



PACIFIC COUNCIL ON
INTERNATIONAL POLICY

**Advancing the International Interests
of African-Americans,
Asian-Americans and Latinos**

A Workshop Organized in Cooperation with

The Tomás Rivera Policy Institute

The Center for Multiethnic and Transnational Studies, University of Southern California

Leadership Education for Asian Pacifics, Inc. (LEAP)

THE PACIFIC COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL POLICY is an independent and nonpartisan membership organization designed to help leaders from many sectors respond more effectively to a rapidly changing world. The western partner of the Council on Foreign Relations (New York), the Pacific Council brings together decision-makers in business and labor, politics and government, religion, the media, law, science and technology, education, arts and entertainment and other professions — all of whom share the conviction that international developments are increasingly significant and ever more interconnected with domestic concerns. The Council aims to strengthen the capacity of leaders; to inform and improve policy-making in both the private and public sectors; to promote public understanding of global trends and their implications; and to enhance international communication on vital economic, social and political issues.

**Advancing the International Interests
of African-Americans,
Asian-Americans and Latinos**

A Workshop Organized in Cooperation with

The Tomás Rivera Policy Institute

The Center for Multiethnic and Transnational Studies, University of Southern California

Leadership Education for Asian Pacifics, Inc. (LEAP)

March 20-21, 1998



PACIFIC COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL POLICY

The western partner of the Council on Foreign Relations

MAY 1998

**PACIFIC COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL POLICY
LOS ANGELES, CA 90089-0035**

**TEL: (213) 740-4296
FAX: (213) 740-9498
E-MAIL: PCIP@USC.EDU**

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Workshop Overview	1
Introduction	3
Theme 1: Major Policy Challenges in the Post-Cold War World	6
Globalization and Income Inequality	6
Immigration Policy	7
Narcotics Policy	9
<i>The Potential for Ethnic Influence on Foreign Policy: Hon. Esteban Torres</i>	10
Theme 2: The International Interests and Foreign Policy Priorities of African-Americans, Asian-Americans and Latinos	11
African-American Perspectives: A Policy Agenda for Africa	11
<i>Comments: Mr. Salih Booker</i>	12
Asian-American Perspectives: Linkages with Homelands	12
<i>Comments: Mr. J. D. Hokoyama</i>	13
Latino Perspectives: Organization and Influence	13
<i>Comments: Dr. Harry Pachón</i>	14
Theme 3: Diversity in U.S. Foreign Policy-Making	15
<i>Opening Remarks: Dr. Ernest Wilson, III</i>	15
<i>African-American Achievements in Foreign Policy Influence: Mr. George Dalley</i>	16
Beyond the Workshop: Next Steps for the Pacific Council	17
Background Memoranda and Papers	18
Workshop Participants	33
Pacific Council Staff	36

WORKSHOP OVERVIEW

“Advancing the International Interests of African-Americans, Asian-Americans and Latinos”

Friday, March 20, 1998

Introductory Remarks:

Dr. Abraham F. Lowenthal, President, Pacific Council on International Policy

Lunch with Keynote Address:

Hon. Esteban E. Torres, U. S. House of Representatives, 34th District

Discussion Session, Theme 1: Major Policy Challenges

Globalization and Income Inequality

Section Chair: Dr. Manuel Pastor, Jr., Professor and Chair, Latin American and Latino Studies, University of California, Santa Cruz

Immigration Policy

Section Chair: Dr. Fernando Guerra, Director, Center for the Study of Los Angeles, Loyola Marymount University

Narcotics Policy

Section Chair: Mr. Craig Chretien, Senior Manager, Protection One
Discussant: Dr. Ethan Nadelmann, Director, Lindesmith Center, Open Society Institute

Second Discussion of Theme 1: Major Policy Challenges
(Same topics and chairs, new participant assignments)

Dinner with Keynote Address: “The Evolution of Minority Foreign Policy Influence: The African-American Experience.” Mr. George Dalley, Partner, Law Offices of Holland & Knight, Washington, DC

Saturday, March 21, 1998

Plenary Session Updates: Reports from Rapporteurs of Friday’s Discussion Sessions

Plenary Session, Theme 2: The International Interests and Foreign Policy Priorities of African-Americans, Asian-Americans and Latinos

- Overview Remarks by Dr. Rodolfo O. de la Garza, Professor, Department of Government, University of Texas at Austin
- An African-American perspective: Mr. Salih Booker, Senior Fellow and Director of Africa Studies, Council on Foreign Relations
- An Asian-American perspective: Mr. J. D. Hokoyama, President and Executive Director, Leadership Education for Asian Pacifics, Inc. (LEAP)

- A Latino perspective: Dr. Harry Pachón, President, The Tomás Rivera Policy Institute

Group Discussions on African-American Perspectives, Asian-American Perspectives and Latino Perspectives

Plenary Session Update: Reports from Rapporteurs of the three breakout sessions on the perspectives of individual ethnic groups, followed by open discussion

Plenary Session, Theme 3: Diversity in U.S. Foreign Policy-Making
Session Chair: Prof. Edwin M. Smith, Leon Benwell Professor of Law and International Relations, University of Southern California

Opening Remarks: Dr. Ernest J. Wilson, III, Director, Center for International Development and Conflict Management, University of Maryland at College Park

Integrative Comments by Designated Discussants, followed by open discussion of further work: Implications for the Pacific Council

Session Chair: Prof. Edwin M. Smith, Leon Benwell Professor of Law and International Relations, University of Southern California

Discussants: Mr. David J. Doerge, President, David J. Doerge & Associates
Ms. Evelyn Keiko Iritani, Pacific Rim Business Correspondent, *The Los Angeles Times*
Dr. Rodolfo O. de la Garza, Professor, Department of Government, University of Texas at Austin
Ms. Marilyn Solomon, President, The Solomon Group

Concluding Remarks and Adjournment

INTRODUCTION



Abraham F. Lowenthal, President of the Pacific Council, welcomes Workshop participants.

Until recently, influential debates on the world role of the United States were largely confined to a relatively small and mostly homogenous “foreign policy community” on the Atlantic seaboard — clustered in and around government, business and financial circles, the prestige media and public policy think-tanks. It was in this context that a group of “wise men” devised the Cold War framework for U.S. foreign policy, which structured this country’s international approaches for nearly fifty years after World War II.

The Pacific Council on International Policy was established in 1995 in large measure to complement (and to some extent correct for) the ideas emanating from this established sector, by drawing on the special vantage-points of the American West.

No consensus exists in the post-Cold War environment, even among those Americans best informed about international affairs, concerning the appropriate U.S. role in a substantially changed world. No small and coherent group of “wise men” (or even “wise men and women”) is likely to develop a broadly-agreed framework for American foreign policy and impose it through acceptance by political leaders. A new and sustainable framework for U.S. policy will emerge, if at all, only through an open political process, in a period when information and power are so widely diffused.

The Western region of the country — and especially California, by far the largest state — is bound to play a much greater role than previously in shaping the U.S. place in the world. The Western region’s influence, in turn, will be shaped by its particular characteristics, including its economic structure and prowess, its demography, and its unique history and culture, including its strong ties — through trade and investment as well as ethnic links — with Asia, Africa and Latin America.

In building the Pacific Council as a West Coast leadership forum focusing in a multisectoral and non-partisan way on international trends and their domestic implications, we have sought from the beginning to engage persons from those “minority” ethnic backgrounds which together comprise the “new majority” in California, as well as persons in affinity groups dealing with the environment, immigration, human rights, narcotics, and other issues gaining more attention in the post-Cold War context. In contrast to the older foreign policy institutions on the Atlantic Coast, the Pacific Council has from its early days had about 20% of its U.S.-based members from the African-American, Asian-American and Latino communities. Leaders from these backgrounds have from the start played prominent roles in the Council’s governance and programs.

To further enhance participation in the Pacific Council and to ensure that our agenda and programs are shaped by a broad range of perspectives, the Pacific Council established in 1997 a “Task Force on Enhancing Diversity in the Pacific Council.” With the help of that Task Force, we organized in March 1998 a special workshop on “Advancing the International Interests of African-Americans, Asian-Americans and Latinos.” Funded with support from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and the Ford Foundation, the workshop was co-sponsored by three other Southern California-based institutions: The Tomás Rivera Policy Institute, The Center for Multiethnic and Transnational Studies at the University of

Southern California, and Leadership Education for Asian Pacifics, Inc. (LEAP).

More than one hundred persons took part in the workshop, including people active and prominent in business, politics, non-governmental organizations, the media, religion and academia. Participants included persons from Chinese-American, Japanese-American, Filipino-American, Vietnamese-American, Thai-American, Muslim-American, Cuban-American, Mexican-American, Salvadoran-American, Colombian-American, Puerto Rican and African-American backgrounds.

Representative Esteban Torres, a leader in the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, and Mr. George Dalley, a former senior State Department official and previously a leading Congressional aide, provided keynote remarks.

Discussions, mainly in breakout groups, focused on the impacts of “globalization” on minority communities and on equity in California; policies on immigration and narcotics, as seen by minority groups; the distinct and shared perspectives of African-Americans, Asian-Americans and Latinos on other international interests and policies; and the implications of diversity for making and implementing U.S. foreign policy.

The workshop did not aim to define a separate foreign policy for “minority” Americans, nor to suggest that persons of color have or should have parochial interests in the international realm. Rather, we sought to promote stronger “minority” engagement in international policy discussions, in part by beginning to identify and articulate some international interests and perspectives of minority communities, and by focusing on how these interests could more effectively connect with regional, national and international policy discussions. By facilitating structured exchange about these questions among persons who have not previously considered them together, the Pacific Council hopes to have contributed both to enhancing effective diversity in its own membership and programs and to stimulating new coalitions of engaged participants to confront international issues.

The workshop was not organized to reach broadly-agreed conclusions, and no doubt participants took very different impressions from the exchanges. The following points were most salient to me:

- Traditional foreign policy discussions framed in the discourse of “national interests” need to take into account a much broader and more diverse “nation” than has been the case in the past.
- The lines between “foreign” and “domestic” policies and politics are blurring, and national borders are becoming much more permeable, because trade, investment, communications and culture are so relentlessly global. Participation in foreign affairs is no longer limited to national governments; local and state governments, corporations, trade unions, the media, religious groups and non-governmental organizations of many types take part in important ways.
- As the international policy agenda changes from nuclear standoff in Central Europe and the super-power confrontation of the Cold War to the concerns of trade and investment, the environment, the drug traffic, immigration policy, identity politics and ethnic conflict, human rights and democratic governance, people from minority communities in the United States will find themselves increasingly interested and involved in the policy formulation process.
- African-American, Asian-American and Latino populations are much larger than they used to be, mainly as a result of recent immigration; they are strategically concentrated in a few states where they have actual or potential political clout; and they are on the whole much more active politically

than they used to be on domestic and international issues and especially on those issues where domestic and international elements come together. The impact on U.S. foreign policy by African-Americans in the cases of South Africa and Haiti, and perhaps soon of Nigeria; of Latinos on Cuba, NAFTA, and immigration policy; and of Chinese-Americans on U.S.-China relations are all considerable.

- There is no “Asian-American” community as such, with a broad international policy consensus, nor is there an overall “Latino” community or collective view, but greater self-consciousness with regard to foreign policy issues is beginning to emerge at the end of the 1990s among all three groups.
- Diversity of both kinds — ethnic background and functional position — makes international policy discussions more complex and multi-dimensional, but can also provide important assets for the formulation and conduct of American foreign policy.
- The Pacific Council can play a modest but significant potential role by showing how diversity in membership and programs can enrich its substantive contribution to regional, national and international deliberations.

