

courier



The Stanley Foundation
Number 44

Summer 2004

PROVOKING THOUGHT AND ENCOURAGING DIALOGUE ABOUT THE WORLD



LIVING IN LIMBO

Internally Displaced People

Life in Bunia

Security and communication are major challenges

One of the most vexing problems facing international humanitarian workers are the people who become trapped inside their own country while fleeing war.

Since 1998 up to three million people have been killed in the Democratic Republic of Congo, the African country formerly called Zaire. Millions more have become internally displaced or have sought asylum in neighboring countries.

As the widest interstate war in modern African history, the conflict—mainly centered in eastern Congo—has involved nine African nations and has directly affected the lives of some 50 million people.

While widespread fighting has stopped, the shootings continue every day in the ethnically divided town of Bunia, located in the heart of Congo's mineral-rich Ituri district.

Militia Men Still At Large

"Bunia still has a lot of militia men. They hide their weapons in the ceilings of their houses, maybe in small rivers, maybe in graveyards," said resident Innocent Umirande. "At night they take their weapons and start shooting. Pop, pop, pop. And MONUC [the United Nations Mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo] isn't able to stop them."

Umirande was among tens of thousands of people displaced from their homes last year when fighting flared up again in this eastern Congo city near the Uganda border. The region is home to a complex, shifting mix of political interests

and at least 13 distinct ethnic groups, each with its own language.

"It is an explosion of camps, factions, subfactions, separations...so it is very complicated for us," said Fred Meylan, head of the Doctors Without Borders operation in Bunia.

'They Just Showed Up'

When people fled the fighting, many settled right next to the UN military base at Bunia's airport.

"Nobody said, 'Oh, build a camp here.' They just showed up," said Rick Neal, a program manager for Oxfam-Great Britain. Oxfam is one of several nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) struggling to provide services to more than 12,000 so-called internally displaced people, or IDPs, now living at the Bunia airport camp.

The airport location worked out quite well for the IDPs. "It was very

"It is an explosion of camps, factions, subfactions, separations ...so it is very complicated for us..."

Cover Photo:
This boy covering his ears in the Bunia displacement camp is one of more than 12,000 residents living in legal limbo while fleeing war.



Clean Water. Oxfam-Great Britain improves the quality of life in the Bunia camp by providing water that meets strict international standards.



◀ **Open Market.** *Impromptu markets like this one just outside the Bunia camp bring goods to the displaced residents. But they can also bring security headaches for UN authorities.*

lucky because it is one of the best IDP sites I have worked in. Natural drainage is excellent. The fact that it is next to a MONUC base makes security easy,” Neal said.

In theory, Neal is right. Security should be easy, but in practice security is one of the most pressing problems in this camp. While the UN peacekeepers assigned to MONUC certainly prevent large-scale aggression here, the open nature of the camp allows easy entry for anyone wanting to terrorize, rob, or rape the IDPs.

Poor Security

The civilian police force in the Democratic Republic of Congo is

still in its infancy. This leaves internal camp security in the hands of the French NGO charged with managing the Bunia airport camp, Atlas Logistiques. Atlas has trained 20 camp residents to serve as conflict resolution mediators.

“When people drink beer, they make trouble. We intervene to stop them when they are fighting with each other,” said mediator Marie Claire. “Then we give them pieces of advice so they can learn to live together.”

Another problem contributing to the poor security situation is a simple lack of communication. The MONUC soldiers come from Uruguay, Pakistan, and a handful of other countries.

“In all of them, only maybe 10 people speak French [the official language of Congo],” said Helene Robin, the head of Atlas Logistiques’ eastern Congo operations. “Sometimes I think I know more than MONUC about where the arms are hidden. Everyone in Bunia knows where the arms are, in which house. They all want peace. They are ready to say, ‘My neighbor has arms,’ but if MONUC cannot communicate with people then you cannot have a deep intervention.”

Innocent Umirande agrees. “I would like to thank Kofi Annan and

the international community for what they have done for Congo. Because if they didn’t intervene, we would be in a war. But now they are not able to do a very good job. Maybe it is the soldiers they chose. They are not able to communicate. They think everyone is the enemy, and this is not good.”

