

 **Conflict Prevention & Resolution Forum**

**SERIES ON DEFENSE, DEVELOPMENT, AND DIPLOMACY (3DS)  
APPROACH TO FOREIGN POLICY**

**FEBRUARY 2009 – OCTOBER 2010**



## Preface

By Susan Collin Marks

Search for Common Ground (Search) started the Conflict Prevention and Resolution Forum (CPRF) in 1999. Despite the hundreds of forums that took place every day in Washington at the time, there was no such venue for sustained discussion that approached important policy issues through the lens of preventing or resolving violent conflicts. The CPRF filled this gap. As Nancy Bearg, former National Security Advisor to then-Vice President George H. W. Bush has said of the CPRF, “there is no other forum in Washington that brings such a diversity of people together, representing a cross-section of stakeholders in government, NGOs, multilateral institutions, think-tanks and policy people focused on conflict prevention and resolution.”

The idea for on-going discussion forums came from my experience in the South African peace process, where we convened forums of all types on issues of key importance to the formation of our new government. It was a way for people to come together for the first time across socioeconomic, political and racial lines to talk about the future of their country. We had forums covering topics such as transportation, education, health, and local government, and we met month after month every week for four to five hours at a time.

I arrived in Washington in 1994. After a trip to establish Search’s program in Burundi, we returned to Washington to start the Burundi Policy Forum, and then the Great Lakes Policy Forum (GLPF)—modeled off the forums we had convened in South Africa. The purpose was to bring together all arms of government – policy-makers and legislators, the US Agency for International Development, the US Department of State and the Department of Defense – with the NGO and multilateral sectors in order to address policy in the Great Lakes region in a collaborative process. We discovered that each sector brought something unique and essential to the discussion: government makes legislation and has power; NGOs have access and are trusted on the ground; and multilateral institutions bring a legitimacy that stretches across regions.

GLPF became institutionalized in Washington. Never before had people from various disciplines been brought together in this way. The result was nothing other than transformational. Various Ambassadors came, people from media, business, and academic sectors, and at one point the CIA became involved. People in the US government found it the most useful and interesting. We had meetings at the White House, and Ambassadors were quoted as saying “This isn’t just interesting, it is a necessity.” The GLPF became a source of information that people could not otherwise get as well as a platform for officials to share ideas with an expert audience.

In 1999, Search developed a forum that aimed to address a wider range of issues through the lens of conflict prevention and resolution. The CPRF was started on the same principle of partnership as the GLPF, modeled by the diverse co-sponsorship of the forum which includes organizations that specialize in conflict resolution and public policy formulation.

The consistency of the monthly CPRF is essential to making it part of people’s life cycles in Washington. The overall makeup of the audience changes month-to-month, but many of the same faces appear again and again to participate in discussions like:

- The Role of the Military in Peacekeeping
- Conflict Resolution & Negotiation in Latin America: Opportunities & Obstacles
- Renegotiating an Effective Non-Proliferation Regime
- Inclusion in Peace Processes: Who Should Have a Seat at the Table?
- Children in Armed Conflict
- Isolation vs. Engagement: When Diplomats Do Their Job.
- Toward a Bi-Partisan Foreign Policy: What Can Religious Leaders Contribute
- Investing in Peace: Taking Conflict Resolution and Development to Scale

We have hosted such speakers as former US Senator Chuck Hagel (R-NE); former US Representative Lee Hamilton (D-IN); current National Security Special Dennis Ross; *Washington Post* columnist Jim Hoagland and writer Karen DeYoung; *Washington Times* writer Barbara Slavin; former Administrator of USAID Brian Atwood; and renowned mediation expert William Ury.

The special series we conducted on Defense, Development and Diplomacy (3Ds) in 2009 represents the vision we attempt to bring to Washington through the CPRF. It is a direct actualization of the common ground approach of understanding the differences and acting on the commonalities. When different sectors, however they are cast, bring the best of what they know and what they can do to the table, and work together through joint problem-solving for the common good, then good things happen. The way you use development can either cause conflict or heal it. There is no peace without development and vice versa. South Africa dealt with this nexus on a daily basis.