I hope readers will derive their own impressions by reading through the summaries of the background memoranda, keynote addresses and general discussions. A complete list of all background papers distributed at the Workshop appears on page 18. These papers are available on request from the Pacific Council.

This report cannot capture the lively exchanges that occurred around dinners and in the corridors and receptions, of course, but they do provide many of the most interesting nuggets of insight and information that emerged from the formal program.

We would welcome comments stimulated by this report, including suggestions for the Pacific Council’s membership and programs. Please address comments to me at the Pacific Council.

Let me take the opportunity to express appreciation to Tuong Vu, my special assistant, for the excellent work he did to coordinate this Workshop’s preparations; to Glenda Jones and Judith Peres of the Council’s administrative staff; to Tina Eshaghpour of Coro Southern California, who took the lead in preparing this report; and to David J. Doerge for his advice and editorial suggestions. We are also grateful to the Pacific Council’s Task Force on Enhancing Diversity; to our co-sponsoring institutions; to all the presenters and participants at the Workshop; and to the Mellon and Ford Foundations for their support.

Abraham F. Lowenthal
President
Pacific Council on International Policy

INVOLVING ETHNIC GROUPS IN FOREIGN POLICY

Dr. Rodolfo O. de la Garza

A distinction needs to be made between foreign relations and foreign policy. Foreign relations mean the various linkages between immigrants and their ancestral homelands. These linkages could be family relations, cultural affinities or business connections. Foreign policy, however, involves issues that affect relations between and among countries. The increasing foreign relations for certain groups do not necessarily imply their increasing influence in foreign policy. For ethnic communities, the challenge is how to translate foreign relations into influence on foreign policy.

There are three analytical approaches to the involvement of ethnic groups in foreign policy:

- 1. The first approach, dubbed the "affirmative action" position, contends that all Americans, regardless of their ethnic origins, should be allowed equal opportunities to participate in the making of policies affecting their concerns. Such participation will make America more democratic, but will not necessarily make any difference to American foreign policy.*
- 2. The second approach, articulated by many leaders of ethnic groups, points to past and current fallacies of American foreign policy as the direct result of the exclusion of ethnic Americans from the policy-making process. This approach argues that such participation will not only change but also improve American foreign policy, given the specific cultural assets that ethnic individuals possess.*
- 3. The third and opposite approach, the most articulate proponent of which is Samuel P. Huntington of Harvard University, rejects the participation of ethnic interests in foreign policy-making as harmful to the broader "national interests."*

T H E M E I :

MAJOR POLICY CHALLENGES IN THE POST-COLD WAR WORLD

GLOBALIZATION AND INCOME INEQUALITY

Chair: Dr. Manuel Pastor, Jr.

One of the most important issues in the United States today — of particular interest to African-American, Asian-American and Latino communities — is rising income inequality and the decline in real wages of working class Americans. Questions have been raised in this

context about the effects of “free trade” and NAFTA, and about the proper role of the federal government in promoting economic growth and development, both at home and abroad. The perception is widespread that expanded international commerce may spell greater exploitation of unskilled labor and medium-level workers, and that economic “globalization” has detrimental domestic consequences, especially for minority groups.

Conferees were asked to consider to what extent

and in what ways “globalization” is actually to blame for the growing inequities in the United States. The discussion initially centered on the economic dimensions of globalization and whether the focus should remain on trade or should also include capital, labor, ideas and services. It was suggested that although globalization contributes to income inequality, there are other factors at work. Job loss was attributed to changes in technology and the skills needed to survive in a global economy. One individual pointed to the role of immigration in generating inequality, referring to a study on income distribution in California that showed a connection between California’s large population of immigrants and its ranking as the most unequal among all states measured by income per household.

There was general agreement that globalization has had differential effects on ethnic communities, creating disparate costs and benefits that exacerbate already unequal distributions of income. While some participants argued that globalization is negative for ethnic communities, others noted that those communities often enjoy linguistic and cultural links with their homelands that give them enormous advantages in establishing trusting relationships necessary for success in global business. It was suggested that class and geography are as much determinants of who reaps the benefits of globalization as ethnicity. However, many acknowledged that ethnicity does affect how the impact of globalization is distributed.

A strong consensus existed among participants that there is an ethnic minority interest in international trade separate from the interest of the nation at large. One participant argued that ethnic communities should not try to obstruct globalization, over which they have little control. These communities should instead focus on the policy choices that will help alleviate the deleterious effects and help more people share in the benefits of globalization. So, what can be done to protect those disadvantaged by globalization?

The empowerment of ethnic communities was discussed as the key to alleviating the income inequality caused by globalization. One strategy suggested was to raise the general level of aware-

ness of the average person — ethnic minority or not — who has little understanding of the impact of globalization. Strategies discussed for empowerment through increased education included training in technical skills, access to a first-rate K-12 education, and the promotion of language diversity based on the idea that multilingual skills are in demand by international businesses. It was also proposed that ethnic communities can be empowered as well through the establishment of community development corporations dedicated to a global model; through increased inter-racial bridges and alliances; and, possibly, through government subsidies to ease the effect of structural adjustment, as in the models provided by the European Union.

Several participants stressed that behind much of globalization has been the “virtual abdication of national government to the market and multinational businesses,” and that specific communities have been pushed aside for a larger agenda. By broadening the discussion of the consequences of globalization to include its human or social implications, issues such as quality of life, the environment and access to communication facilities or channels will receive more attention. It was suggested that international organizations and corporations, not just states, should take more responsibility in ameliorating the costs of globalization to communities by promoting social safety nets for “human” security.

For a background discussion, see Manuel Pastor’s paper on page 19.

IMMIGRATION POLICY

Chair: Dr. Fernando Guerra

As a nation of immigrants, the United States has long been a pluralistic society. The demographic transition in California and the western states stemming from continuing pressures of migration, especially from Latin America and East and Southeast Asia, is simultaneously being met by the rising pressures to control and restrict immigration. Tensions have been rising in the United States, between recent immigrants and



Workshop participants meet in plenary session.

U.S.-born citizens, between African-Americans and immigrants from Latin America, Asia, and the Middle East, and between new and more established groups of immigrants. Conferees discussed the causes of immigration, as well as prevailing attitudes and concerns about U.S. immigration policy.

How do international economic trends influence the patterns of population movement? It was suggested that the globalization of capital cannot occur without the globalization of labor, and that immigration is the inevitable consequence of economic globalization. One participant argued that the United States is the victim of its own success because its economic prosperity inevitably attracts immigrants. Another participant countered with the need for an approach that addresses the economic and social problems that induce emigration in the “sending countries.” This approach calls for more financial investment and development assistance to these countries.

Although participants agreed that economics is an important consideration, some argued that concerns about immigrants should also be linked to domestic concerns and socioeconomic issues in a way that is more appealing to policy-makers and the American public. For instance, one participant asserted that depriving immigrants of education and health services only leads to social problems.

Additionally, immigrants serve as an important labor pool. Yet differences in legal status have affected the social mobility of ethnic immigrant communities in the U.S., as is evident in comparisons of Asian-Americans to Latinos.

Attitudes about “illegal” immigrants are strongly influenced by public perception and how that perception shapes public policy. In particular, the racial dimension of the immigration issue was discussed, comparing the status of Mexican and Caribbean immigrants to Canadians in the United States.

Participants agreed that immigrants who are easily distinguishable from the majority white population are more vulnerable to public attacks and resentment.

Latinos constitute the single largest minority group in California, though this population is not a single homogenous group. In order for Latinos to take advantage of their numeric strength, they must overcome two important hurdles: low levels of political organization and ethnic group consciousness, especially as compared to some other prominent ethnic groups in the United States. Inconsistencies in immigration policy have contributed to rising tensions within the Latino community that may prevent them from building a consensus on foreign policy issues. Participants discussed polls that suggest the support of a growing number of Latinos for more restrictions on immigration, especially for measures to prevent undocumented immigrants. Fear of competition from newcomers for jobs, one participant observed, might be behind this anti-immigration attitude. Another noted that researchers have identified level of education as the most significant determinant of Latino attitudes about immigration; but, controlling for education, ethnic identity within individual communities emerges as the significant variable.

There are issues on which a coalition could be built between African-Americans and Latinos on immigration policy. African-Americans, one participant noted, are strongly interested in correcting the inequalities of immigration law, and in expos-

ing the hypocrisy between the private sector's promotion of globalization on the one hand and its silence about labor on the other. By attacking policies that offer unequal forms of treatment to illegal immigrants and to refugees, African-Americans can join forces with Latinos.

Coalition-building within and among ethnic minorities may be the key to increasing levels of acceptance of ethnic and cultural diversity and effectively pursuing common interests. This may be achieved by identifying points of agreement among minority communities. One participant identified four such opportunities: 1) more talks, on immigration and other issues, are necessary within and among minority groups; 2) minorities need to decide on certain rules to prevent the occurrence of "special pleading" that could undercut broader consensus; 3) issues of "Latino interests" should be reformulated and advocated in terms of "U.S. self-interests"; and 4) more soul-searching and philosophical inquiry is necessary to determine what responsibilities minorities should and could have to their homelands and to the United States.

NARCOTICS POLICY

Chair: Mr. Craig Chretien

The narcotics trade has become one of the most worrisome problems for American society. It is also one of the most contentious aspects of U.S. foreign policy, especially in U.S. relations with Colombia, Mexico, Peru, Bolivia and other countries in Latin America and the Caribbean where illegal drugs are grown, refined, and trafficked to the world's largest consumer market. Although consumption of illegal drugs is widespread in the United States, affecting all regions and ethnic groups, the African-American, Asian-American and Latino communities of California and the West have been especially hard hit, and have a correspondingly large stake in the effective reduction of the narcotics trade.

A former Drug Enforcement Administration official gave an insider's view of the difficulties facing government efforts to stem the flow of drugs

into the United States. He argued that the greatest challenge in the "war on drugs" has been the ability of international drug traffickers to shift their production and supply bases to avoid government suppression. The resilience of drug suppliers, as demonstrated historically by the increased narcotics production in Southeast Asia to replace the drop in production in Turkey, has made enforcing drug policy a difficult ongoing process.

In response to calls for stronger efforts to stem the supply of drugs, several participants asserted that the present U.S. drug policy has failed because minimal attention has been paid to the demand side of the equation. Prevalent strategies and tactics for dealing with the drug traffic have focused on international aspects in a "drug war," without acknowledging the social and physiological dimensions of drug use. One participant asserted that this country will be unable to eliminate the societal demand for drugs. Consequently, he recommended that the U.S. should treat narcotics as a public health concern, as opposed to a criminal problem. A more sound approach might seek a middle ground between abstinence and addiction, concentrating on the reduction of harm by providing clean needles, establishing more methadone clinics, and decriminalizing narcotics use.

This "harm reduction approach" was a controversial idea that stimulated much discussion but no consensus. Several participants argued that it would undermine social morality. It was also criticized as an irrelevant policy in communities where people are already dying due to narcotics use and trafficking. Participants suggested that drug use was more properly characterized as a symptom



Stanley Sanders, Senior Partner at Barnes, McGhee, & Pryce.

of those communities' lack of hope in the future, and its trade the only economic opportunity available to satisfy individuals' aspirations for upward social mobility. Racial dimensions of the drug issue, including the assertion that the government has largely ignored the problems of poverty, crime, and drug-related health problems in communities

of predominant minority populations, were the focus of many comments.