‘They All Want to Go Home’

Of course, the ultimate goal for the United Nations and the government is to see the IDPs safely returned to their own homes. “The displaced persons want to go back home, and we all want them to go back,” says Robin. But she says this must only happen as a result of resolving underlying problems.

“Go to the camp and you see how they live. You cannot say these people stay for the comfort. People won’t go back [to where their homes are] because there is no security,” Robin said. For half of the residents, their homes are within one mile of the camp and many of the homes are occupied by armed members of rival groups. “[The IDPs] all go to their house everyday to see how the situation is. They all want to go home. They cannot.”

—Keith Porter

“Then we give them pieces of advice so they can learn to live together.”

Resources

The plight of internally displaced people in the Democratic Republic of Congo is highlighted in the Stanley Foundation’s radio documentary “UNder Fire: The United Nations’ Battle for Relevance.” For more information, visit www.underfire.org.

courier

No. 44, Summer 2004 ISSN 1044-5900

Courier is published quarterly by the Stanley Foundation and mailed without charge to interested readers within the United States. The views expressed here are not necessarily those of the foundation.

President	Richard H. Stanley
Director of Programs	Jeffrey G. Martin
Editor	Keith Porter
Managing Editor	Loren Keller
Creative Director	Amy Bakke
Copyeditor	Margo Schneider

©2004 by The Stanley Foundation.
Reprints of certain articles may be obtained upon permission from the foundation.

To receive future issues, contact:
The Stanley Foundation
209 Iowa Avenue
Muscatine, Iowa 52761 USA
563-264-1500 • 563-264-0864 fax
info@stanleyfoundation.org

www.stanleyfoundation.org

[There's a Long Way to Go](#)

Stemming the Scourge of Small Arms

Disarmament advocates believe the United Nations can do more

“Because you think everyone else has a gun, the first thing you do is shoot.”



PHOTO BY KITA PEDRO/VIVA RIO

Worldwide, the deaths of more than half a million people annually can be attributed to the use of small firearms—what one activist calls “the new threat of mass destruction.”

Nearly 10 percent of those deaths—an estimated 40,000—occur in Brazil, a democratic country with less than 3 percent of the world’s population.

Brazil is not a country embroiled in civil war or at war with its neighbors. But the highly unequal distribution of wealth among its 180 million citizens remains a pressing problem.

“Where you have enormous populations, all kinds of social injustice, no housing programs, no health

Preparing for Meltdown. Soldiers ready for the destruction of firearms in Rio de Janeiro.

programs, and no education programs, basically violence seems to be the most effective way—or the only way—to deal with any kind of problem,” said Denis Mizne, executive director of Instituto Sou da Paz, a Brazilian nongovernmental organization aimed at disarming youth in economically disadvantaged areas.

“So if your neighbor is listening to his music too loud, or you don’t like the way someone looked at your girlfriend, you basically kill them. Because you think everyone else has a gun, the first thing you do is shoot.”

When his organization began its work in 1997, Mizne said, the issue

of small arms violence was not high on Brazil’s national agenda.

Since then, the Brazilian Congress passed the Disarmament Statute in 2003, which outlaws international firearms trafficking and tightens restrictions on gun ownership. The minimum age to purchase firearms rose from 21 to 25. Homicide rates in Brazil are dropping as more guns are being collected and destroyed.

Getting Small Arms on the Agenda

While Brazil has made some progress in stemming the flow of small weapons within its own borders, disarmament advocates agree that the larger challenge is getting the United Nations to place the

issue of small arms violence higher on its own agenda.

In 2001 the United Nations held a conference on the “Illicit Trade of Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects” and produced a “Programme of Action” (POA), a consensus document containing recommendations for how the small arms problem should be addressed. In 2006 the United Nations will host another conference to review progress on implementing the 2001 agenda.

Rebecca Peters, director of the International Action Network on Small Arms, is among those who believe the POA has yet to reach its goals. Peters said she would like to see the United Nations’ recently created High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges, and Change view small arms as a problem that underlies many other threats to security.

“Small arms are the new threat of mass destruction,” she said. “It’s not something that should be seen as a choice—like either we deal with terrorists or we deal with small arms, or we deal with failing states or small arms, or weapons of mass destruction or small arms. We need to increase the priority. Otherwise small arms always loses out if we compare it with these other threats.”

