Director
AID/PDC/PVC
Agency for International Development
Washington, DC 20523

REGISTERED PARTICIPANTS FOR AID/PVO ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING ON
VOLUNTARY AID
December 9 & 10, 1980

Holmes, Dr. Edward
The Episcopal Church
815 Second Avenue
New York, New York 10017

Lowry, Boyd, Executive Director
CODEL (Coordination in Development)
79 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10157

Hooper, Minnie
AID-PDC/PVC
Agency for International Development
Room 227 C
21st and Virginia Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20523

Lubell, Ira, M.D., Executive Dir.
Association for Voluntary
Sterilization
708 3rd Avenue
New York, New York 10017

Hope, Clifford R., Jr.
Haag, Hope, Mills, Bolin & Collins
607 N. Seventh
Garden City, Kansas 67846

Lundblad, Arthur M. (Rev.)
Executive Director
Paul Carlson Medical Program, Inc.
3305 West Foster Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60625

Keehn, Thomas B., President
World Education, Inc.
251 Park Avenue South
New York, New York 10010

McClusky, Bob
AID-PDC/PVC, Room 225 SA-8
Agency for International Development
Washington, DC 20523

Kennedy, Dr. Joseph C.
Director of International Development
(Program Coordinator)
AFRICARE
1601 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20009

McCoy, Michael, Program Officer
UN/Non-Governmental Liaison Service
Room 1051
New York, New York 10017

Knoll, Jerry
International Rescue Committee
1732 Eye Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

McLaughlin, Martin M.
Overseas Development Council
1717 Massachusetts Avenue
Suite 501
Washington, DC

Kottke, Mary, Executive Secretary
CARE, Inc.
2025 I Street, NW, Suite 1004
Washington, DC 20006

MacCormack, Dr. Charles, President
The Experiment in International
Living
Kipling Road
Brattleboro, Vermont 05301

REGISTERED PARTICIPANTS FOR AID/PVO ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING ON
VOLUNTARY AID
December 9 & 10, 1980

MacCracken, James, Vice President
Save the Children
48 Wilton Road
Westport, Connecticut 06880

Neil, Suzanne, Program Officer
Institute of International Education
11 Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20036

Maguire, Paul G., Latin America
AID-PDC, Room 3253
Department of State
Washington, DC 20523

Neilsen, Ove R., Assistant Executive
Director
Lutheran World Relief
360 Park Avenue South
New York, New York 10010

Marcy, Mildred, Director
Office of Institutional Relations
International Communications Agency
Washington, DC 20547

Norman, Henry R., Executive Director
VITA
3706 Rhode Island Avenue
Mt. Rainier, Maryland 20822

Marion, Leon O., Executive Director
American Council of Voluntary
Agencies for Foreign Service
200 Park Avenue South
New York, New York 10003

O'Brien, Robert, Executive Director
PACT
777 UN Plaza
New York City, New York 10017

Marquardt, Michael
Overseas Education Fund of the
League of Women Voters
2101 L Street, NW, Suite 916
Washington, DC 20037

Oerke, Andrew, President
Partnership for Productivity
2441 18th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009

Metzler, Edgar
Mennonite Central Committee
110 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002

Pall, Agnes
YMCA-International Division
291 Broadway
New York, New York 10007

Miller, Lt. Colonel Ernest A.
Director
Salvation Army World Service Office
The Salvation Army
1025 Vermont Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20005

Patterson, Roy, PVO Coordinator
AID/AFR/HA
VS State Department
Washington, DC 20520

Mills, Verent J., Dr.
Executive Director
Christian Children's Fund, Inc.
203 East Cary Street
Richmond, Virginia 23220

Perez, Eduardo
Sister Cities International
1625 I Street, NW, Room 424
Washington, DC 20006

**REGISTERED PARTICIPANTS FOR AID/PVO ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING ON
VOLUNTARY AID
December 9 & 10, 1980**

Perry, Moses
YMCA-International Division
291 Broadway
New York, New York 10007

Regenstein, Charney
Pan-American Development Foundation
1625 Eye Street, NW, Suite 622
Washington, DC 20006

Peters, Mary F.
Washington Representative
Girl Scouts USA
910 17th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006

Ren, Myles K., Dr.
Executive Director
International Human Assistance
Program, Inc.
360 Park Avenue South
New York, New York 10010

Petty, Irene M., Director
International Division
National Council of Negro Women, Inc.
1819 H Street, NW, Suite 900
Washington, DC

Ricci, Bonnie
New TransCentury Foundation
1789 Columbia Road, NW
Washington, DC 20009