Even with a more domestic focus for a narcotics policy, the challenge will be how to implement policy at the national level in ways that could make a difference in individual communities.

THE POTENTIAL FOR ETHNIC INFLUENCE ON FOREIGN POLICY *Hon. Esteban E. Torres, U.S. House of Representatives, 34th District*

Given recent Congressional and public debates on presidential "fast-track" authority, funding for the IMF, and the certification of Mexico as an "ally" of the U.S. in the war on drugs, this workshop is timely and relevant to ethnic communities. Important questions that need to be asked are how policies on these issues impact ethnic communities, and how these communities can enter the marketplace of ideas so that they too can play a role in helping shape their outcomes.

Policy debates on trade and immigration — no longer solely domestic or international issues in their scope or impact — must take into account families, wages, the environment, health care, and numerous other considerations. Taking NAFTA as an example, while there have been winners and losers, there has been a net loss of approximately 90,000 jobs in the U.S. The negative effects have not been evenly spread out, however: African-Americans, Latinos, and women of color, especially those living in Los Angeles County and in El Paso, Texas, have suffered disproportionate impacts from NAFTA.

Ethnic communities will become even more active and influential in future debates on international policy. Latinos have played a crucial role in the debates on NAFTA and in the formation of the North American Development Bank. Ethnic communities now have academics, negotiators, politicians, and business people who can lend their knowledge and experience to the democratic process of determining what is in the interests of their communities and the nation as a whole.



Congressman Esteban Torres, delivering keynote address.

THE INTERNATIONAL INTERESTS AND FOREIGN POLICY PRIORITIES OF AFRICAN-AMERICANS, ASIAN-AMERICANS AND LATINOS

Traditionally, foreign policies pursue “national interests,” which have been defined by what the formal political process identifies as important and what the informal community of foreign policy practitioners sees as a high priority. In the post-Cold War era, ethnic minorities are less constrained by traditional approaches to foreign policy and have unprecedented opportunities to affect the process. What can racial and ethnic minorities do to assure that the issues they care most about get quality attention both in the broad political arena and in the “foreign policy establishment”? Conferees identified the perceived foreign policy and international interests and priorities of African-Americans, Asian-Americans and Latinos and discussed how these interests may be distinct from those of other Americans.

The following are brief summaries of the main points made in one-hour breakout sessions. The sessions and summaries were not meant to be comprehensive in scope, but allowed participants to begin to consider agendas relevant to their foreign policy concerns and interests.

AFRICAN-AMERICAN PERSPECTIVES: A POLICY AGENDA FOR AFRICA

Chair: Ms. Marilyn Solomon

For African-Americans to be influential and effective in the process of formulating and implementing U.S. foreign policy, both economic interests and moral conscience should be addressed in an African-American agenda. Perhaps it is no surprise then that dialogue relating to the perceived foreign policy and international priorities of African-Americans focused heavily on con-



Norman Gregory Young, Professor of Law for International Business at California Polytechnic University in Pomona; Richard Pedersen, Member of the Board of Directors for the Center for Civic Education; Mai Cong, President & CEO of the Vietnamese Community of Orange County, Inc.; and Dinh K. Le, President of Le & Associates.

cerns over U.S. policy towards Nigeria. Participants expressed disappointment that this policy has not taken into consideration African-Americans’ strong feelings against corruption and human rights abuses, and questioned the wisdom of the “constructive engagement” with Nigeria.

A proposal that religious institutions with historically pan-Africanist concerns assume an important role in building bridges to Africa was met with mixed reactions. Although it received the support of some participants, others were concerned that African-American institutions are too dependent on a few individual leaders. In their view, African-American perspectives should better reflect the diversity of the community. Just as no single person or institution represents the foreign policy views of any other community, there should be no individual or sector monopolizing the foreign policy views of African-Americans.

Participants highlighted the need to nurture an African-American constituency with a strong interest in foreign policy issues. It was suggested that African-Americans consider how their human capital could be employed in Africa's endeavors for development, providing political support in return for economic opportunity. However, the difficulties with effective mobilization and formulation of an African-American agenda on Africa may be attributed, in part, to the lack of interaction between African-Americans and immigrants from Africa. These groups first must come together to forge a common policy position around issues of race and racism, and then mobilize around public policy regarding Africa.

In order to formulate effective foreign policy alternatives, one participant encouraged African-Americans to broaden the scope of their interests and their institutions to include important foreign policy issues that go beyond Africa. The argument is that a comparison of U.S. relations with China and Latin America to those of the U. S. with Africa will ultimately enhance the African-Americans' ability to position their foreign policy agenda in a global context.

AN AFRICAN-AMERICAN PERSPECTIVE *Mr. Salih Booker*

When examining foreign relations, African-Americans are particularly sensitive to racial issues. As a result of their historical repression, they are also concerned with questions of justice, and generally tend to side with the underdog. For African-Americans, democracy is a foreign policy priority, as are economic growth and development in Africa.

Foreign policy institutions need to take into account the rich diversity of opinion within the African-American community regarding the foreign policy questions. While we need to educate African-Americans more on international policy issues, I challenge the perception that African-Americans are not interested in foreign policy. After all, "We came to America due to international trade."

ASIAN-AMERICAN PERSPECTIVES: LINKAGES WITH HOMELANDS *Chair: Mr. J. D. Hokoyama*

The well-being of Asian-Americans has been "inextricably linked" to the role and influence of Asian nations and to the nature of the relationships between immigrants' adopted and ancestral homes. Such strong linkages have inadvertently contributed to the widespread perception in America of Asian-Americans as perpetual foreigners and outsiders. Participants identified historical animosities linked to Asian-Americans' strong allegiance to their native homelands as a force that divides the different Asian communities. Some argued that such strong interests in their homelands also take away time and resources that could be used to invest in their communities in America.

Linkages to their homelands, however, are not necessarily burdens for Asian-Americans. With Asia as an important market, Asian-Americans with cultural and family links are considered assets to be utilized. Moreover, it was suggested that Asian-Americans working in the private sector could be viewed as assets for their ethnic group, given the important role played by multinational companies in many foreign policy issues.

Despite their strong interests in foreign policy issues, Asian-Americans are not players when it comes to foreign policy. Participants expressed concern over political backlashes when steps have been taken to increase participation in the domestic political process. For instance, the recent political campaign finance scandal, they feared, will blunt Asian-American activism for many years to come.

The discussion on political backlash prompted the question of whether and how Asian-Americans should unite for electoral strength to ensure success for their activism. One participant noted that the base for such unity is Asian-Americans' common experience of prejudice and abuse in America. However, it was also suggested that uniting does not necessarily mean speaking with a single voice nor having a single foreign policy position for all Asian-American groups. Human rights was proposed as an issue that could help build consensus

among Asian-Americans, given the moral authority that immigrants and refugees from Asia could bring to the debate.

For a background discussion, see Paul Watanabe's paper on page 20.

**LATINO PERSPECTIVES:
ORGANIZATION AND INFLUENCE**
Chair: Mr. Thomas Saenz

Looking for models to evaluate Latino involvement in international policy, participants discussed several historical and current examples. The role of Cuban-Americans in influencing U.S. foreign policy, without forming coalitions with other Latino groups, was identified as one model. Four factors explain Cuban-Americans' success: 1) a strong consensus exists among Cuban-Americans in their opposition to the Castro government in Cuba; 2) most Cuban-Americans are concentrated in only two states – New Jersey and Florida – a fact which significantly enhances their electoral power; 3) anti-Castro Cuban-Americans have been able to build up a powerful, well-organized and well-funded lobby centered around the Cuban American National Foundation; and 4) Cuban-Americans have donated heavily to political campaigns in return for access to and influence vis-à-vis public office-holders. However, some participants warned that as a model for successful promotion of international interests, the success of Cuban-Americans was unique to the Cold War and to the communist threat to the U.S., which allowed a highly magnified Cuban voice. This factor may limit its use as a benchmark to evaluate other Latino efforts and, indeed, may be a distraction in uniting Latinos on foreign policy.

As the Cuban-American example shows, groups within the Latino community historically have been centered around and united by links with their former homelands. Building coalitions to overcome these historical divisions between different Spanish-speaking communities is an important challenge that Latinos face in the United States.

**AN ASIAN-AMERICAN
PERSPECTIVE**
Mr. J. D. Hokoyama

Unlike other minorities, Asian-Americans have historically been viewed as foreign agents, as evidenced in uneven immigration laws and in the internment of Japanese-Americans. As a group, Asian-Americans do not have much political power, nor are they well represented in foreign policy institutions. There have been only three Asian-American ambassadors in American history, for example.

As a continent with dozens of countries and extremely diverse cultures, there should not be one single foreign policy towards Asia. The most important way for Asian-Americans to empower themselves is to win acceptance as "an insider looking out" when it comes to foreign policy.

Speaking from his experience in mobilizing Latino voters, one participant suggested a four-step path to build a perspective common to all Latinos. First, ethnic groups should not monopolize policy issues relating to their former home countries. Second, Latino leaders should seek to build coalitions with others, regardless of their countries of origin. Third, polling should be increasingly used to define common stands and to



Paul Watanabe, Co-director of the Institute for Asian American Studies at the University of Massachusetts, Boston.

build consensus among all Latinos. Previous polls, for instance, have shown a high level of consensus among Latinos in their conditional support for NAFTA and presidential "fast track" authority and their opposition to continued funding for Nicaraguan Contras and the Salvadoran government. These polls established a set of concerns among the majority of Latinos on particular policy areas that are distinct from or contradictory to the policies of the U.S. government. Finally, Latino

organizations should move outside the Latino community to join forces with environmental organizations, private businesses, and other groups on issues of common concern.

For background discussions, see papers by Antonio Gonzalez, Patricia Hamm, Manuel Orozco, Carlos González Gutiérrez, and Dario Moreno, beginning on pages 21.

A LATINO PERSPECTIVE *Dr. Harry Pachón*

The U.S. Hispanic population, fueled by immigration and a larger family size, has grown from 6% of the nation's population in 1980 to 10% in 1995. Hispanics are projected to become the nation's largest minority group in the year 2010 and make up 25% of the nation's population by the year 2050. Theoretically, Hispanics have the potential to be significant players in shaping U.S.-Latin American relations.

There is optimism among Latino leaders that, overall, Latinos will be politically influential in the near future. Does this influence mean that Latinos primarily will be interested in domestic policy?

In "Here to Stay: The Domestic and International Priorities of Latino Leaders," a joint project between The Tomás Rivera Policy Institute and Public Agenda, the results of a national survey of Latino leaders regarding U.S.-Latin American relations are examined. Many Latino leaders have indicated a strong interest in and have maintained close ties to the region. Most actively follow political and economic events in Latin America and have even participated in activities regarding U.S.-Latin American relations. Most Latino leaders argue that it is in the U.S. interest to continue to take an active part in world affairs — only a small percentage argue that U.S. involvement in foreign affairs should be kept to a minimum.

Are Latino interests congruent with overall U.S. strategic interests in the region? Latino leaders suggest that the primary long-range foreign policy goals for the U.S. are to continue expanding international trade and business opportunities. Moreover, most Latino leaders believe they have an obligation to work within the framework and bounds of official U.S. foreign policy. Many argue that Latinos should pursue their own objectives in Latin America so long as they do not contradict U.S. foreign policy interests.

THEME 3:

DIVERSITY IN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY-MAKING

OPENING REMARKS

Dr. Ernest Wilson, III

Sharing perspectives gained from his extensive foreign policy experience, including work with the National Security Council, Dr. Wilson focused on the U.S. political structure and the role of ethnic minorities. He asserted that people from different racial communities in the U.S. tend to have different attitudes and interpretations of their social realities, and these attitudes differ in important ways from group to group.