An ‘Age-Old Issue’

So why don’t governments do more to clamp down on small arms smugglers and brokers?

Part of the reason lies in Cold War-era networks specifically developed to proliferate weapons, said Kathi Austin, director of the Arms and Conflict Project at the University of California-Berkeley.

“It’s an age-old issue,” Austin said. “Governments have had longstanding relationships with arms brokers. They used them during the Cold War. In the war on terrorism

right now, they’re considered key informants and it’s more important to have the intelligence they offer than to care about what they’re doing far away.”

A recent example is Victor Bout, a notorious arms trafficker commonly described as a “merchant of death” for his role in supplying illicit arms that have fueled devastating conflicts in Angola, Sierra Leone, Liberia, and elsewhere.

Yet allegations swirl that Bout and his associates provided air freight services for the United States during the Iraq war. Also troubling are reports claiming the United States tried to keep Bout’s name off a

international regulatory regime, and pay greater attention to physical movement of weapons by smugglers, Austin said.

Brazil’s Mizne believes his country—where civil society and government have worked together to take guns off the streets and prevent more from resurfacing by reducing existing stockpiles—could be an example for other developing countries.

“We’re winning the fight—that’s the good part,” he said. “But there’s a long way to go.”

—Loren Keller



The Folly of Weapons. This bronze sculpture, outside UN headquarters entitled “Non-Violence,” depicts sculptor Karl Fredrik Reuterswärd’s commentary on the folly of war and weapons.

UNDP PHOTO

United Nations-compiled “asset freeze list,” which targeted individuals believed to have helped ousted Liberian strongman Charles Taylor.

The Bush administration denies these charges. Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage said, “[Bout] ought to be on any asset freeze list and anything else you can do to him.”

Lack of Law Enforcement

Another problem in shutting down such networks is a lack of law enforcement and prosecution, Austin said. And national laws rarely apply internationally.

The best way for the United Nations to disrupt the illegal flow of small arms would be to enforce the UN arms embargo, create an



UNDP PHOTO

Young Guns. This child in Kosovo represents a larger population of child soldiers worldwide still to be disarmed.

“It’s not something that should be seen as a choice—like either we deal with terrorists or we deal with small arms....”

Resources

The report entitled “Issues Before the UN’s High-Level Panel—The Scourge of Small Arms and Light Weapons” is available at reports.stanleyfoundation.org or see page 11 to order.

Charting a New Course

Rethinking Security in the Gulf

A multilateral approach would strengthen regional bonds

Whatever happens in Iraq, the United States will be a key player in defining and maintaining the Persian Gulf security order for the foreseeable future.

The greatest danger in the Gulf is not a nuclear Iran or a traditional threat of conventional interstate invasion by an aggressor, but internal socioeconomic and political changes that might be increasingly hard to direct or control from the outside.

Unfortunately, the United States has in the past been focused almost completely on building up strong local allies (“pillars”) to dominate the region without taking into account the domestic side of security in the Gulf.

Past Failures

In the 1970s, the United States relied on a strategy of “local hegemony”—support for Saudi Arabia and the shah of Iran as the principal rule-makers of the Gulf region. However, this strategy failed when the Iranian coup of 1979 ejected the shah from power, and later when the rise of transnational terror groups with Saudi citizens as active members resulted in the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. Both of these failures were brought about by domestic developments within Iran and Saudi Arabia.

In the 1980s the United States tried to create a pure “balance of power” to keep the peace. This included US intelligence and financial aid to Iraq in its war with Iran, which kept both countries from growing too powerful and thereby provided immediate security to neighboring

Arab regimes. However, this strategy allowed the Iraqi buildup of offensive military power and turned a blind eye to the human rights transgressions of Saddam Hussein against his own people as well as his use of chemical weapons against Iran.

After the war with Saddam in 1991, former Presidents Bush and Clinton created and maintained a multilateral (multination) security framework known as the “Madrid Process.” Under this umbrella fell individual “baskets” of issues, including the Oslo Peace Process between Israel and the Palestinians and separate multination talks on limiting conventional arms and weapons of mass destruction (WMD). There were also talks on

“soft security” issues such as environmental degradation, economic development, and water sharing.

