

picking up stray animals and taking them home for care.

John P. Garmone, as clerk of court for the Lyndhurst Municipal Court, John Garmone is responsible for the preparation and maintenance of the docket, general index and other court records. He is also responsible for collecting all monies payable to the clerk's office including fines, court costs and fees, bail, garnishments, bank attachments and trusteeships. In addition to signing and issuing arrest warrants, John also supervises a staff of seven full-time deputy clerks and two part-time deputy clerks.

After graduating in 1974 from Cleveland State with a bachelor of science degree, John immediately took a position with the municipal court in Cleveland as chief deputy clerk. John also was a bail investigator with the Cuyahoga County Bail Commissions interviewing and recruiting county prisoners for probationary diversion programs.

John lists his being a past president of Northeastern Ohio Municipal Court Clerks Association in 1993 as one of his outstanding accomplishments.

Married to Kathleen for nearly 3 years, he enjoys music and the theater and trying "to keep his wife in the style of living to which she has become accustomed." John also states that, "Trying to treat everyone as I would appreciate whether they are the public, coworkers, whomever and keep a sense of humor while doing it". John describes a typical day as, "Everyday is a Joke! And I would not have it any other way".

Rosanne M. O'Brien, born in Washington Island, WI, Rosanne O'Brien took a position with Cuyahoga County Juvenile Court in her senior year of high school as part of a career class. While holding a number of positions such as general clerk, numbering clerk, docketing clerk, and senior clerk typist since 1972. Her current position, assistant courtroom coordinator, is her most challenging yet. She is responsible for scheduling and reviewing cases prior to court and must speak with probation officers, attorneys, and clients to assure a smooth hearing in the courtroom. With such a diversified background, it is no wonder she has been nominated for employee of the year five times.

Rosanne is also very committed to her community, being a campaign volunteer for the American Cancer Society, American Heart Association, American Lung Association, Easter Seals and United Way. On the political side, she is also an elected precinct committee member and Chairperson for membership and attendance with the Lakewood Democratic Club.

Rosanne and her husband, James, have enjoyed over 18 years of marriage. Her two golden retrievers, Sandy and Dusty, keep her busy when she's not bowling or doing needle crafts.

Fred W. Papay, born in Cleveland, Fred W. Papay graduated from West Technical High School. He began his work with the Cuyahoga County Clerk of Courts at the age of 24 in 1971. Nominated by Gerald E. Fuerst, clerk of courts for Cuyahoga County, Fred W. Papay is chief filing clerk. His responsibilities include overseeing all of the filing for both civil and divorce cases, and all subsequent pleadings in those cases.

A sergeant with the U.S. Air Force for 3 years, Fred is a Vietnam war veteran. After serving his country, he remained on inactive duty for another 2 years.

When Fred is not busy at work filing court documents, he enjoys sports. Fred is also an avid collector of any type of sports memorabilia. He says that in addition to his fascination with sports, he loves to collect elephant statues.

Maryellen Reddy, as a journal clerk/court community service liaison in Cuyahoga

County domestic relations court for over 20 years, Maryellen Reddy has a wide range of job responsibilities. Her position requires her to review all journal entries prior to any hearings or the judges' signature. She also makes sure that all documents required by the State or local rules are attached to all entries. She monitors all contempt of court cases with the court's orders for compliance with the court community service.

Maryellen has been active in the political arena as well as being an executive board committee member of the Democratic Precinct, Ward 19.

An avid Cleveland sports fan, Maryellen is proud of the fact that she has been an eighteen year season ticket holder in the "Dawg Pound". She also enjoys Cleveland baseball, having season tickets for the Cleveland Indians. In her leisure time, Maryellen enjoys spending time with her family and cuddling up to a good book.

## OPPORTUNITIES BEING LOST

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 11, 1997*

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to my colleagues' attention the following editorial by my good friend Charles William Maynes. Charles is retiring from his position as editor of Foreign Policy, the magazine of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

I laud Charles for his thoughts in this editorial. He clearly outlines the need for the political will to aid the developing world, both overseas and here in the United States. He makes the case for aid in international development as a tool to achieve our national interest of peacefully coexisting constitutional democracies.

Charles is not unaware of the challenges facing the disbursement of international aid. He presents several concrete ideas for reforming the way in which aid reaches developing economies. The international economic system that is the rubic under which aid is now being administered demands changes in the way development aid is collected and distributed.

As the Congress debates the level of international aid the United States should contribute, I hope my colleagues will familiarize themselves with the following article, and the rest of Charles William Maynes' work.

[From the Washington Times, Jan. 20, 1997]

### OPPORTUNITIES BEING LOST

(By Charles William Maynes)

Charles Williams Maynes is retiring as editor of Foreign Policy, the magazine published by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Its editor since 1980, he delivered a farewell address in Washington to a closing session Jan. 15 of the International Development Conference, which is attended annually by more than 1,000 analysts, diplomats, businessmen and politicians involved with development work in the Third World. The following are excerpts from his address, which sets out his view of the world in the years head:

We are in one of the most plastic periods in modern history. It is rare in history for all of the great powers to be essentially at peace with one another and for all of them to accept one another's international legitimacy. In this remarkable moment, we have such a

consensus, yet we are failing to exploit it, and opportunities are being lost every day.