## Introduction

By Lisa Schirch

### From Realist to Constructivist Approaches to Foreign Policy

The Conflict Prevention and Resolution Forum (CPRF) undertook this year-long series of dialogues because there seemed to be a small but growing discussion among policymakers in Washington DC supporting the goals of preventive action and identifying the need for greater investments in development and diplomacy.

The debacles in Iraq and Afghanistan created a space in Washington to ask bigger questions. Realist theories that viewed international relations solely as a calculus of balance of power lost ground as the fantasy of quick firepower solutions failed. In both of these countries, constructivist theories of foreign policy—where government creates systems to address human needs—began to take shape. Military and civilian government leaders reached back through history and pulled the concept of nation-building out of its grave. The rhetoric in Washington began pairing the soft power, persuasive strategies of development and diplomacy with the military's hard power, defensive strategies.



Against the backdrop of the failures in Iraq and Afghanistan, civil society also entered the conversation by supporting greater rhetoric linking human rights, participatory democracy, and sustainable, locally-led development. Civil society put forth a broader *human security* agenda focused on both civilian protection and the rights of individuals and communities. Shifting conceptions of security mean the possibility of greater investments in development and diplomacy and the recognition of the links between national and global security.

Thus, military, government, and civil society leaders alike came to condemn the severe imbalances between civilian and military actors' resources, capacity and expertise. Many argued for new measures to fund, identify, recruit, train and deploy civilian experts in both government and civil society at both the strategic planning and operational planning levels. Strategic planning for civilian missions requires knowledge and experience in the areas of civilian-crisis response, such as strengthening police, the rule of law, civilian administration and civilian protection. In this new policy context, the best practices and lessons learned by civil society organizations, many with decades of experience in preventive action, peacebuilding, reconstruction and stabilization efforts, were thought to be particularly valuable to government and military personnel with less experience in these areas.

But the initial enthusiasm about a new “soft power” approach to security faced complications.

### Different Versions of “3D”

What does it mean for the US to take a 3D—development, diplomacy, and defense—approach to foreign policy? This collection of reports from the yearlong series of forums on this question yields no definitive answer. Indeed, the pages of this report buckle under the weight of diversity of thought laden herein.

To some, a 3D approach means orienting all elements of national power around short-term political and security goals, defined by a very narrow interpretation of what constitutes US national interests. On the ground in places like Iraq, Afghanistan, Somalia, and Colombia, this means orienting development and diplomatic efforts toward counterinsurgency military efforts. As a result, USAID dollars get spent in nations and communities where insurgency is growing rather than where development is most needed or possible. In this view, the Department of Defense “pushes a plough at the tip of a spear.”

Many civil society groups shudder at the concept of a 3D or whole-of-government approach: for them, it has come to mean navigating a quagmire of hijacked NGOs and development dollars to fight the war on terror. They point to ever-increasing violence against humanitarian aid workers and shrinking humanitarian space, along with the increasingly blurry lines between civil society, political and military personnel and goals.

NGOs rightly resist being used as implementers in someone else's foreign policy strategy—especially when the strategy has little to do with principled poverty reduction and sustainable peace and development.

Thankfully, this is not the only model of a comprehensive approach to foreign policy. Ideally, a 3D approach to foreign policy means a more balanced budgeting of resources among development, diplomacy and defense; while bringing all elements of national power to issues of civilian protection and the broader human security of people and communities.

What surfaces from the diversity of thought in this report are three more specific questions. First, "What are U.S. interests and goals for security and foreign policy in the 21<sup>st</sup> century?" Many speakers in the CPRF forum point to this underlying question. After all, development, diplomacy and defense are tools, not goals. These tools can be used to protect human security or to maintain US global dominance. While these goals may not be mutually exclusive, some have argued—as reported in the pages here—that there are times when we have to choose between overall human security and more narrowly-defined national interests.

This report also asks a second deeper question: "Will government, military, and civil society engage with each other in an approach that *integrates* development, diplomacy and defense strategies or rather, will a 3D approach recognize the importance of each and *protect the unique mission* and approach of development, diplomacy and defense strategies?" This ongoing discussion in Washington's policy corridors is far from over. One strand of this conversation is touched on here: this report covers some of the historical struggle between locating USAID under the control of the State Department's shorter-term political imperatives and creating a separate US Department of Development that could focus on longer-term development issues.