One crucial way for minorities to acquire influence on policy-making is to invest in long-term personal links with members of Congress and government agencies. Another important principle is to become familiar with the culture inside the foreign affairs and national security-related government agencies. Policy alternatives should be formulated in “realistic” terms. Mobilizing communities and public opinion on foreign policy issues is an important technique for increasing the responsiveness of government agencies. Furthermore, as non-governmental organizations and private corporations become increasingly involved in the formulation of U.S. foreign policy, ethnic groups should reach out to engage these organizations, as well. The difficulty is how to sensitize uninterested communities to foreign policy.

Dr. Wilson argued that ethnic minorities can bring to bear their cultural sensitivity and their willingness to listen to other countries as assets in the formulation and implementation of American foreign policy. However, the culture and recruitment practices of the foreign policy agencies do not reflect the diversity of American society. It is important to educate and mentor foreign policy specialists from minority communities who can inject a new perspective in government and international agencies. Dr. Wilson advised that, instead of representing or specializing in an ethnocentric perspective on a single issue, minorities who aspire to be included in foreign policy institutions



Michael Murtaugh, Public Relations Consultant; Marilyn Solomon, President of The Solomon Group; and Raymond Gonzales, Professor at the Institute of World Languages and Cultures at California State University, Monterey Bay.

should also learn to be “generalists,” in the sense of developing interests in not only regional but also global issues.

A broad global perspective will enhance policy-makers’ understanding of the diversity in size, culture, political system and economic importance of developing countries. This diversity precludes the U.S. from having a consistent foreign policy toward all countries. However, long-term consistency that also fosters certain moral principles in international relations is crucial to effective policymaking.

The main challenge that remains is for minority groups to engage in consistent, serious discussion of foreign policy issues, especially across ethnic lines, and to be willing to be open and honestly critical about the shortcomings of organizations of color involved in foreign affairs.

For background discussions, see papers by Allan Goodman, Ernest Wilson, and Juan Garcia-Passalacqua, beginning on page 28.

**AFRICAN-AMERICAN ACHIEVEMENTS
IN FOREIGN POLICY INFLUENCE**
*Mr. George Dalley, Partner,
Holland & Knight, Washington, DC*

Notable examples of achievements by African-American organizations in influencing U.S. foreign policy over the last thirty years include the anti-apartheid movement, which mobilized a sit-in at the South African embassy in 1984 and successfully pushed the U.S. to enact sanctions against South Africa, and a hunger strike which contributed to the decision to intervene in Haiti to restore democracy.

The Congressional Black Caucus has assumed an important role in voicing the opinions of African-Americans on foreign policy. The Caucus' influence, however, has been limited by the group's position as "outsider" to the establishment. The most significant challenge for the Caucus — and for African-Americans, as well — is to "infiltrate" the establishment in order to change the rules of power from within. African-Americans have grown too comfortable in their role of challenging power, rather than being the people in power.

To make their mark in foreign policy, African-Americans need organizations and institutions that are sufficiently mature to survive leadership changes and to pursue agendas reflecting the interest of the larger community, and not just those individuals at the top.



George Dalley discussed African-American leadership on policy issues.

BEYOND THE WORKSHOP:

NEXT STEPS FOR THE PACIFIC COUNCIL

The March Workshop, including the Saturday afternoon wrap-up session chaired by Professor Edwin M. Smith, was a timely and fruitful exchange. It was clear that participants valued the opportunity to focus on the links between international and domestic policy issues, and to take part in structured and high-quality discussions on issues most of them do not address in their day-to-day work. African-Americans, Asian-Americans and Latinos have not traditionally been active participants in foreign policy discussions, even less so if they reside in California rather than on the Atlantic Coast. The Workshop reaffirmed that these communities have strong interests in international policy issues and, given the opportunity, can contribute important insights to the consideration of those issues.

Drawing upon the workshop discussions, subsequent feedback, and consultation with members of the Pacific Council's Task Force on Enhancing Diversity, we contemplate several further steps to continue broadening participation in and strengthening the impact of the Pacific Council.

- We propose to work with community groups to expand attention to the interests of African-Americans, Asian-Americans and Latinos on international policy issues. Well-attended workshops on Latino leaders and their foreign policy perceptions and on U.S.-Africa relations following President Clinton's visit to Africa have already been held.
- Targeted efforts will continue to expand membership and active participation in the Pacific Council by people from minority backgrounds, not only in the Los Angeles metropolitan area but also in the Bay Area, San Jose, San Diego, Phoenix and Seattle.



Philip Romero, Deputy Cabinet Secretary and Chief Economist, Governor's Office, State of California; Beverly Ryder, Corporate Secretary of Edison International; and Paul Turner, Project Manager at Southern California Edison.

- To expand the involvement of people from traditionally "domestic" backgrounds, the Pacific Council will give increased attention to such issues as globalization and its impacts, immigration policy, international labor issues, environmental protection, and transnational networks dealing with domestic issues of concern in various countries.
- The Pacific Council will seek to cooperate with community and ethnic organizations to convey the results of our meetings and programs, to make high-quality information and policy analysis more accessible to those organizations, and to draw on their expertise to inform the full Pacific Council membership.

BACKGROUND MEMORANDA AND PAPERS

The following is a list of all papers presented at the Pacific Council workshop. Titles in boldface type are papers prepared specifically for the workshop, and summaries are included (in list order) in the pages that follow.

T H E M E 1

“International Trade, Inequality, and the ‘New Majority’ in Los Angeles,” by Manuel Pastor, University of California, Santa Cruz.

“Demographic Changes in California, 1980-1997,” compiled by Frank Bean, University of Texas, Austin.

“Common Sense Drug Policy,” (Foreign Affairs, Jan/Feb 1998), by Ethan A. Nadelmann, The Open Society Institute, New York.

T H E M E 2

“Foreign Policy and Asian-American Activism,” by Paul Watanabe, University of Massachusetts, Boston.

“Central Americans in the United States: Issues about Their Foreign Policy and International Interests,” by Manuel Orozco, University of Texas, Austin.

“Latino Participation in U.S. Foreign Policy,” by Antonio Gonzalez, William C. Velasquez Institute, Los Angeles.

“The International Interests and Foreign Policy Priorities of Mexican-Americans,” by Patricia Hamm, University of California, Irvine.

“U.S. Policy Towards Africa: An African-American Agenda,” by Herschelle Challenor, Clark Atlanta University (policy paper originally prepared for the Constituency for Africa).

“Mexicans in the United States: An Incipient Diaspora,” by Carlos González Gutiérrez, Director for Community Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mexico.

“The International Interests of Cuban-Americans,” by Dario Moreno, Florida International University, Miami.

T H E M E 3

“Diversity in U.S. Foreign Policy-Making: The Dilemma Endures,” by Allan E. Goodman, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

“Diversity in U.S. Foreign Policy-Making,” by Ernest J. Wilson, III, University of Maryland, College Park.

“Advancing Diversity Views of American International Interests,” by Juan M. Garcia-Passalacqua, Analisis, Inc., Hato Rey, Puerto Rico.

“The Erosion of American National Interests,” (Foreign Affairs, Sept/Oct 1997), by Samuel P. Huntington, Harvard University, Cambridge.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE, INEQUALITY, AND THE "NEW MAJORITY" IN LOS ANGELES

Dr. Manuel Pastor, Jr.

Los Angeles is at the center of a surge in foreign trade in the 1990s while it continues to be plagued by inequality and racial tension. Changes in the regional economic structure — including the decline of unionized manufacturing jobs and the relative increase in low-wage service and light industrial positions — have contributed to an increasing geographic concentration of the poor and enhanced differentiation in the region's social hierarchy. The question is, "What is the relationship between international trade and inequality, particularly by race, in Los Angeles?"

Trade and Inequality

Economists who argue that trade has not been an important factor in rising domestic inequality dispute public concern involving the impact of internationalization on income distribution. Yet research has shown that trade does have some effect. Negative trade effects may be more pronounced for African-American and Latino workers who generally occupy more vulnerable positions in the labor hierarchy. For instance, Latinos experienced the highest level of documented job loss due to trade dislocations wrought by NAFTA.

The failure to secure fast-track negotiating authority, despite the obvious aggregate gains from enhancing trade in the Americas, suggests a general principle: the political viability of trade depends, in part, on its distributional consequences. To understand this, the impacts of trade as an industry need to be separated from the effects of trade on industry.

Import and export pressures in Los Angeles have contributed to a bifurcated labor market. In some sectors, both employment and wage growth have been the norm. In other industries, employment has risen but with flat or declining wages. Mapping national-level trade information onto Public Use Microdata Areas (PUMAs), a striking pattern appears: The areas losing from trade are generally both poor and minority (20% African-



J.D. Hokoyama, President and Executive Director of Leadership Education for Asian Pacifics (LEAP); Salih Booker, Senior Fellow and Director of Africa Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations; Harry Pachón, President of The Tomás Rivera Policy Institute at Claremont Graduate University; and Rodolfo O. de la Garza, Professor in the Department of Government, University of Texas at Austin.

American, 60% Latino). While the areas winning from trade include some working-class districts, they are generally disproportionately (62%) white and well-off.

International Success: Why Equity Matters

Emerging research suggests that equity may, in fact, be conducive to aggregate economic growth, particularly at the regional level. Those regions that were "trade winners" tended to be characterized by lower initial levels of central city poverty and inequality. Other variables that may contribute to improved trade performance and equity are: a large foreign population, which allows a region to better connect with foreign markets; higher levels of education, which helps an area produce higher-value products; and larger city size, which provides producers with a wider range of suppliers. Higher inequality breeds social tension, erodes social capital, and hence diminishes trade performance.

The research points to the need for designing policies and rules that offer a fairer distribution of the benefits and burdens of trade. This will help the political viability of trade and eventually enhance trade success.

Policies for a New Majority

The national level evidence suggests that African-Americans and Latinos have been hardest hit by international competition, in part because of the positions they occupy in the labor market. A new approach, which brings together equity, growth, and trade expansion, could have positive benefits for all. The International Trade Forum focusing on how minority-owned and small businesses could take advantage of new global opportunities is just one example of forums that make explicit the specific interests of ethnic minorities in the foreign policy realm.

Communities divided by race, income, and trade status fail to recognize their interrelated future. Articulation of a new common good is a key political task in linking minorities to the broader economic dynamics of the region. Identifying shared interests is a prerequisite to furthering the interests of minority groups who, thus far, have had unequal access to trade benefits.

FOREIGN POLICY AND ASIAN-AMERICAN ACTIVISM

Dr. Paul Watanabe

A host of complex factors needs to be assessed in examining the role of Asian-Americans in international policy. In fact, considerable disagreement exists over the extent, feasibility, and desirability of Asian-American involvement in the foreign policy realm.

Changes and Opportunities

Asian-American efforts in the foreign policy arena and responses to them may be influenced by dramatic transformations in at least three realms: 1) the size and composition of Asian-American communities — Asian-Americans are a larger, more diverse group, with new immigrants drawn from broad social strata; 2) the role of Asia in the international system — the rise and restructuring of Asia afford Asian-Americans opportunities to influence the nature of those changes and America's policy responses; and 3) American foreign policy goals

and the policymaking process — the passing of the Cold War, combined with the growing complexity of factors that impact the focus and structure of American foreign policy, offers increased opportunities to inject Asian-American interests and perspectives in the policymaking process.

