

Alternatively, foreign intervention has also generated negative impacts in El Salvador. Involvement of the United States in the civil war could be examined based on its 'success' in averting the spread of Communism in Central America, based on Cold War mentalities and justifications. Or, one could consider how superpower interests and 'west versus the rest' attitudes lengthened the war, where dialogue and negotiations was never considered an option until the fall of the Berlin wall.

Overall, foreign intervention will always influence the lives of those that they choose to involve themselves in. It is through their choices of action and inaction, and the strategy of intervention that determines whether it helps perpetuate the *institutionalization* of fear, or the transition towards peace. For instance, the United States' choice to use brute military force to *aid* El Salvador resolve its civil war -- instead of addressing the underlying social and economic interests -- indirectly helped maintain structures within the country responsible for human rights violations, rather than deal with more difficult issues.

Fear becomes institutionalized when those with the ability to prevent violence and fear choose not to; when these same people choose to benefit at the expense of others, who often give up not only their livelihoods, but also life itself. It is institutionalized, when the oppressed choose to remain silent. As simplistic as these statements seem, ultimately, everything is a matter of choice. We may not always have the power to create all the desirable 'options', but even to the smallest degree, there will always be a decision to be made, whether it is the choice of silence or death, or the use of dialogue instead of fists.

Amidst the complexities of each situation in which certain variables may only be modified by an elite few, one may still strive towards achieving a legacy of peace, and the creation of conditions in which human development may occur, and human security established.

Thus, the types of foreign intervention discussed above have helped to create a window of opportunity by addressing and publicly criticizing the problems of El Salvador's government and political structure. In order to promote long-term stability and achieve human security, conflict management solutions that do not rely upon violence must be institutionalized and ingrained in all levels of society. All citizens must learn the value of using dialogue over violence.

But, in order to remove the 'institutionalized fear,' a feasible alternative must be created. Is democracy the solution? Will it rid the system of the deep historically rooted mesh of corruption within the military, government, economic elites, and judiciary system? Or, will El Salvador's old corrupt system find new loopholes and avenues within 'democracy' to ensure its needs and interests are met? Overcoming this hurdle will require a great deal more than a peace accord, dialogue, and international observation units. At this point in El Salvador's history, the quest for a *legacy of peace* is still but an ambitious dream...