But the Madrid Process had several flaws, including an overreliance on military tools to threaten Iraq and Iran rather than a political framework or a rules-based order to bring comprehensive peace to the region. Arab states were led to depend on the United States for security instead of one other. And there was a mistaken assumption that authoritarian regimes in Iran and Iraq could be brought down through isolation and economic strangulation. In reality, Saddam Hussein and Iranian clerics were able to stay in power indefinitely despite substantial US pressure on both governments.

The greatest dangers in the Gulf are internal socioeconomic and political changes that might be increasingly hard to direct or control from the outside.



Bush Doctrine. *US Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld speaks to American troops inside a former Saddam Hussein palace in Iraq.*

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PHOTO

In the end, there are two major contending approaches to Gulf security: US hegemony (the “Bush Doctrine”) and a strategy of principled multilateralism.

The Bush Doctrine

If the United States continues with the Bush administration’s approach, then Gulf relations would be patterned along the following lines:

- Gulf security would be exclusionary, with US “friends and allies” on one side and US enemies such as Iran on the other.
- The United States would make a decision on who is included or excluded, and this decision would be based on factors such as internal regime structure, support of terrorism, and aspirations for WMD—as judged by the United States. States would not be judged on the basis of commonly agreed, universal principles applicable to all.
- Confidence-building measures in the military realm (such as arms limitations, cooperative military exercises, or transparency on arms buildups) would only apply to friends and allies.
- The ultimate goal would be to target those “rogue” states outside the established order, isolate them, and bring about a “regime conversion” or regime change.
- The legitimate right to self-defense would be recognized only for states acting in accordance with US policy.
- WMD would not be viewed as “bad” in and of themselves; rather, the character of the state obtaining WMD would be the primary criterion for counterproliferation efforts.
- Arab friends and allies would not base regional security on their

Continued on page 8.

The School of Multilateralism

A foreign policy analyst explains what some might also call “liberal internationalism”

Stanley Foundation partner Lawrence J. Korb, senior fellow at the Center for American Progress who served as assistant secretary of Defense from 1981 through 1985, recently gave a speech to the Iowa City Foreign Relations Council titled “National Security in an Age of Terrorists, Tyrants, and Weapons of Mass Destruction.” Among the topics he discussed was the “school” of international politics called multilateralism. Some excerpts:

Certainly you can talk about preemption, particularly of a terrorist group. But the best way to preempt is not through military means. Dry up their financial assets. Share intelligence. Law enforcement. The president himself, in his State of the Union address in 2003, talked about the fact that working with our friends around the world, we dried up \$200 million in money that may have gone to Al Qaeda and we’ve arrested 3,000 suspects. And you’re going to have to do that working with other countries. Because while the United States is powerful, it’s not omnipotent. And it needs the help of other countries if it’s going to win this war against terrorism with a global reach.

The next thing people in this school would argue is that in dealing with the long-term causes of terrorism, you really have to focus on the problem of failed states—that is, states that collapse because they’ve got overwhelming problems of poverty, hunger, disease, lawlessness. These failed states not only become a haven for terrorists—as we saw with Afghanistan and certain countries in Africa—but they drive young people to join these groups because they have no hope in these areas where they live. So what you really ought to do is not spend so much money on the military; you want to spend money on the World Health Organization. You want to spend money on what we call “cooperative threat reduction”...where you go around and you try to get all of this loose material, these “loose nukes”—particularly in the states of the former Soviet Union—so they don’t get in the hands of terrorists who could use them against you.

We have a nonproliferation treaty. We need to get more involved and more engaged in that... An international criminal court would bring these people who violate human rights to justice. The United Nations is a group we started. If we don’t like it and think it’s got some problems, let’s fix the problems. Let’s not just ignore it, because for the most part it does our bidding and what we’re trying to do in the long term is establish standards of behavior... And really those are the things that we should be talking about because they have great potential for safeguarding the security of this country.

While the United States is powerful, it’s not omnipotent. And it needs the help of other countries....

AP/WIDE WORLD PHOTO



The strategy of principled multilateralism assumes that security is sought with other states, rather than against them....

Multilateral Approach. *US Secretary of State Colin Powell meets with international donors to discuss the reconstruction of Iraq.*

own indigenous capabilities—that is, on multilateral cooperation between themselves—but rather on continued dependence on the United States as an outside power who guarantees security on a state-by-state basis through bilateral agreements.