Asian-Americans and U.S.-Asia Relations

Linkages. The well-being of Asian-Americans has been inextricably linked to the role and influence of Asian nations and to the nature of the relationships between their adopted and ancestral homes. Migration patterns and treatment of Asians domestically have been affected by these relationships.



Evelyn Iritani, Pacific Rim Business Correspondent for The Los Angeles Times.

Interest. The existence of generational differences regarding interest in foreign policy has been routinely identified by Asian-Americans, but with little agreement as to the direction and impact of those differences. Some claim a heightened preoccupation with and passion for international policy among the foreign born. Others contend that first and second generation immigrants are focused on making a living and have limited capacity to exercise policymaking clout. Once the Asian-American communities expand their socioeconomic and other resources, the capabilities for effective involvement in politics grow.

Activism. The historical experience of Asian-Americans shows that while interest in foreign policy matters may be high, activism has been uneven and episodic. Various Asian-American groups periodically have lobbied for or against policies impacting their Asian homelands, but they have often engendered harsh treatment. Expanded activism on

foreign policy matters enhances public perception of Asian-Americans as perpetual foreigners and strangers, increasing the likelihood of harsh backlashes. Despite the strong potential for political clout, the tendency to confuse activism and dissent with disloyalty and unreliability may have a “chilling” effect on Asian-Americans.

Tearing Apart, Coming Together, and Identifying Barriers

Centrifugal Forces. Differences that emerge within specific Asian-American communities over foreign policy matters reflect many things, including generational differences, contending political allegiances, and regional variations. The persistence of myriad factors promoting potential disunity makes the establishment and maintenance of unity around foreign policy considerations more problematic for Asian-Americans.

Centripetal Forces. Homeland and Asian experiences tend to divide Asian-Americans while shared American experiences provide opportunities to unite them. Circumstances that might promote unity among diverse Asian-American communities may be linked to the common experiences of prejudice and abuse that define a collective Asian-American experience.

Barriers to Participation. Structural impediments restricting immigration and naturalization combined with a sense of political vulnerability and ineffectiveness make it difficult for Asian-Americans to be active. In addition, the desire for political activism for certain communities is complicated by the presence of communism in their homelands. Another barrier is the reluctance of certain Asian-American associations to approve of aggressive efforts to alter the shape of American foreign policy. There is some reluctance as well because of the belief that domestic and local matters should be the principal focuses of political participation.

The Case for Asian-American Participation

Advocates for Asian-American involvement in influencing U.S. foreign policy point to the potential for contributions of expertise and insights from people who have first-hand knowledge about the

countries. Precisely because of their continued interest in their homelands, Asian-Americans’ knowledge and perspective can be useful in any foreign policy debate. Yet, Asian-Americans have seldom performed key foreign policymaking roles. Instead, they have been principally active on the policymaking periphery working as consultants and relying upon non-Asian members of Congress to influence U.S. policy.

CENTRAL AMERICANS IN THE UNITED STATES: ISSUES ABOUT THEIR FOREIGN POLICY AND INTERNATIONAL INTERESTS *Mr. Manuel Orozco*

The ability of Central Americans in the United States to get attention in the foreign policy establishment depends on various factors. These criteria include their ability to become a unified group, Central American government efforts to reach out to Central Americans in the United States, and continued efforts by Central Americans to integrate into the U.S. polity.

A range of issues have influenced the development of Nicaraguans, Salvadorans, and Guatemalans as a political diaspora in the United States:

Central Americans as a Fresh Diaspora

The main reason Central Americans migrated to the United States was directly linked to the internal wars and the regional crisis that occurred in the 1980s. A large proportion of Central Americans now in the U.S. escaped various forms of political instability and repression, as well as economic crisis and social injustice. These groups still maintain various symbolic, sentimental, as well as material links with their home countries.

Central American groups in the U.S. live in very different demographic concentrations. The majority of Nicaraguans reside in Miami and over half the Salvadorans and Guatemalans have settled in California. The rest are scattered throughout U.S. principal cities. Therefore there have been few



Edward Perkins, Executive Director of the International Programs Center at the University of Oklahoma; Maureen Kindel, President of Rose & Kindel; Ethan Nadelmann, Director of the Lindsmith Center; and Jane Pisano, Senior Vice President for External Relations at the University of Southern California.

opportunities for cooperation on Central American issues, given that these groups often do not interact regularly or live in the same cities.

International Interests of Central Americans

Four distinctive, albeit related, international interests are identified among Central Americans:

- Central Americans assert that *continued relationships with the home country* are beneficial to them. One clearly expressed link relates to the financial commitments they have to their relatives living in Central America.
- *Migration* is expressed as both a domestic and international concern. On the one hand, there is a desire among Central Americans to be recognized by their home countries' governments and societies as an important group connected to their home countries, even though they are distant. On the other hand, there is a belief that continued migration is a legitimate way to maintain good relations between the U.S. and Central America.
- Concerns about social improvement stress a

humanitarian perspective on *development* in the region, with assistance and contributions oriented towards supporting community rather than promoting economic development *per se*. There is also agreement that *trade relations* between the United States and Central American countries must be strengthened and increased.

- For most Central Americans, stability in the region guarantees that their countries will continue to progress, and their families and relatives will not endure the same experiences that led them to migrate.

Country-Specific Positions

While they share the same interests, Nicaraguans, Salvadorans, and Guatemalans have had very different political experiences and hold divergent world outlooks. These political and historical factors, combined with different cultural and national experiences, account for the lack of unified mobilization which reflects each group's country-specific orientation. However, migration and asylum policy are often important exceptions to country-specific organizing and have been issues where Central Americans have tried to team up.

International Links and the U.S. Foreign Policy Establishment

In most cases, diasporic efforts to establish links with the home country take the form of cultural organizations or associations whose objective is to maintain symbolic linkages. Central Americans living in the United States share the *same* foreign policy interests maintained by the foreign policy establishment. However, these groups' interests and perspectives are not communicated to the U.S. government. Most foreign policy lobbying is carried out by international organizations or by Central American-based groups with ties to the U.S.

The absence of effective foreign policy lobbying may, in part, be attributed to the fact that Central Americans have not prioritized international mobilization to the extent they have promoted domestic interests. However, this does not imply that, from time to time, Central Americans have not reached official channels, including foreign policy institutions and town mayors or state governors.

International Activism's Recent Origins and Limited Consensus

Central American groups or associations mobilizing towards maintaining links with their home country exhibit some common characteristics: these organizations are quite new; some of them are organizationally weak and, therefore, do not last long; they are usually small; they lack broad consensus with regard to the methods of international actions and, thus, do not mobilize in a unified manner; and, in the case of the three countries studied, the international reach of these organizations is offset by the more important goal of domestic mobilization. Nevertheless, there seems to be a gradual change, quicker among migrants from some countries than others, towards unification of interests and actions. Salvadorans are currently the only group of Central Americans who have created a national organization that is making efforts to develop a larger diasporic appeal.

Mobilization Abroad Preceded by Domestic Concerns

The saliency of and interest in international mobilization is secondary to domestic concerns in the United States. Thus, the strength of Central American organizations lies in their ability to address local community issues. Nicaraguans, Salvadorans, and Guatemalans have all expressed that their main community priorities, for now, are: to achieve a legal status in the U.S. (legal residency), to obtain decent jobs, to provide an education for their children, to protect them from the continued threat of crime, and to move up the social hierarchy as they settle in this society.

Implications for the U.S.: Create Spaces for Successful Integration

With a tendency to concentrate their energy and will on attaining incorporation into the U.S. polity and to hold foreign policy perspectives that run parallel to those currently held by the foreign policy establishment, Central Americans represent no threat to national unity and identity. Instead, given the growing and emerging number of diasporic organizations, outreach efforts must be established to facilitate their organized participation in domestic, as well as international, issues.

LATINO PARTICIPATION IN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. Antonio Gonzalez

Since 1976, Latinos have been the fastest growing ethnic group in registration and voting in the U.S. This rise in political power has cast Latino leaders in a new role where they are compelled to become decision-makers on issues relevant to U.S. foreign policy. Moreover, national Latino organizations have conducted foreign policy-related initiatives that strengthen and expand participation of Latino elected officials and community leaders.

Background

With a foreign-born rate of at least forty percent, Spanish-language proficiency and strong family ties across borders, Latinos are the largest "internationalized" social constituency in America. Economically, Latino workers are more located in the "traded" sectors than any other ethnic groups. Yet Latino leaders historically have been slow to participate in foreign policy. This pattern of mainstream Latino aloofness from participation in foreign policy issues was juxtaposed against active participation by politically marginal "exile" or "country of origin" efforts until the mid-1980s.

Case Studies

Several foreign policy debates in the 1980s and 1990s stand out as case studies of active Latino participation.

U.S.-Central America Policy. The Southwest Voter Research Institute (SVRI) conducted a leadership education and advocacy effort that sought to gain Latino support for proposals to end U.S. military aid and involvement with the Nicaraguan "contras" and Salvadoran government. These efforts created a dialogue on the importance of participation in issues of U.S. foreign policy and set important processes in motion that would cause even greater participation around the question of NAFTA.

The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and NADBank. The debate around NAFTA divided traditional U.S. domestic allies on all sides and created new, temporary alliances. In this context, SVRI, the National Council of La

Raza, and the Mexican American Legal Defense & Education Fund (MALDEF) created the “Latino Consensus on NAFTA” through which they proposed a series of nine conditions for supporting NAFTA to the Clinton Administration. The Latino Consensus conducted a grassroots educational, public relations and advocacy effort designed to flex Latino political muscle on the NAFTA debate. Their endorsement came with Clinton’s acceptance of six of the nine Latino conditions. This was arguably the most influential “foreign policy” effort ever undertaken by Latinos. Following the NAFTA debate, participation in U.S.-Mexico relations among Latino business interests, national organizations, and Mexican-origin groups has expanded exponentially.

Fast-Track Authority. The William C. Velasquez Institute (WCVI) conducted briefings, conferences, and press conferences, and issued publications in order to educate the Latino leadership about the Administration’s failure to keep its NAFTA promises, as well as the dangers of extending the problematic NAFTA model to South America by giving Clinton fast-track authority. When the Administration refused to meet the Latino conditions, WCVI launched a campaign of public opposition that resulted in the President’s deciding not to bring fast-track to a vote. This effort is considered a model of Latino “accountability” advocacy on a foreign policy matter.

U.S.-Cuba Policy. The Helms-Burton law tightens the U.S. embargo of Cuba and sanctions third parties that trade or invest with Cuba. WCVI believed the escalation set a dangerous precedent on issues of trade and international law. Having sent delegations to Cuba and studied Latino public opinion, WCVI has launched an education and advocacy effort in support of legislation to lift the embargo on foods and medicine.

Lessons

Certain tactics and strategies are key to effective participation by and advocacy for Latinos:

- Linking foreign policy to domestic impacts/benefits makes participation important to Latino leadership.



Carlos González Gutiérrez, Director of the Program for Mexican Communities Abroad, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Mexico.

- Building consensus through Latino-specific educational events is key.
- Original research on Latino-specific themes reveals the specific consequences or benefits of certain foreign policy proposals or practices.
- Developing affirmative alternatives allows Latino leaders to play constructive rather than destructive roles, encouraging broader participation and projecting Latinos as leaders.
- Coincidence with both Latino voter opinion and U.S. public opinion appear to be more important than coincidence with the position of the White House, Congress, or international opinion in determining effective Latino participation and/or advocacy.