Pierson, Gordon K.
Deputy Assistant Administrator for
Private Development Cooperation
AID
Washington, DC 20523

Richards, Marilyn
New TransCentury Foundation
1789 Columbia Road, NW
Washington, DC 20009

Pinkau, Irene, Director
Development Services Cooperation
Project
Coordinated by Charles F. Kettering
Foundation
1665 32nd Street, NW
Washington, DC 20007

Roberts, Harold G., Executive Dir.
Helen Keller International, Inc.
22 West 17th Street
New York, New York 10011

Ransom, Bob, Director
Africa Goodwill Industries
9200 Wisconsin Avenue
Washington, DC 20014

Rose, Joseph Mrs.
Washington Representative
Hadassah
4829 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC

Raun, N.S., Vice President
Winrock International
Petit Jean Mountain, Rt. 3
Morrlilton, Arkansas 72110

Ruopp, Phillips
The Charles F. Kettering Foundation
5335 Far Hills Avenue
Dayton, Ohio 45429

**REGISTERED PARTICIPANTS FOR AID/PVO ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING ON
VOLUNTARY AID
December 9 & 10, 1980**

Russell, Bernard
National Office for Social
Responsibility
208 North Washington Street
Alexandria, Virginia

Sands, James W.
Associate Executive Director
United States Foundation for
International Scouting
P.O. Box 61030 - D/FW Airport
Dallas, Texas 75261

Sant, Vicki, Chairperson
Washington Resource Group
1710 Hoban Road, NW
Washington, DC 20007

Schmidt, Armin L., Director of Eval.
Heifer Project International, Inc.
P.O. Box 808, 825 West 3rd
Little Rock, Arkansas 72203

Sewell, John, President
Overseas Development Council
1717 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Shade, John A., Executive Director
Pearl S. Buck Foundation, Inc.
Green Hills Farm
Perrassie, Pennsylvania 18944

Shaffer, Jack
AID
Washington, DC

Sherman, Norman, Public Affairs
Agency for International Development
21st & Virginia Avenue, NW
Room 4898
Washington, DC 20523

Siegel, Stanley J.
Coordinator for African Refugee
and Humanitarian Affairs-Africa
Humanitarian Affairs-Africa
Bureau of AID-AFR/HA
Agency for International
Development
21st & Virginia Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20523

Smith, Alise
Overseas Education Fund of the
League of Women Voters
2101 L Street, NW, Suite 916
Washington, DC 20037

Smith, Craig
Council on Foundations
2010 R Street, NW 3
Washington, DC 20007

Snoddy, Michael J.
PVO Liaison Officer - AID
3208 N Street
Washington, DC 20523

Sommer, John G., Special Assistant
to the Administrator - AID
Room 5924 NS
Washington, DC 20523

Soumah, Ruth, Project Coordinator
National Council
of Negro Women, Inc.
1819 H Street
Washington, DC

Spencer, Dao
Assistant Executive Director
American Council of Volunteer
Agencies/Foreign Service
200 Park Avenue South
New York, New York 10003

**REGISTERED PARTICIPANTS FOR AID/PVO ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING ON
VOLUNTARY AID
December 9 & 10, 1980**

Spurlock, Peola, Program Coordinator
Office of Development Education--
Peace Corps
806 Connecticut Avenue, NS
Suite M-1207
Washington, DC 20525

Vukasin, Helen L., Liaison
Environment and Development
CODEL
79 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 12561

Stanberg, Louis C.
Acting Director
Office of Program and Management
Support, PDC Bureau-AID
Washington, DC 20523

Wells, Carl, Program Manager
AFRICARE
1601 Connecticut Ave.,NW, Suite 600
Washington, DC 20009

Swatwood, Jack W.
Director Project Management
International Eye Foundation
7801 Norfolk Avenue
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Wheeler, R.O., President
Winrock International
Petit Jean Mountain, Rt. 3
Morrilton, Arkansas 72110

Sykes, Charles, Director
Program Liaison Office
CARE
2007 Eye Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006

Williams, E.L.
Development Officer
Winrock International
Petit Jean Mountain, Rt. 3
Morrilton, Arkansas 72110

Turner, June H., Director
International Network Program
International Educational
Development, Inc. (IED)
8409 Dixon Avenue, Suite #1
Silver Springs, Maryland

Williams, Max
AID/PDC/PVC
Agency for International Development
Room 3253
Washington, DC 20523

Tuthill, Janet
Inter-American Development Institute
1789 Columbia Road, NW
Washington, DC 20036