

Who can slander and threaten his neighbor for three years and then expect him to come and play ball? This is real life in the real world. While formally accepting Soviet participation, the U.S. Government was simultaneously tolerating, if not sanctioning, the threats of hate organizations about keeping the Soviet Union from participating—all of which received wide media coverage. There were threatening letters to the Soviet Olympic Committee and people wearing "Kill a Russian" lapel badges in Los Angeles. In an atmosphere in which these kinds of actions were not disapproved by officials at the highest levels of power, there was the very serious possibility of a violent incident or even terrorist act aimed at Soviet athletes. For them at least and for the athletes of many other countries, the climate surrounding the Los Angeles Olympic Games became one that clearly violated everything the Olympics stands for: sportsmanship, fair play, friendly competition, international cooperation, integrity.

The Soviet Union was justifiably concerned that its sports representatives would have been subject to considerable harassment, insult, and even danger in Los Angeles. As an example I can cite our participation in a track and field meet in New York City in late February and early March this year. On the second day of the meet a bomb was exploded outside the buildings where Soviet diplomats and their families live. Hardly a friendly gesture.

A sense that the Soviet athletes were not exactly welcome in Los Angeles was given at the very beginning of preparations for the Games, when the U.S. Olympic Committee and the State Department placed specific restrictions on Soviet athletes and our representatives, restrictions unprecedented in the history of the Games. It seems logical to suppose that the U.S. administration may never have intended the Los Angeles Olympics to include the Soviet athletes. And considering the longstanding ties between the anti-Soviet groups and U.S. intelligence agencies, the Soviet delegation had good reason to be skeptical about the massive security measures planned for Los Angeles. In view of

Washington's refusal to admit the Soviet officials assigned to review security, the Olympic Committee of the USSR was unconvinced about the ability of the U.S. to protect the athletes from terrorism.

The violation of the very spirit of the Olympics is also demonstrated by the commercialization of the '84 Games. In Los Angeles, U.S. corporations have turned the Olympics into a big business venture. It's worth remembering how the Los Angeles Olympic Committee responded to the demands of the Government of Greece that Olympic torch ceremonies not be commercialized; the selling by U.S. corporations of the right to carry the torch was also a central concern for Greek officials. To protest the commercialization, Greece held no Olympic ceremony of its own. There was and probably still is a collision between those who want to preserve the Olympic ideals and those who are going along with American business and politics.

Maybe I am wrong, but it seems to me that the American people would like to see the Soviet athletes compete. Life, unfortunately, dictates its own laws. The people and athletes of the world have already paid a high price for a policy of cold war and confrontation, harsh rhetoric, and irresponsible actions. Everybody is sorry about not having full-fledged Olympic Games. Because of the absence of the socialist countries' top athletes, the Olympic gold medal will be drastically diminished in its real value and there will be lost profits for the TV networks and other commercial interests. Who knows, there may be a certain justice in this, given the U.S. role in organizing the Western boycott of the 1980 Olympics in Moscow.

Revenge? Not at all. Just playing fair. And reminding some people in Washington that this is real life in the real world.

EXCURSUS 2

Rafael Suarez, Jr., on FOOD FOR PEACE?

This summer U.S. officials will mark the thirtieth anniversary of the Food for Peace program, or Public Law 480. A creation of the Eisenhower administration, Food for Peace was conceived as a way of disposing of burgeoning American farm surpluses while helping the United States not only to meet its humanitarian obligations overseas but to stave off revolution in newly emerging countries. The government official responsible for PL480 today is M. Peter McPherson, administrator of the Agency for International Development (AID), who noted recently that Food for Peace has provided 656 billion pounds of food to more than a hundred countries in the last three decades, making it a major instrument of U.S. foreign policy.

McPherson's audience, the Newspaper Farm Editors of America, was also told that the program has helped create markets for U.S. farm products, resulting in "an enormous return on investment." He offered the example of Korea, the recipient of \$1.6 billion in PL480 food over the years but now buying a similar amount each year from American farm-

THE BIG TEN

The following are the ten biggest stories of 1983 as named by Associated Press newspaper and broadcast member editors.

1. Marines Massacred in Beirut
2. Soviets Down KAL Airliner
3. U.S. Invades Grenada
4. American Economy
5. Missiles Deployed in Europe
6. European Nuclear Protests
7. Lech Walesa/Nobel Peace Prize
8. Menachem Begin Resigns
9. Weather
10. James Watt Resigns

ers. As nations develop their economies, McPherson explained, "they'll buy more from us. They'll be like Korea." He pointed out that when nations raise their own agricultural production, there is more money to spare for imports, including products from the United States. "I look at the foreign aid program as an investment in our own future." McPherson noted too that President Reagan had had some serious questions about foreign aid when he first took office; but now that we have programs that promote self-help and render aid more than "international welfare," the president sees them as important foreign policy tools.

The AID administrator's sanguine view of PL480's role as an aid to self-help is not shared by the Institute for Food and Development Policy, among others. Nick Allen, an associate of the San-Francisco-based research and information center, does not doubt that the program is well-intentioned but maintains that it is poorly targeted. "Basically, American food aid is administered like other aid. And it doesn't always have the desired effect. Take disaster aid, which is a component of PL480. Often this aid goes to countries where there isn't a shortage, and it just disrupts markets."