THE INTERNATIONAL INTERESTS AND FOREIGN POLICY PRIORITIES OF MEXICAN-AMERICANS *Ms. Patricia Hamm*

Divisions of class, national origin, and length of residence in the U.S. render Mexican-Americans a heterogeneous group whose views on foreign policy and international stakes are not monolithic.

Mexican-American Interests

Most of the foreign policy and international interests and priorities of Mexican-Americans relate to those of the U.S.-Mexico bilateral relationship. These interests include trade, immigration, U.S.-Mexico border issues, narcotics, and Mexican politics.

Trade. At the top of foreign policy priorities are U.S. trade policies, because they are closely linked to employment and business opportunities. Increasing integration between the Mexican and the American economies has fundamental implications for Mexican-Americans. The large trade volume with Mexico, the high concentration of Mexican-Americans in low-skilled jobs, and the potential benefits from increased trade and investment opportunities to Mexican-American businesses and professionals all point to reasons why discussion about NAFTA is such a priority.

Immigration. Due to the large number of recent immigrants, and to limit or prevent discriminatory measures, Mexican-Americans have a large common stake in U.S. immigration policies that effectively, but fairly, regulate and limit immigration flows; foster safe and legal immigration; and speed naturalization processes.

U.S.-Mexico Border. The Southwest is the home of most of the population of Mexican origin. Given that the lives of the communities on both side of the border are so intertwined, the lax Mexican environmental and urbanization regulations, the explosion of the “maquiladora” industry, and increased migrant populations have contributed to the worsening of the quality of life for U.S. and Mexican residents. Hence, questions of the infrastructure and environment on the U.S.-Mexico border have been redefined as trade-related issues in NAFTA.

Narcotics Trade. Mexican-Americans are among the groups most directly and severely affected by high levels of illegal drug consumption and drug-related criminal activity. It is in their interest to push for greater emphasis on a dual track approach to drug enforcement measures.

Mexican Politics and Development. Due to their cultural, linguistic, material, and familial ties to Mexico, Mexican-Americans have a stake in U.S.-Mexican policies that assist Mexico to achieve sustainable development and overcome economic and financial crises. Simultaneously, Mexican-Americans would have a better chance of being viewed positively in the U.S. when democracy, peace, and prosperity materialize in Mexico.

Minority-Shared Interests

Mexican-Americans, African-Americans, and Asian-Americans share a common interest to “democratize” the definition of national interests by incorporating their visions, perspectives, and priorities. They share several distinctive minority interests:

- Ethnic minorities are likely to disproportionately suffer the negative effects of NAFTA because they are disproportionately concentrated in industries experiencing increasing international competition.
- Ethnic minorities suffer the consequences of detrimental immigration and social policies and the tensions and frictions they often incite. They have a high stake in U.S. federal policies on these issues.
- Ethnic minorities suffer similarly from high drug consumption levels and the criminal activities that result from drug trafficking. They share a common interest in solving the drug problem.



*Edwin M. Smith,
Leon Benwell
Professor of Law
and International
Relations,
University of
Southern
California.*

Their chances of influencing foreign policy-making increases with greater political and economic power, combined with an ability to frame and articulate their positions in ways that advocate values and perspectives that are congruent with American principles.

Techniques and Instruments

Several techniques and instruments contributed to the success of such groups as the Latino Consensus, a broad coalition of organizations and elected officials who positioned themselves as a strategic actor in negotiations for NAFTA between the U.S. and Mexico. These strategies compensated for the absence of a strong Mexican-American presence in Washington, relatively low political and economic power, and limited lobbying capability.

Grassroots Mobilizing Strategies. The community organizing campaign was designed to identify common foreign policy, international, and transnational interests, as well as to educate local activists and community leaders about the links between international and domestic issues, and their impact on the community. Using this strategy, the Latino Consensus could identify common, narrow interests and clear, viable objectives that were then used to generate grassroots pressure on targeted Latino community leaders and elected officials to adopt positions favorable to their interests.

Coalition-Building Strategies. If Mexican-Americans are to maximize their political leverage, they must base their alliances on narrow issues where they can reach consensus, and follow clear and specific objectives. Otherwise, they run the risk of defections that can jeopardize the effectiveness of the coalition. The most effective crossover alliance that the Latino Consensus built with non-Mexican-American organizations was with the moderate wing of the environmentalist movement. Policy networking and the effectiveness of its NAFTA campaign were possible largely due to the presence of savvy, sophisticated, and skilled political entrepreneurs in the Latino Consensus.

MEXICANS IN THE UNITED STATES: AN INCIPIENT DIASPORA

Mr. Carlos González Gutiérrez

Approximately 18 million people of Mexican origin were living in the United States in 1996. Of these, 7 million to 7.3 million were first generation immigrants born in Mexico, while more than 11 million were U.S. citizens of Mexican descent.

The Mexican government has tried to cultivate long-term relationships with the Mexican diaspora in the United States. Mexico wants to contribute to improving the living standards of Mexican families in the U.S. for reasons of immediate national interest: solidarity with Mexicans abroad is a moral government obligation toward the nation's compatriots who feel no less a part of Mexico for living abroad and continue to support the country's development with their investments and the cash remittances they send home.

In 1990, the Program for Mexican Communities Abroad, an office of the Foreign Affairs Ministry, was created by presidential decree. Its aim was to coordinate the efforts of different government bodies regarding Mexicans abroad. Its fundamental mandate was to create awareness among Mexicans the world over that "the Mexican nation extends beyond the territory within its borders."

A Diaspora Without Consciousness

The vast majority of U.S. citizens of Mexican origin feel no founding uprootedness; they were not expelled from the promised land, nor did the feeling of being a "dispersed people" precede in any way the formation of the nation-state we today know as Mexico. As a result, practically no one has done consciousness raising about diaspora identity inside the community.

The nature of the U.S. political system has done much more to politically activate Mexican-Americans than any feeling of being part of a diaspora. Until very recently Mexico did not cultivate a consciousness of a "dispersed people" among its emigrants.

Strategic — Not Emotional — Considerations

There are common interests between homeland and diaspora, such as the repudiation of Mexico-bashing by U.S. conservative politicians, or a rejection of extreme migratory controls that directly or indirectly propitiate xenophobic or discriminatory attitudes against the general population of Mexican origin, regardless of their nationality or migratory status.

However, in contrast with Cuban-Americans' attitude regarding the Castro government in Cuba, or with Jewish-Americans' feelings about Israel's security in the Middle East, Mexican-Americans' emotional attitudes regarding their homeland play a secondary role in their efforts to influence U.S. policy toward Mexico. Analysis of Mexican-American lobbying efforts during the negotiations leading up to the North American Free Trade Agreement shows class loyalties and strategic considerations were given much more weight than inter-ethnic solidarity by the active Mexican-American organizations and Hispanic members of Congress in deciding their positions.

A Long Term Challenge

In late 1996, the Mexican Congress approved a constitutional amendment whereby the voluntary acquisition of another nationality would no longer mean Mexicans would lose their Mexican nationality. While the lawmakers sought on the one hand to strengthen the ties that link emigrants with their homeland, at the same time they acted with an eye to facilitating the integration of Mexican migrants into the societies that take them in, in an attempt to contribute to eliminating discriminatory practices against them and their families. This is an important step in broadening out and consolidating government support programs fundamental for giving concrete content to the feeling of belonging the Mexican government is promoting abroad.

For Mexico, the ultimate goal must be solely creating a legitimate space that situates relations between Mexico and its diaspora on a different plane, a plane on which the efforts of the Mexican state to better living standards of the communities abroad, or to generate support in its diaspora for development of the homeland, can be seen as a log-

ical result of the feeling among people of Mexican descent that they belong to the Mexican nation.

THE INTERNATIONAL INTERESTS OF CUBAN-AMERICANS

Dr. Dario Moreno

The clearly articulated goal of the Cuban community is the overthrow of Fidel Castro and the establishment of a democratic government in its place. In order to influence U.S. Cuban policy, Cuban-Americans have developed institutions and learned tactics suited for the U.S. political system. The community's ability to deliver votes and monies has brought it the active courtship of presidential hopefuls seeking votes, members of Congress seeking campaign contributions, and other conservative and Hispanic groups seeking allies.

Cuban-American Success in Foreign Policy

The Cuban exile community has been largely successful in its effort to influence U.S. foreign policy. Cuban-Americans have become the single most important interest group shaping U.S. Cuban policy for four reasons:



Rodolfo O. de la Garza, Professor in the Department of Government, University of Texas at Austin; David Doerge, President of David J. Doerge & Associates; and Dario Moreno, Associate Professor at the Latin American & Caribbean Center, Florida International University

1. *The Cuban-American Consensus.*

Cuban-American influence over U.S. Cuban policy is largely due to the political cohesiveness of the community. The anti-Castro agenda has broad and deep support among Cuban-Americans and is reflected in the voting booth. The centerpiece of this strategy is maintaining and tightening the U.S. economic embargo against the island. However, the polls are also beginning to show a generational shift in the attitudes of Cuban-Americans, with the younger generation rejecting the dogmatism that has characterized Cuban-American politics.

2. *The Cuban American National Foundation.*

As the principal institution within the Cuban community that facilitated the transition from exile politics to interest group politics, the Cuban American National Foundation mobilized Cuban-Americans to participate in U.S. politics by voting for and contributing to politicians who supported a hard-line U.S. policy toward the Castro regime. The foundation's ability to deliver votes and monies gained it access to policymakers in the White House and on Capitol Hill.

3. *Money to Buy Congressional Influence.*

Money from the foundation's political-action committee and other Cubans has helped buy congressional influence for *La Causa*. Cuban-Americans have given generously to both parties. In fact, the Cuban-American community's ability to raise monies has made Miami a mecca for bi-partisan fundraising.

4. *Presidential Politics.*

Cuban-American influence on national issues is enhanced by their voting power in presidential elections. The compactness of the Cuban community in South Florida and northern New Jersey makes them an important constituency for both political parties in presidential elections. The foreign policy conservatism of the Cuban-American community is one of the key reasons for the group's strong support for Republican candidates. However, in response to Bill Clinton's continuous outreach to the Cuban community, Cuban-Americans dramatically changed their voting behavior in the 1996 presidential election, helping elect the first Democrat in twenty years to win in the state of Florida.

Ideological Isolation from Other Ethnic Groups

Cuban-Americans have demonstrated an ability to influence international policy on two key issues: immigration and Cuba. However, the Cuban communities' ideological isolation from other minority groups has prevented them from joining with other people of color in coalitions.

By virtue of their "conservative" and anti-communist foreign policy attitudes, Cuban-Americans often find themselves at odds with other minority groups who tend to favor a more "liberal" diplomatic orientation. The liberal orientation of most other "people of color" has led Cuban-Americans to search for allies outside traditional minority communities.

DIVERSITY IN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY MAKING: THE DILEMMA ENDURES

Dr. Allan E. Goodman

The United States has yet to come to terms with its own diversity. American governmental institutions today remain remarkably resistant to embracing the contributions that persons of color can make to the policies and processes that shape our future.

Data on the employment of minorities in the U.S. government indicate that persons of color account for slightly more than 30 percent of the Federal workforce. However, the representation of minorities in government is largely confined to the lowest levels of the career services. Women, all minority groups, and people with disabilities continue to be underrepresented at the middle and especially the top salary and responsibility grades.