The above strategy, in the end, does not deviate from US policies in previous periods and thus risks more policy failure and regional instability.

A Multilateral Approach

In stark contrast, an “accommodative” or principled multilateral approach to Gulf security would have the following attributes:

- Gulf security would be inclusive. Even if states such as Iran might not be integrated into the collective military structure of US friends and allies, Iran would still be included through myriad eco-

nomie or security ties, as opportunities for common action arose.

- Gulf security would be built on the foundation of a “rule-based order,” in which universal principles would apply to all actors in the Gulf, including the United States.
- There would be a basic recognition of the inherent right to legitimate measures for self-defense on the part of all states in the region, whether or not the United States considered those states to be friends or allies. Thus Iran’s rights to self-defense, including the maintenance of a viable military, would be recognized and allowed.
- The “demand” side of WMD proliferation would be addressed because every actor’s security concerns would be taken into account, directly or indirectly.

- The goal would not be to end competition through regime change, but rather to manage competition between all governments as they are currently constituted.
- WMD would be viewed as a general problem requiring equal rules and constraints that apply to all parties, including the United States and Israel.

The strategy of principled multilateralism assumes that security is sought with other states, rather than against them—and that domestic developments in the Gulf will follow a more beneficial course if all states are gradually intertwined in a web of military and economic agreements that creates strong interdependence among them.

—Michael Kraig

Playing for Life

Learning the flute spared former Cambodian refugee from death

Playing the flute literally saved the life of former Cambodian refugee Arn Chorn-Pond.

Chorn-Pond was a nine-year-old boy in 1975 when the Khmer Rouge, a group of ultra Maoist rebels, seized power in Cambodia. An estimated 1.7 million people died as the reign of leader Pol Pot and his followers brought chaos, brutality, and starvation to the small Southeast Asian country.

The rebels separated Chorn-Pond from his family and held him in a temple with 700 other children.

“The Khmer Rouge were crazy,” he said. “They were going to start a music and dance troupe to entertain [their leaders].”

Taught by an older man later killed by the Khmer Rouge, Chorn-Pond learned to play the flute. Three other children were unsuccessful and the rebels killed them also, he said. The Khmer Rouge also forced Chorn-Pond to play in a nearby orange grove while they murdered Cambodians around him.

‘Escaped With the Music’

Chorn-Pond closed his eyes, numbing himself to the horror. “I escaped with the music. I played it and my mind would be somewhere else.”

The Khmer Rouge forced Chorn-Pond to become a child soldier when the Vietnamese invaded Cambodia in 1979. He finally escaped into the jungle, eventually finding his way to a Thai refugee camp.

“I lived two years in the camp. Then one night this guy stepped on me. He was like 250 pounds. I

screamed. He bent down, and I hung on him and wouldn’t let go, like a little monkey.”

That man, Lutheran minister and refugee camp worker Peter Pond, brought Chorn-Pond and several other children to New Hampshire where he and his wife adopted them.

No More Nightmares?

Today, Chorn-Pond still plays the flute with his eyes closed. But when he opens them these days he usually sees children. Part of Chorn-Pond’s therapy is traveling around America playing for school kids and spreading his message of tolerance.

“It sometimes make me hurt to hear you guys call each other names,” Chorn-Pond recently told an assembly of students at an Iowa middle school. “Caring and respecting each other feels good.”

Two years ago Chorn-Pond decided to make his home in Cambodia

again. But he travels to the United States frequently to raise funds for his many projects, which include a community service program for Cambodian children, a gang intervention program, and a project to find former Cambodian cultural masters. Chorn-Pond estimates that the Khmer Rouge killed 90 percent of the country’s artists, musicians, and dancers.

As for the future, Chorn-Pond wishes for world peace and a good night’s sleep.

“America can make McDonald’s popular, we can make peace popular,” he said. “Before I die I want to have one good dream, no more nightmares. I don’t think it’s too much to ask, for a 12-year-old child that probably is still in the jungle holding a gun, and I’m still calling him to come. And I want to wish that for him.”

—Cliff Brockman

“Before I die I want to have one good dream, no more nightmares.”



Survivor. Arn Chorn-Pond

Resources.

Arn Chorn-Pond is the subject of a documentary film released last year called “The Flute Player.” For more information about the documentary, visit www.commongroundradio.org.