Finally, the report draws attention to the role of civil society in US foreign policy efforts to build global peace and security. What is the role of civil society—including religious leaders, media, NGOs, universities and other nongovernmental and nonprofit groups—in addressing the root causes of conflict and fostering processes for peace? How does civil society's unofficial diplomatic and development efforts in conflict-affected regions relate to the US interagency or whole-of-government approach? While civil society is not often "at the policy table" when assessment and planning takes place in Washington, they have much to offer these discussions. Specifically, civil society aims to influence the definition of security by highlighting core national values of democratic decision-making, human rights, and human development. How do relatively small but experienced civil society organizations have an impact on how conflict and security are understood; what goals for security are set; and what methods are used to achieve said security?

This report summarizes this broader discussion. Do we use development funds and diplomacy to bend hearts and minds toward political leaders abroad, giving the U.S. short-term access to natural resources or protecting geopolitical interests related to global power dynamics? Or are development and diplomacy fundamentally about building a shared vision of freedom, participatory governance, and human rights? Does civil society have a role in security sector oversight, or are civil society groups simply implementers of a government-defined foreign policy?

### **Conflict Prevention and Resolution Approach to Dialogue on US Foreign Policy**

There is no consensus in these pages or among Washington's policymakers. What is clear is that the dialogue must continue. The sponsors of the Conflict Prevention and Resolution Forum draw on principles and practices that define our profession.

The field of conflict prevention and resolution, also known as peacebuilding, includes NGOs, religious leaders, media professionals, business and other public sectors. While this “peacebuilding community” shares many principles and programs with the development, human rights, and humanitarian sectors, it is also unique in a number of ways. These underlying principles of conflict prevention and resolution, rooted in the wider field of peacebuilding, form the foundation of the CPRF model.

# 1

## **Multi-Stakeholder Processes**

Government, military and civil society are all necessary stakeholders when discussing foreign policy; no single group can build lasting peace or security without a comprehensive approach. Civil society actors heavily debate the principles and protocols for this multi-stakeholder comprehensive approach in terms of leadership and group relations. However valid these conflicts and concerns may be, they do not discount the core value of creating multi-stakeholder policy dialogues. The CPRF exists precisely *because* there are different points of view, and in order to find effective solutions, these diverse viewpoints must engage.

# 2

## **Engage and Build Relationships and Networks**

The basic theory of change in conflict prevention and resolution is a strategy of engagement: change comes not out of isolation or separation, but from relationships, even when groups perceive themselves as vastly different from each other. Communication and networking among diverse stakeholders is also seen as important.

Civil society organizations involved in security sector reform; disarmament, demobilization and reintegration; and other reconciliation and broader peacebuilding efforts already share space and some goals with military actors in some regions of the world. Many of these civil society organizations have already determined that it is in their interest to set up clearer lines of communication with military actors and remain more open to the possibility of collaboration in certain contexts.

# 3

## **Conflict Assessment – Identify Differences & Common Ground**

Dialogue forums such as CPRF serve as ongoing mechanisms for multi-stakeholder conflict assessment. At an operational level, conflict assessment processes increase understanding and transform perceptions between polarized groups by both identifying differences and exploring common ground. In this forum, the principles of facilitated dialogue help address conflicts in public and foreign policy.

At a time when many in the humanitarian aid community are ending or limiting any communication with the military, civil society organizations coming from the field of conflict prevention and resolution approach these challenges by walking toward the conflict rather than away from it. Conflict prevention and resolution processes help people with vastly different sets of experiences and beliefs find a way to both listen and talk with each other to foster better understanding. Learning to see the world from a different point of view is a first step in identifying key issues and exploring options for addressing tensions.

Peacebuilding practitioners have a long history of engaging directly with armed actors on all sides of a conflict around the world. A number of peacebuilding organizations have begun efforts to engage in dialogue directly with members of the US military. The CPRF is a facilitated, public forum using the principles of respectful listening and dialogue where this civil society-military dialogue and civil society-government dialogue can take place.