Where change has occurred, it has had to come through the courts with equal employment opportunity suits and class actions. Any gains have come at tremendous and continuing cost to minorities, professionally and psychologically. The view that minorities are less qualified for public service persists. Minority officials regard the personnel system



Ernest Wilson, III, Director of the Center for International Development and Conflict Management at the University of Maryland in College Park.

as insensitive to their capabilities and needs, unforgiving of mistakes, and unwilling to take any steps that would provide opportunities to qualified minorities for the sake of increasing the diversity of viewpoints about the conduct of U.S. foreign policy. The net effect of these perceptions is personal stress, degradation and shaken confidence, as well as a tendency to conclude early on that the chances for advancement are poor.

While there is a clear and compelling national need to broaden the intellectual base of foreign policy which has to deal with a complex, multicultural world and a need to strengthen U.S. representational effectiveness abroad, there are no clear means at hand to do this. A key element in changing this situation will continue to be the willingness of minorities to file complaints against supervisors and systems that take promotion, assignment, and award decisions resulting in the persistent underrepresentation of specific groups of people. However, another key factor is raising consciousness about recent trends in diversity within and across agencies.

Workforce demographics need to be reported accurately and in a timely fashion to inform selection panels about the existence (or nonexistence) of equal employment opportunity at a particular agency. One specific step that would improve

knowledge of trends within and across agencies would be to develop a single, integrated and relational data base system for all the career services feeding into the foreign affairs agencies and departments and build into that data base the capacity to monitor EEO progress specifically. With this information, agencies should aim to refresh and broaden the segment of society tapped as public members for selection panels.

The aim is to achieve a foreign affairs community of professionals where no meeting to formulate a policy or decide on an implementing strategy would be considered complete or likely to be successful if all the participants looked alike. There is no research yet done that confirms that the policies of persons of color will be substantially different from those currently being followed. Thus, greater diversity will not automatically or even necessarily transform what America does in world affairs. But U.S. actions likely would be better received abroad and our options more effectively evaluated at home if the councils of those who decide and command were certain to include the most diverse array of talented Americans possible.

DIVERSITY IN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY MAKING

Dr. Ernest J. Wilson, III

The definition of national interest has become a subject of heated debate lately. These debates encompass the conduct and content of foreign, as well as domestic, policy.

A National Debate

The traditionalists argue that the national interest is being undercut by the ideology of multiculturalism. The non-traditionalists respond that the definition and articulation of the national interest must reflect the changing demographic character of the entire nation. This essay addresses the debate in the context of the actual design, staffing, implementation and defense of U.S. foreign policy.

Double Diversity

As an analytic framework for U.S. foreign policy interests, “Double Diversity” serves as a reminder of the intersection of the international and national, the domestic and the foreign. U.S. foreign interests now exist in an altered cultural terrain that affects national and international policies in new and unanticipated ways. This new analytic approach is an alternative to the more dichotomous Cold War framework that too often trivialized non-military and non-strategic factors like culture, or non-Northern countries like Brazil.

Within the context of Double Diversity, two guiding questions may be posed:

1. Is there a difference descriptively and analytically in the participation of people of color and of whites in the senior ranks of professions engaged in foreign affairs?
2. Do differences in relative shares of participation make a difference in the conduct of foreign affairs and the defense of the national interest?

Minority Participation Rates

What do the numbers reveal about minority participation in the upper regions of foreign policy professionals?

- There remains substantial under-representation of minorities in the senior positions of key sectors, though Asian-Americans, Hispanic-Americans, and African-Americans together comprise more than 25% of the U.S. population.
- The absolute numbers of minorities in senior positions are often quite modest.
- While growth in numbers is evident in most professions, there is not an inevitable upward trend.
- There are important differences across international fields, and across groups.
- These numbers alone miss an increasingly important element of upward mobility of individuals across fields, disciplines, and institutions.

These very low participation rates suggest that the progressive positive intersections of domestic and foreign diversity are not as robust as they should or could be. But does the absence of minorities at the top make a difference or not in the content of foreign affairs?

Ethnicity and Race Make No Difference. Those who argue the position that ethnicity and race make no difference insist that internationally-oriented institutions are, and must remain, color blind. They assert that greater racial or ethnic diversity does not affect either the content or the conduct of U.S. foreign policy. The implication is that programs of affirmative action are therefore unnecessary.

Ethnicity Makes a Difference. The “traditionalists” argue that the introduction of individuals of diverse cultures, and the political arguments they tend to raise, are injurious to American foreign policy. They contend the American government’s vulnerability to “particularistic” claims by newly mobilized groups diverts resources and power. Traditionalists are also concerned about a lowered standard for Foreign Service officers when more deserving white males are passed over while unqualified minorities are promoted. Finally, they question the effectiveness of diplomacy abroad with minorities as ambassadors for the United States.

Multiculturalism. This perspective contends that the differences in outlook and values of individuals from different demographic groups holding office in international positions are ultimately beneficial



*Fumiko
Hachiya
Wasserman,
Los Angeles
Superior Court
Judge.*

to U.S. foreign policymaking. Having endured certain demographic and historical conditions, minorities might be more sympathetic to the underdogs in the world, more willing to listen to people from other cultures, and more experienced in negotiating the difficult terrains of multiculturalism at home and abroad.

ADVANCING DIVERSITY VIEWS OF AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL INTERESTS

Dr. Juan M. Garcia-Passalacqua

Ethnically diverse people who have largely been absent from the traditional foreign policy establishment of the United States have interests and perspectives that ought to be taken into account in debates on the United States' national interest.

The following are six propositions for discussion about the foreign policy of the United States for the 21st Century.

Diversity and the National Interest

As ethnography transforms the nation, the "minorities" of yesterday are on the way to becoming the majority of tomorrow. It is time to determine how we, of the "diverse", understand, define, and act on the national interest and how we purport to redefine the United States of America. Advancing diversity views is in the interest of the Establishment, but is a unitary definition of the American national interest possible given the existence of conflicting world views within the United States?

The foreign policy and international interests and priorities of "diverse" groups are as diverse as the groups themselves. Each group relates ethnographically to locations or issues on the globe that relate to their ancestral ties. This is not going to change towards a broad-based "diversity" interest. The United States must prepare itself to become a nation of nationalities, and its foreign policy will soon begin to show the pulls and stresses of a multi-centered public policy debate.

Challenge of Inequality

Will the United States be an ethnocentric or pluralistic nation after the millennium? This is the key issue. The challenge is how persons with a more diverse world view than the Establishment will have access in a nation that is characterized by a growing gap between the rich and the poor. It must be decided whether the transnationalization of capital will be accompanied by openness to "discordant" voices, or if the democratic crisis will prevail and "minority" groups will continue to be marginalized economically and politically.

Immigration Flows

The cardinal mistake of the United States as it looks to its own future is the assumption that you can promote and lead the internationalization of capital in the globe without at the same time accepting the internationalization of labor. The migration trend is irreversible. Inclusion of minorities in economic, political, social and cultural dimensions is the only way to prevent both civil strife and policy chaos. To accomplish this, diversity groups must be transformed in broad public perceptions from supposed problems to potential solutions.

Narcotics Trade

The drug problem is only a symptom of a much more profound phenomenon: the emergence of alternative capitalist modes by marginalized sectors of the globe. The economic marginalization of minority groups has led to a clandestine form of "savage capitalism" that services the demand for drugs in the United States.

Fate of Puerto Rico

The "English-only" movement was the counter-reaction to Hispanic cultural affirmation and resistance to assimilation. Intolerance based on language against Hispanic-Americans has joined racism against African-Americans. As an island where some desire statehood while retaining Spanish as its official language, Puerto Rico plays a key role in today's definition of the United States national interest regarding ethnic communities within and without. A vote on whether to accept a Spanish-speaking state is really a decision on whether the U.S. government conceives the nation in ethnocentric or pluralistic terms.

Minority Participation

The rising demographic power of “diverse” groups in the United States implies the need for an institution to accommodate all the various strains of ethnological influences in an open, continuous, and useful dialogue about the national interest. In the past, minority groups who voiced their concern about a political issue were questioned on their loyalty to the U.S. or were forced to wait for their position to be recognized. The major challenge for the United States at century’s end is whether the American political establishment and structure is willing to consider alternative views of the national interest.

The first step is to recognize that there are indeed two completely different world views in the United States, one coming from the traditional Establishment and other from the traditionally marginalized. The next steps are to describe the world views, compare them, search for common ground, define that common ground, and propose it as a new national interest.



Eugene Grigsby, III, Director of the Advanced Public Policy Institute at the University of California, Los Angeles.



Pacific Council member David Doerge (center) with Pacific Council staff: Tuong Vu, Workshop Coordinator and Assistant to the President; Glenda Jones, Membership Services Coordinator; Pedro Villegas, Project Assistant, Pacific Council Study of Southern California's Global Connections; and Tina Eshaghpour, CORO Fellow and Workshop Report Editor.



Michael Preston, Director of the Center for Multiethnic and Transnational Studies at the University of Southern California; Beverly Hawkins, President of OFS The Business Doctors.

DR. ASLAM ABDULLA
Editor-in-Chief
The Minaret

MR. SALAM S. AL-MARAYATI
National Director
Muslim Public Affairs Council

DR. BYRON AUGUSTE *
Senior Engagement Manager
McKinsey & Company, Inc.

MR. DAVID AYON
Research Associate
Center for the Study of Los Angeles
Loyola Marymount University

DR. FRANK D. BEAN
Professor
Population Research Center
University of Texas at Austin

MR. J. ARNOLDO BELTRAN *
Principal
Beltran, Leal & Medina

MR. SALIH BOOKER
Senior Fellow and Director of Africa Studies
Council on Foreign Relations
Washington, DC

MS. JULIE-ANNE BOUDREAU
North American Integration and Development Center
School of Public Policy and Social Research
University of California, Los Angeles

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

MS. SHIRLEY BRYANT
President
Bryant Company International

MR. GILBERTO CARDENAS
Director
Inter-University Program for Latin Research (IUPLR)
University of Texas at Austin

MS. JOY YU CHEN
Partner
Chen Partners

MR. CRAIG CHRETIEN
Senior Manager
Protection One

MS. JANET CLAYTON *
Editor of the Editorial Pages & Vice President
The Los Angeles Times

MS. MAI CONG *
President and CEO
Vietnamese Community of Orange County, Inc.

DR. SUSAN COUTIN
Visiting Professor
Center for Multiethnic and Transnational Studies
University of Southern California

MR. GEORGE A. DALLEY
Partner
Law Offices of Holland & Knight
Washington, DC

MS. MICHELLE DASH
Program Assistant
Human Rights and International Cooperation
The Ford Foundation
New York, NY

MS. TERESA LEGER DE FERNANDEZ
Partner
Nordhaus, Haltom, Taylor, Taradash & Frye
Santa Fe, NM

DR. ENRIQUE DE LA CRUZ
Assistant Director
Asian American Studies Center
University of California, Los Angeles

DR. RODOLFO O. DE LA GARZA *
Professor
Department of Government
University of Texas at Austin

DR. MICHAEL J. DEAR
Director
The Southern California Studies Center
University of Southern California

MR. SONY DEVABHAKTUNI
Program Assistant for South Asia
The Asia Society
New York, NY

MR. DAVID DOERGE
President
David J. Doerge & Associates
Iowa City, IA

MS. TINA ESHAGHPOUR
Public Affairs Fellow
Coro Southern California

MS. IVELISSE ESTRADA
Vice President of Corporate & Community Relations
Univision Communications, Inc.