Allen points to Guatemala in the aftermath of the 1976 earthquake. At that time the U.S. shipped tons of food to Guatemala, even though there was no food shortage in the country; the quake had merely disrupted the marketing and distribution system. But as a result of American largesse, Allen maintains, the prices for locally produced corn dropped dramatically. The IFDP and many other private groups and news agencies have remarked as well on the corruption and abuses of Food for Peace provisions in El Salvador, where American-donated food is sold openly in town markets, still in containers marked "not for sale."

In addition to disaster aid and outright grants, PL480 food is often given as budgetary support for overseas governments. In such cases, the U.S. sells food at a concessionary rate to a foreign government, which resells it and uses the local currency it receives to finance its own programs. The way the aid is used is determined by the recipient government according to its own domestic and political concerns. The U.S. Government has never pretended that this food is meant to feed the hungry, Allen notes, but Americans themselves are probably unaware of this dimension of the food aid program; "they probably think it's for poor and hungry people, not for friendly governments."

Another effect of U.S. food aid is to encourage a taste for an American-style diet in countries ill suited to such a pattern of consumption. Some consumers in poor countries now demand white bread and beef, rejecting local food products. "There's nothing wrong with importing food," Allen contends, "but countries should realize it makes them vulnerable." When asked about IFDP's suggestions about how to administer PL480, Allen said the Institute would like to see the program dropped, except for emergency assistance. "We don't think most American aid plays a role in helping the hungry or in development."

The administration and the American people face some difficult questions concerning U.S. aid programs. Perhaps the thirtieth anniversary of Food for Peace is a good time to address them.

Rafael Suarez, Jr., is a journalist who frequently writes on food and development issues. He is the most recent re-

WORLDVIEW is available in Microform.



University Microfilms International

Please send additional information

for _____
(name of publication)

Name _____

Institution _____

Street _____

City _____

State _____ Zip _____

300 North Zeeb Road
Dept. P.R.
Ann Arbor, Mi. 48106

ipient of New York University's Daaku Prize in African Studies.

EXCURSUS 3

Thomas Land on SATELLITES FOR PEACE

A committee of scientists at the University of Toronto recently launched an international campaign to raise \$1 billion for a peacekeeping surveillance satellite. Their proposal—following a quarter-century of bargaining over the uses of outer space—may soon lead to the establishment of a global space satellite agency under the auspices of the United Nations charged with verifying arms control agreements and monitoring military crises.

The committee, called Science for Peace, has attracted much interest and support at the universities and other research institutions of such countries as Canada, France, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and New Zealand. Some of its members may, in fact, be asked by the U.N. to assist in the establishment of its projected space monitoring agency. And though only the two superpowers now possess the technology specific to military satellites, other countries, including members of the European Community and China and Japan, are engaged in relevant remote-sensing space programs.

Military satellites deployed in the cause of peace would detect violations of arms control accords and serve as a deterrent to violations by increasing the risk of exposure. They would also give early warning of developing armed confrontations and help in the prevention and management of international crises. The process would contribute to confidence-building among the nations at a cost well under 1 per cent of the world's annual expenditure on armaments.

Since the dawn of the space age in 1957, the superpowers have failed to agree on the limits to be placed on the use of satellites. By 1962 a U.N. committee that includes both the U.S. and USSR managed to arrive at an acceptable

formula, but the talks that have followed over two decades have coincided with the emergence of military space technology offering the potential of global holocaust.

In the boom years following the Second World War many economists mistook the coincidence of high military expenditure and high economic growth for a casual relationship. By the time the boom ended in 1973, the arms race was running out of control. In 1980 the global military investment was \$500 billion, and there was a stockpile of 50,000 nuclear warheads. The recent series of U.N. "disarmament sessions" were encouraged by the inability of the superpowers to curb, let alone control, their armament industries. The proposal pursued by the Science for Peace committee has now been turned into a detailed technological, legal, and financial development plan by a U.N.-appointed international group of government specialists.

During the past decade satellites have been used increasingly for identifying military targets, predicting weather conditions, facilitating communications, and measuring natural resources. The expert study emphasizes that both civilian and military satellites could be used for arms control verification.

In phase one of its development, the new agency would acquire its own data-processing, management, and analysis and interpretation system at a capital cost of \$8 million and an annual operating cost of up to \$30 million. Phase two would involve the acquisition of ten ground-receiving stations costing up to \$80 million to install and \$20 million to operate. In phase three, the system would be completed with the launching of perhaps three satellites using optical, infrared, and radar-type signals. The cost of launching a single satellite for area monitoring may cost as much as \$400 million; satellite renewal is estimated at \$50-200 million a year.

Many existing arms control agreements refer to "national technical means of verification," and the projected U.N. organization will thus be able to act on behalf of the contracting parties as their technical agent. Its legal power would derive from Article 1 of the United Nations Charter, in which member-states agree to "take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace."

Thomas Land, a frequent contributor to Worldview, writes from Europe on global affairs.

COMING

Islam in Pakistan, Arthur Miller in China, Qaddafi in the
Middle East, U.S. Military Bases in Doubt...