## Reshaping the Foreign Policy Bureaucracy

10 February 2009

**SUSAN COLLIN MARKS (MODERATOR)** – Senior Vice President, Search for Common Ground

**AMBASSADOR WENDY CHAMBERLIN** – President, Middle East Institute

**KAREN DEYOUNG** – Associate Editor, *The Washington Post*

**SAMUEL LEWIS** – Former Director of Policy Planning and Former Ambassador to Israel, U.S. Department of State

**RICHARD MOOSE** – Former Under Secretary of Management, U.S. Department of State

*This forum was the first in a series on Defense, Development, and Diplomacy, and examined the pivotal transitional time for the State Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) in the immediate aftermath of President Obama's inauguration in January 2009. This panel explored the following questions: What structural and cultural changes should occur in order for State and AID to successfully execute this new foreign policy agenda? How would these changes ultimately lead to better policy-making and national security?*



Former Ambassador to Pakistan and current President of the Middle East Institute **Wendy Chamberlin** opened February's Conflict Prevention and Resolution Forum (CPRF) by highlighting President Obama's and Secretary of State Clinton's sentiments toward the United States' current approach to foreign policy strategy. She noted that "during their campaigns, both [Clinton and Obama] decried the over-militarization of our diplomacy," and have expressed a desire to "restore the balance" among the State Department, USAID, the Department of Defense and the National Security Council. Amb. Chamberlin highlighted that President Obama's first visit to an executive agency was to the State Department, emphasizing his "sincere interest" in reworking the bureaucratic framework to allow for the best execution of diplomacy. Furthermore Amb. Chamberlin continued, "He sent out a clear message when he appointed Clinton, and he demonstrated confidence in his own leadership when he asked [Secretary of Defense Robert] Gates to stay on. We need these three top leaders to be committed to development."

Amb. Chamberlin, a former head of the USAID Asia and Near East Bureau, also spoke about that agency's position within the current foreign policy agenda. "USAID has been beaten up and distorted. It is now an agency that contracts out to [non-governmental organizations (NGOs)] and for-profit organizations." The ambassador outlined three possible scenarios for the future of USAID within the Obama administration:

1. USAID could become an empowered, independent cabinet-level agency;
2. It could be reworked as an entity within the State Department; or
3. There could be an invigorated effort to rebuild the structure of USAID, pulling in the outliers such as the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), the Millennium Challenge Corporation, and other programs that have been administered outside of the agency but fall within its scope.

The ambassador concluded her presentation by proposing some indicators that might gauge the administration's commitment to the restructuring process at USAID. She specifically targeted the importance of the agency's leadership, asking, "[Will] President Obama and Secretary Clinton assign a high profile superstar as minister of AID... who is skilled in change management and... who will have a regular seat at the table at cabinet meetings?" Finally, she underlined the importance of a new USAID being "fully empowered to control [its] own budget and planning."

Panelist **Richard Moose**, former Under Secretary of Management at the Department of State, spoke about interagency and departmental cooperation. "A successful State [Department] and a successful start toward reinvigorating diplomacy must begin with important changes... mostly its outlook on development and public diplomacy, [but] also breaking down the divisive attitudes and combative habits of various

bureaucracies.” In order to achieve this, Mr. Moose called on department leadership to act, saying this process “must be led by example, especially from the top [by] Secretary Clinton.”

Mr. Moose continued by calling on the State Department to re-evaluate how it values and fosters leadership. “There are significant managerial issues at the State Department. The Department must build an effective, sustained interest in its resources, mainly its personnel. It is of utmost importance to the quality of US diplomacy for the State Department to focus on its competence and career development, including how its Foreign Service Officers are selected and trained.” As an example of inter-department cooperation, he cited how State could learn from the Armed Forces: “Military services show that you can nourish leadership if you concentrate on doing so.”

While Mr. Moose acknowledged a budgeting gap, he emphasized a necessary shift in leadership mentality to make change happen, stating that “money could make it possible, but it also needs to be a cultural revolution. The Secretary has to lead that effort.”

The next panelist, former US Ambassador to Israel **Sam Lewis**, echoed Mr. Moose’s comments about changing institutional mentality, starting at high-level department positions. “Substantive change must start at the top. A system that brokers fairly different points of views [must be established], and that will only happen in the White House and at the secretarial level.” The ambassador continued by calling on President Obama to set the tone, saying that “a lot depends on the President and...the personalities of the players. It is important for there to be coordination and interagency transparency.”