DR. LUIS FERNANDEZ Y ZAVALA
President
Latin American Focus
Santa Fe, NM

DR. JOEL FETZER
Visiting Scholar
Center for International Studies
University of Southern California

DR. JUAN MANUEL GARCIA-PASSALACQUA
Presidente
Analisis, Inc.
Hato Rey, Puerto Rico

DR. JUAN GÓMEZ-QUINONES
Professor of History
University of California, Los Angeles

DR. RAYMOND GONZALES
Professor
Institute of World Languages and Cultures
California State University, Monterey Bay

MR. ANTONIO GONZALEZ *
President
William C. Velasquez Institute

SR. CARLOS GONZÁLEZ GUTIÉRREZ
Director for Community Affairs
Programa para las Comunidades
Mexicanas en el Extranjero
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Mexico, D.F.

PROF. NEIL T. GOTANDA
Professor of Law
Western State University College of Law

DR. J. EUGENE GRIGSBY, III *#
Director
Advanced Public Policy Institute
University of California, Los Angeles

MR. J. ERNESTO GRIJALVA
Corporate Counsel Vice President for Public
Policy
Greater San Diego Chamber of Commerce

DR. FERNANDO J. GUERRA
Director, Center for the Study of Los Angeles
Loyola Marymount University

DR. C.R. D. HALISI
Assistant Professor
Department of Political Science
University of Southern California

MS. PATRICIA H. HAMM
Department of Political Science
University of California, Irvine

DR. BEVERLY HAWKINS
President
OFS The Business Doctors

MR. RAY HERNANDEZ
President
Barron Transworld Trading Ltd., L.L.C.

MR. JORGE HINOJOSA
Economic Development Specialist
National Council of La Raza
San Diego, CA

DR. RAUL HINOJOSA-OJEDA *
Research Director
North American Integration & Development
Center
University of California, Los Angeles

MS. VISALAYA HIRUNPIDOK
Public Affairs Specialist
The Los Angeles Times

MR. J. D. HOKOYAMA *#
President and Executive Director
Leadership Education for Asian Pacifics,
Inc. (LEAP)

MR. DWIGHT F. HOLLOWAY, JR. *
Vice President
Pacific Investment Management Company

MS. WENDY H. HSIEH
Program Associate
The Asia Society, Southern California
Center

MS. EVELYN KEIKO IRITANI *#
Pacific Rim Business Correspondent
The Los Angeles Times

DR. JANE S. JAQUETTE *
Chair
Department of Diplomacy and World
Affairs
Occidental College

REV. NORMAN S. JOHNSON
President
Board of Directors
Southern Christian Leadership Conference

MR. JONATHAN T. KAJI *
Director for Asia
California Office of Trade & Investment
Tokyo, Japan

MS. LILLIAN Y. KAWASAKI
General Manager
Environmental Affairs Department
City of Los Angeles

DR. EDMOND J. KELLER *
Director
James S. Coleman African Studies Center
University of California, Los Angeles

MS. CHARLOTTE T. KENNEDY *
Vice President, Programs and
Administration
Pacific Council on International Policy

MS. MAUREEN KINDEL *
President
Rose & Kindel

MR. DINH K. LE
President
Le & Associates

DR. ABRAHAM F. LOWENTHAL *#
President
Pacific Council on International Policy

MS. MONICA C. LOZANO *
Associate Publisher and Executive Editor
La Opinión

MR. DAVID W. LYON *
President and CEO
Public Policy Institute of California
San Francisco, CA

DR. CATHERINE LYON
Public Policy Institute of California
San Francisco, CA

DR. DAVID R. MARES
Professor
Department of Political Science
University of California, San Diego
(UCSD)

MR. CLAUDE MARTINEZ
Consultant
Law Offices of Gomez & Lombardi

MR. NABAR ENRIQUE MARTINEZ
City Manager
City of Bell Gardens

HON. GWEN MOORE
President
GeM Communication Group

DR. DARIO MORENO
Associate Professor
Latin American & Caribbean Center
Florida International University
Miami, FL

DR. DAN PING MU *
Partner
Mu & Kang Consultants, LLC

MS. EMILY MOTO MURASE *
Department of Communication
Stanford University

MR. MICHAEL MURTAUGH *
Public Relations Consultant

MR. ETHAN NADELMANN
Director, Lindesmith Center
Open Society Institute
New York, NY

MR. MANUEL OROZCO
Department of Government
University of Texas at Austin

DR. HARRY P. PACHÓN *#
President
The Tomás Rivera Policy Institute
Claremont Graduate University

MS. NAMPET PANICHPANT-M *
President
International Thai Leadership Council

DR. MANUEL PASTOR, JR. *
Professor & Chair
Latin American and Latino Studies
University of California, Santa Cruz

HON. RICHARD F. PEDERSEN *
Member
Board of Directors
Center for Civic Education

HON. EDWARD J. PERKINS *
Executive Director
International Programs Center
University of Oklahoma
Norman, OK

MR. N. BRUCE PICKERING
Director of Programs
World Affairs Council of Northern
California
San Francisco, CA

DR. BARBARA PILLSBURY *
Co-Founder and Director
Pacific Institute for Women's Health

DR. JANE PISANO
Senior Vice President for External Relations
University of Southern California

DR. MICHAEL B. PRESTON *#
Director
Center for Multiethnic and Transnational
Studies
University of Southern California

MS. LYNNE JOY ROGERS
Director
Ronald Brown Information Technology &
Business Center
Los Angeles Urban League

DR. PHILIP J. ROMERO *
Deputy Cabinet Secretary and Chief
Economist
Governor's Office, State of California
Sacramento, CA

MR. RICHARD ROTHSTEIN *
Research Associate
Economic Policy Institute

MS. BEVERLY RYDER *
Corporate Secretary
Edison International

MR. THOMAS A. SAENZ
Regional Counsel
MALDEF

MR. J. STANLEY SANDERS *#
Senior Partner
Barnes, McGhee, & Pryce

DR. GONZALO SANTOS
Professor of Sociology
California State University, Bakersfield

MR. KEVIN SCOTT
Deputy Director
Los Angeles Charter Reform Commission

MR. DANIEL A. SEPULVEDA
Trade Policy Analyst
National Council of La Raza
Washington, DC

MR. ROBERT L. SHARP *
Principal
Pacific Overtures

DR. EDWIN M. SMITH *#
Leon Benwell Professor of Law and
International Relations
University of Southern California

MS. MARILYN F. SOLOMON *#
President
The Solomon Group

MR. ROBERT D. TAYLOR
Founding Partner
Blue Capital Management, L.L.C.

HON. ESTEBAN E. TORRES *
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC

DR. FERNANDO M. TORRES-GIL *
Associate Dean, Academic Affairs
School of Public Policy and Social Research
University of California, Los Angeles

MR. PAUL TURNER
Project Manager
Southern California Edison

MS. TRAN TUONG NHU
Columnist
San Jose Mercury News

DR. GEORGES VERNEZ
Director
Center for Research on Immigration Policy
RAND

MR. DAVID J. VIDAL
Director of Research
Global Corporate Citizenship
The Conference Board
New York, NY

MR. TUONG H. VU
Assistant to the President
Pacific Council on International Policy

MR. RICK WARTZMAN *
Editor
California Edition
The Wall Street Journal

HON. FUMIKO HACHIYA WASSERMAN
Judge
Los Angeles Superior Court

DR. PAUL WATANABE
Co-Director, Institute for Asian American
Studies
University of Massachusetts at Boston

MS. YVONNE WILLIAMS
National Director
Public Policy and International Affairs
Fellowships Program
Academy for Educational Development
Washington, DC

DR. ERNEST J. WILSON, III
Director
Center for International Development &
Conflict Management
University of Maryland, College Park

PROF. NORMAN GREGORY YOUNG
Law for International Business Program
California Polytechnic University, Pomona

MS. NANCY A. YOSHIHARA *#
Editorial Board Member
The Los Angeles Times

* *Member of the Pacific Council on*
International Policy

Member of the Pacific Council Task
Force on Enhancing Diversity

PACIFIC COUNCIL STAFF AND FELLOWS

STAFF

Abraham F. Lowenthal	<i>President</i>
Charlotte T. Kennedy	<i>Vice President, Programs and Administration</i>
David J. Karl	<i>Director of Membership Affairs</i>
Tuong Vu	<i>Assistant to the President</i>
Catherine Holt-Cedeño	<i>Executive Assistant</i>
Glenda Jones	<i>Membership Services Coordinator</i>
Timothy Nelson	<i>Programs and Events Coordinator</i>
Judith Peres	<i>Administrative Assistant</i>
Pedro Villegas	<i>Program Assistant</i>
Claude Williams III	<i>Coordinator, Microcomputer Information Systems</i>
Emma Woodford	<i>Administrative Assistant</i>

VISITING FELLOWS

William Fleming	<i>James Pearson Fellow, U.S. State Department</i>
Stephen Heeney	<i>Canadian International Visiting Fellow</i>
Geoffrey Wiseman	<i>Pacific Council Visiting Fellow</i>

PACIFIC COUNCIL ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMS

Presented in cooperation with the Council on Foreign Relations

Through its various programs and activities, the Pacific Council facilitates the exchange of ideas, information and analysis on international issues, and generates insights about these issues by drawing on the experience and distinct perspectives of our membership.

Membership meetings and briefings have been held on issues ranging from trends in China, Japan, Korea, Mexico, Russia and Indonesia to economic regionalism, “enhancing Southern California’s global engagement,” ethnic conflict, immigration policy, peacekeeping, and Asia’s financial meltdown.

Our annual retreats have attracted approximately 125 members of the Pacific Council for intense exchanges on key topics. The Pacific Council has organized workshops that offer stimulating exchange among scholars and practitioners; recent workshops have focused on “Constructing Democracy and Markets: Comparing Latin America and East Asia” and “Rethinking Development in East Asia and Latin America.”

The Council has also launched several structured Study Groups, including one on “The Future of China,” another on “The American West and the International Economy,” a third on “Protecting International Intellectual Property” and a current Study Group focusing on “The Future of Mexico.” Each has members from throughout the western states, international participation, rapporteurs’ reports of each session, and the aim of generating a report reflecting the group’s deliberations.

In addition to members’ briefings, workshops, and conferences, Study Groups, and the annual retreat, the Pacific Council organizes task forces from time to time, to engage relatively small numbers of members in focused efforts to reach findings and recommendations on specific policy issues, particularly those on which there is significant interest and expertise among the Council’s membership.

Membership in the Pacific Council on International Policy is extended by invitation of the Board of Directors, upon recommendation of the Pacific Council’s membership committee, to persons of leadership quality who have demonstrated interest in and capacity to contribute on international affairs. Membership will not be limited to those who define themselves as working primarily on international issues. Rather, it will include persons whose decisions and actions have important international aspects; whose work is significantly affected by international trends; whose effectiveness would be enhanced by participating in structured explorations of international issues; and who intend to contribute to the Pacific Council’s consideration of such questions.

The Pacific Council seeks the active participation of men and women of different backgrounds and professional and political perspectives, and strives to include persons from groups which have heretofore been under-represented in foreign policy discussions. The Pacific Council endeavors to maintain a balance among participants from business, labor, politics and government, religion, the media, arts and entertainment, law, science and technology, the academic community, and other professions.

The Pacific Council’s members are drawn principally from the western region of the United States, but the Council also seeks to engage members from elsewhere in the U.S., from Canada and Mexico, from throughout the Americas, and from Asia — in short, from around the Pacific Rim and beyond.

**PACIFIC COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL POLICY
LOS ANGELES, CA 90089-0035**

**TEL: (213) 740-4296
FAX: (213) 740-9498
E-MAIL: PCIP@USC.EDU**