Anti-immigrant feeling has never been higher in the postwar period. The vicious political infighting has already resumed on Capitol Hill. Concern for others is down. The publishing sensation of the country in recent years has been a study of white and black education performance, with the subliminal message one of resignation. Why continue efforts to lift others out of their current state if those you want to help are predisposed to remain there? Why try to help others catch up, when studies show that they never will?

The country is increasingly skeptical and cynical. Few believe that government can work. And if it can't work at home, how can it possibly work abroad in cultures we scarcely comprehend? If we cannot construct sensible development programs for south-central Los Angeles, how can we possibly expect to develop them for Haiti?

### AMERICANS ARE GROWING FEARFUL

We are facing, in other words, a new pessimism that threatens all sound programs for change and reform. Much of this new pessimism toward the developing world rests on a dark vision of the future . . .

[But] the World Bank forecasts that over the next 10 years, developing countries, including the former Soviet bloc, will grow by nearly 5 percent a year, compared with a rate of 2.7 percent in the rich industrial North. In other words, the Third World is going to be the growth engine of the world economy in the coming decade.

In addition, the share of the developing countries of the world economy is already much greater than common discourse allows. If output is measured on the basis of purchasing-power parities, then the developing countries and the former Soviet bloc already account for 44 percent of the world's output. If the World Bank's estimates turn out to be right, by the year 2020, these countries will have 60 percent of the world's global output.

What is the explanation for this deep pessimism that pervades American thinking?

We have to look for the answer not in facts, but in politics. What we are witnessing is the collapse of a powerful governmental paradigm, which governed our affairs for much of the post-World War Two period. After the great war, in part because of the genuine and heroic accomplishments of that struggle, in which everyone played a role from the president to the private to Rosie the Riveter, there was a widespread belief that government could work. Men and women could band together to accomplish high and noble goals. After all, they had already done it.

### LOSS OF FAITH IN GOVERNMENT

In all of our political cultures, the dominant ideology became a disguised form of social democracy, which rested on the belief that governments, if well-organized and properly funded, could change societies for the better.

Even conservatives, with the evidence of the war effort so near, were hard pressed to reject this vision. And if the war memory did not persuade them, then they were converted because they feared that unless their society had answers for searing social and economic problems, the masses might be drawn to communism, which did promise answers.

Much of the international development effort rested on that ideology of social democracy, which has now collapsed. It was believed that if the New Deal could work at home, it could work abroad. The problem was simply to find the money.

Now communism has gone as an ideological challenge. But more important, also gone is our belief that we know what works. The result is a collapse in American leadership in the development field.

## U.S. DEVELOPMENT EFFORT FALTERS

American aid levels have plummeted. In the 1950s and 1960s, America pioneered the concept of development assistance. Its contributions led all others. Today, America ranks at the bottom of the [Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development] countries in terms of [aid].

A growing percentage of our aid is concentrated in the Middle East and southern Africa, both regions that enjoy high aid levels, for political reasons. . . .

The Overseas Development Council estimates that no more than 17 percent of U.S. bilateral aid now goes for development. And multilateral aid has also been infected with the political virus. The United States and other donors have pressed the World Bank to make loans to the former communist countries that, under former criteria, would never have been allowed.

The cause of human rights has also suffered severe setbacks as a result of the new cynicism. When President Clinton announced a bold, new China policy, he said that "the core of this policy will be a resolute insistence upon significant progress on human rights in China." He received widespread applause. A few months later, he was the subject of mounting criticism as commentators claimed that he was sacrificing American commercial interests on the altar of a utopian concept of human rights. He decided to abandon the policy completely.

## IDEALS TAKE A BACK SEAT

In Russia, most commentators applauded the administration for approving as a Russian president bombarded a parliament into submission, even though the essence of a democratic system is respect for laws, not respect for powerful individuals.

In Rwanda, the first case of documented genocide since the Second World War, virtually no one objected as the administration resisted U.N. involvement until spurred by a secretary-general who said that he was ashamed by the inaction of the Security Council.

To general silence, our State Department attempted to talk of "acts of genocide" rather than "genocide" because use of the latter word might trigger commitments under the Genocide Convention that no one wanted to honor. It has been estimated that as little as 2,000 troops could have prevented hundreds of thousands of deaths.

In the development field, we need to shift our focus from countries to problems. With the Cold War over, our people find it difficult to understand why we continue to support foreign countries.

Perhaps the American people could understand our desire to work with others on common problems. In an age of massive international travel, the United States is necessarily concerned about international health problems. It could work with others on those common problems. People at home would understand such an expenditure.

The administration has talked in these terms, but not boldly from the White House.

## JOINT EFFORTS NEEDED

Our citizens would understand common efforts to deal with international environmental problems. We are helping Mexico to clean up rivers that borders both countries. We can work with other states to protect fisheries. We can attempt to develop a bold development effort for states that generate economic immigrants for the United States.