Amb. Lewis then related this issue to his experience in the Middle East, commenting on the importance of employing diplomatic approaches within the greater security paradigm. “Concerning Israel-Palestine, serious diplomatic attention has been paid to human rights issues there. The Gaza situation will require a huge USAID role, but you cannot rebuild places until you see some modicum increase in the security situation.” Amb. Lewis also reflected on the necessity of evaluating the efficacy of existing diplomatic approaches. He admitted, “We don’t have an answer for [the Middle East yet, but] despite all of the problems in Iraq and Afghanistan, a lot has been learned. We need to preserve knowledge and come up with new strategies of how to use it.”

Speaking last, Associate Editor at *The Washington Post* **Karen DeYoung** recalled Secretary Clinton’s pledge to restore functional powers at the State Department by “taking back” the authorities that the Department has lost. Ms. DeYoung went on to underline the difficulties Clinton will face in pursuing this goal, based on the current wars in both Iraq and Afghanistan as well as the military’s foray into development work in places such as Djibouti. She closed by echoing the call for transparency and leadership made by the other panelists and praising former Secretary of State Colin Powell: “He was successful in the Department of State because he brought a military sense to it. He thought you cannot have a structure that is not transparent.”



## A New Direction for USAID—At Home and Abroad

10 March 2009

**RICK BARTON (MODERATOR)** – Senior Advisor, Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) International Security Program; Co-Director, Post-Conflict Reconstruction Project

**GORDON ADAMS** – Distinguished Fellow, Henry L. Stimson Center; Professor U.S. Foreign Policy, American University

**RAYMOND SHONHOLTZ** – *Founder and President, Partners for Democratic Change*



*This second forum in the 3D series looked at the proposed cabinet-level development agency, and the new pathways the Obama administration might pursue to increase collaboration and cooperation between the development community and the various arms of the U.S. foreign policy establishment. What are the right solutions to the bureaucratic roadblocks? How could these changes ultimately lead to better structures and better-implemented foreign policy? What are the challenges in appropriating more money in Congress for USAID?*

Moderator **Rick Barton**, a Senior Advisor at the CSIS International Security Program, set the stage at March's CPRF by explaining that the climate is right for changing U.S. development policy and bureaucracy. "There is a feeling that we are at a special moment here in Washington, maybe a time of harmonic convergence, where the national security establishment might be ready to address America's asymmetric civilian capacities and resources, and produce a more effective way forward." Mr. Barton continued, citing the recent activity of senior officials, "We've heard and read...Secretary Gate's speeches, we've seen that many people in the Congress are ready to re-draft enabling legislation. We've read about President Obama's doubling of the budget over the next five years; we've seen Secretary Clinton's visit to USAID on her second day in office."

Panelist **Gordon Adams**, a Distinguished Fellow at the Stimson Center and a Professor of U.S. Foreign Policy at American University, opened his remarks by asking some fundamental questions. "How do you rebalance the tool of American statecraft? How do we get economic policy, trade policy, investment policy and security all marching together, to help countries avoid a slide into disaster, and to recover from what could be a very prolonged and very severe economic crisis internationally?" Mr. Adams continued by reaffirming the sentiments of many previous CPRF panelists, stating that "with this administration and with the problems...we are facing, I think we have a unique opportunity to set that target well in our sights and make some real progress."

Mr. Adams noted the ongoing lack of integration and strategic planning within and across the US foreign affairs agencies and went on to suggest key areas that demand attention in order to revamp U.S. statecraft. First, he detailed his concerns about the "weaknesses of the State Department in strategic planning, in program thinking, in program management, in integrated budgeting..." but emphasized that "the chance to do something about that is enormous today." Specifically, Mr. Adams felt that the appointment of Hillary Clinton to Secretary of State and Jack Lou as Deputy Secretary of State—two officials who have substantial diplomatic and managerial experience—will enhance the Department's ability to address these issues.