The New Stanley Foundation

Our plan to give multilateralism a better chance of being understood and used

Regular readers of *Courier* know that this space is usually reserved for advertisements for *World Press Review* and *Common Ground*, the Stanley Foundation-sponsored monthly magazine and weekly radio program. No more. This spring, the foundation closed down both enterprises.

This has been an extremely difficult decision. The May 2004 issue of *World Press Review*—the last to be published—marked the 30th anniversary of foundation and Stanley family support for the magazine

that brought information and perspectives from around the world to a predominantly US readership. *Common Ground*, radio's weekly program on world affairs—aimed primarily at the public radio audience—first hit the airwaves in October 1980. And so it has completed a nearly 24-year run.

The fact that we have grown attached to these two products is only one reason that the decision was hard. We are also proud of the work that has been done under these two banners. We have had the great privilege to work with top-flight journalists and other professionals who operated with exceptionally high standards.

However, the media environment today is much different from the one of two or three decades ago. There are many more information and communication channels, and many of those channels operate globally. The resources required to work in this environment have

grown. And, after a lengthy strategic planning process and review, the Stanley Foundation has decided to focus its resources more sharply—toward promoting and building support for principled multilateralism in addressing international issues.

Principled multilateralism is kind of a five-dollar term for a common sense idea, an idea that the foundation has espoused from its inception in 1956. The foundation has always sought a secure peace with

perspectives, and to find and develop workable bargains and win-win solutions that are built on sound principles and norms.

Principled multilateralism encompasses this course of action. And we plan to give multilateral approaches to addressing problems a better chance of being understood and used.

We are not going to stop our communication efforts. There is a story to be told about the options that

...the Stanley Foundation has decided to focus its resources more sharply—toward promoting and building support for principled multilateralism in addressing international issues.

freedom and justice, built on world citizenship and effective global governance, and this hasn't changed. To that end, we encourage greater reliance on principled international collaboration, cooperation, the rule of law, agreements, and effective institutions. There's a reason for that.

Our world is increasingly interconnected and interdependent. Business and economic activity is more and more globalized. Groups of citizens, including those with good motives and those with bad, operate across national boundaries and influence outcomes. The survival issues of the future are beyond the control of any one or a few nations. In these circumstances the wise course is to work constructively with others, to understand each other's needs and

our country and the world face, and we want to be a part of telling that story. But to accomplish that, our communication efforts need to be more closely integrated with other program activities, including meetings and seminars.

The passing of two old friends, *Common Ground* and *World Press Review*, brings a touch of sadness. But it also gives us an opportunity to invent some new things. We hope that you who are readers of *Courier* and friends of the Stanley Foundation will come back to read future issues of this publication and watch as we grow into something new.

—Jeffrey Martin



Jeffrey G. Martin
Executive Vice President
Director of Programs
The Stanley Foundation



J. BEESLEY/OXFAM GB

SAMY HADDAD

[Peace, Love, Kum ba yah?](#)

Is the United Nations Still Relevant?

Foundation radio documentary explores the future of 60-year-old institution



The United Nations was formed nearly six decades ago to maintain international peace and security, protect basic human rights, foster social progress, and promote international law. It has survived the Cold War, dozens of hot wars, and lukewarm support.

But in the post-9/11 world, is the United Nations still relevant?

A new Stanley Foundation public radio documentary, "UNder Fire: The United Nations' Battle for Relevance," tackles this question with expert insight and field

reports from some of the world's toughest hot spots. From its world headquarters in New York to the people it reaches worldwide, the program explores how the United Nations struggles to meet the complex challenges of human need in every corner of the globe.

David Brancaccio, co-host of *NOW with Bill Moyers* and former anchor of *Marketplace*, hosts and reports for the special, one-hour documentary.

The special will debut in June. For more information about the program, check out the program Web site at underfire.org.

Did You Know?

The United Nations costs every American man, woman, and child in the United States about \$7.50 annually—roughly the cost of a single pack of cigarettes in New York City, or in total the equivalent of one \$2.2 billion B-2 "stealth" bomber.

The Stanley Foundation
209 Iowa Avenue
Muscatine, Iowa 52761

Address Service Requested

Nonprofit Org.
 U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
 Cedar Rapids, IA
 Permit 174