We must understand that people in those countries will only remain when they believe that there is hope for their children, even if

there may not be much for them in their own lifetime.

In the field of democracy, we also need a new approach. At least at the governmental level, we have adopted a cookie-cutter approach to democratic development. There has been too much emphasis on elections and not enough on institutions. Yet, the essence of democracy is the web of institutions that together bring us the role of law, rather than the whim of leaders.

In the case of Russia, the U.S. made a serious mistake in backing [President Boris Yeltsin] so unconditionally in his struggle with the Duma. We should have pressed him to reach a compromise with its members, who now look moderate compared to those who replaced them. Democracy is not attained through sudden conversion, but through patient development efforts taking years.

We must also understand that in many ethnically divided societies, the American form of democracy poses a great threat to civil peace.

## MAJORITY RULE REQUIRES SAFEGUARDS

"One man, one vote" in a winner-take-all election is too brutal a form of leader-selection for such countries. It will shatter consensus and can bring on civil war. For what we want is not majoritarian democracy, but constitutional democracy. The former can be established overnight, with a single election; the latter takes years.

We say that we favor democracy worldwide. But until the mediating institutions of a constitutional democracy have evolved, won't democracy in the Arab world bring to power forces that will be profoundly anti-Western and maybe even authoritarian, although seemingly "democratic"?

With its elections and vigorous parliament, Iran is probably more democratic than most states in the Muslim world. But it has established a form of majoritarian democracy that must disturb us. There is no protection for vulnerable minorities or the dissident voice.

What we want immediately in the Arab world is decent governments that respect the fundamental human rights of their citizens. The building of real democracy is going to take decades.

We need a new approach to our campaign both for human rights and democracy. It should now be clear that the U.S. cannot impose its standards on the rest of the world. As strong as we are, we are not that strong.

We should work harder to multilateralize our human rights program. Human rights organizations contend that this administration, like its predecessors, is uncomfortable working with others in the human rights field. We must reverse this.

We need to begin to work harder to live up ourselves to international standards in the field of economic and social rights so that we can develop a common language with others. It is a disgrace that the infant-mortality rate in Washington, D.C., is higher than in many extremely poor Third World countries.

What is more disgraceful is that Washington policy-makers at times seemed more concerned with the rate in foreign countries than in their own capital. We have to recognize that the U.S. no longer has the power or enjoys the deference internationally simply to command others to behave as we wish.

## NEEDED: A NEW RATIONALE FOR AID

Critical to the success of the humanitarian tradition in American foreign policy is funds.

We no longer have the Cold War to provide the excuse for large aid levels. We have to

recognize that we are unlikely to be able to reverse such attitudes in the near future. There is little hope in trying to increase the aid budget under current conditions. We need a new paradigm.

We should begin to explore ways of asking those who benefit from the management of the global commons to help pay for its upkeep. This is probably going to involve some taxation on international activities, but for reasons of accountability, if such taxes are established, their management must be subject to the control of national legislatures.

We must begin to wean some of the countries that view U.S. aid as an entitlement. The Middle East countries should be given a period over which U.S. aid to them would be significantly reduced and would be channeled into programs for regional development and global problems.

We need gun control abroad just as much as we need gun control at home. The position of the major supplier countries is an intellectual and policy scandal. The U.S. and its allies are the most culpable. The U.S. alone supplies over 70 percent of the international arms trade.

## DISCOURAGE OVERSPENDING ON ARMS

We need to limit the ability of states that spend beyond a certain portion of the [gross national product] on defense to have access to the international financial institutions. We may have to offer a special exemption to states that face a unique security situation. But the ability to get such a waiver would be limited.

We need to convert the development effort from a responsibility of the rich toward the poor into a common responsibility. Every state above a certain level should be required to contribute to global-development funds. Membership in key global institutions might be keyed to such a requirement.

We should stress more South-South cooperation. We should limit the number of experts from the North, in order to reflect the success we have had in creating an enormous pool of trained expertise within the South itself.

We should insist that aid recipients agree to enter into regional projects as a condition of their aid.

## TRADE, COMMUNICATIONS UNIFY GLOBE

Today, an international system is developing that is more inclusive economically and politically. Trade is pulling people together and communications are enabling them to form common views, which are a prerequisite to subsequent participation in the determination of their political fate.

But the U.S. is unable to exploit this moment because we are incapable of bold thinking. Today, we are like a musclebound giant that can't tie his shoes. We have a defense budget that is larger than all of the major countries in the world combined, but we can't reallocate the money where it would do the most good. We plan for wars that will not happen in our lifetime, and we are unable to participate in security operations that are needed today.

Meanwhile, we are largely absent in the countries whose future will determine the fate of whole regions.

In conclusion, in the current era, we must not allow inertia to define our policy. If we wish to seize the moment, all of us are going to have to think boldly. And we cannot wait for leadership from the administration or the Congress.

The more bold ordinary citizens are outside the offices of officials, the bolder they are likely to be inside. For in today's poll-driven politics, leadership lies as much with the people as with the officials. Power can lie in hands like yours. I urge you to use it.