Mr. Adams continued, "[The Department of] State is a culture of report, represent and negotiate. It is not necessarily a culture of program and build and management and strategic planning...it seriously needs to become that." Adams suggested that the Department shift its focus to, "what kind of people do we recruit as the frontline of America's global engagement, how do we train them, where do we assign them, how do we incentive-ize them to work across agency, how do we define their mission so that it incorporates thinking both long-term and short-term and the connection between the two?"

Mr. Adams' second point shifted to the disarray in international development and "how to rebuild a human resources capability in USAID." With so many government departments and agencies participating in development activities, there has been a loss of centralized cooperation and coordination—a role USAID can and should fill as the government's primary department focused on development. USAID needs to

ensure it has the expertise and capacity to tackle a wide range of development issues while concurrently strategizing with the US State Department and Department of Defense.

Mr. Adams' third point focused on changing the United States' approach to engaging with post-conflict situations abroad. "The [Defense] Secretary has given a lot of voice to the desire to rebuild the [affected] states' capacity, to do security assistance, to do post-conflict reconstruction and stabilization operations, to do development assistance." While supporting the overarching goals, Mr. Adams called for a "re-migration back to the civilian agencies" of the many new tasks the defense department has adopted in recent years.

Next, **Raymond Shonholtz**, the *Founder and President of Partners for Democratic Change*, spoke about the changes he envisions happening at USAID, couched in a theoretical example of an environmental development program in Afghanistan. "The mission director in Afghanistan... wants to set up a water and sanitation program. He wants this program to be managed in three years by Afghans in that region and he wants it to be self-sufficient in six years. That is, he wants it to pay for itself. Just doing that is real tricky under AID rules. [It] would be hard to get that [Request for Application (RFA)] or [Request for Proposal (RFP)] out for the agency. Under our [just]-envisioned, newly-reformed Gordon Adams approach, we can do that (because) we have an agency dedicated to development that is behaving in one of its critical dimensions—basically aggregating its responsibility."

Mr. Shonholtz continued, emphasizing the improved efficiency the development community—both at home and abroad—could expect under the "new" USAID. "What we [would] begin to see is that world experience of knowledge aggregated, so that our person who is running the innovation office for the mission director [gets] an improved product."

In conclusion, Mr. Shonholtz discussed how young professionals are already equipped with the tools needed to effectively operate in this new USAID environment. "They have [technological] knowledge, they can do the crowd-sourcing process, they can get knowledge and put it up, they can aggregate the information, they have [those skills] already...They are coming out of a culture that's tech savvy."

## Toward a New Security Framework: Civil-Military Relations and Interagency Coordination

14 April 2009

**LISA SCHIRCH (MODERATOR)** – Director, 3D Security Initiative

**LT. COL. SHANNON BEEBE**– Former Senior Africa Analyst, Office of U.S. Army Deputy Chief of Staff

**REUBEN BRIGETY** – Director, Sustainable Security Program, Center for American Progress

**BARAK A. SALMONI** – Full Political Scientist, RAND Corporation



*Defense Secretary Robert Gates said, “We need to strengthen America’s nonmilitary instruments of national power... [and] look at the underlying bureaucratic structure of the U.S. national security apparatus.” As the foreign policy community broadens its conception of security, the Department of Defense is also called to reexamine and renegotiate its role, structure and strategy in relation to other government agencies and civil institutions. The third forum explored the best ways to address appeals from various sectors for more interagency coordination and cooperation. The panelists discussed to what extent and in what contexts the military should work with civilian organizations and the Department of State to effectively achieve their objectives.*

Panelist **Reuben Brigety**, Director of the Sustainable Security Program at the Center for American Progress, spoke of the importance of reorganizing the development and defense bureaucracies: “Bureaucratic challenges involving the 3Ds [defense, development and diplomacy] are important right now...even though it might seem arcane and boring. Some might think that we don’t need to reform the architecture, but bureaucratic structures matter profoundly. It matters for building a framework for new policy. It is also important to look at the distribution of resources because we need a bureaucratic structure that provides resources to agencies to sustain them.”

Dr. Brigety continued by highlighting the recent example of the U.S. invasion of Iraq: “I submit to you that we would not have had the profound problems in the initial stages of the Iraq War had our development professionals been accorded a seat at the table in the planning process leading up to the invasion... we can’t afford to have that kind of failure of policy again, and one of the best ways to do that is to change the bureaucratic structures...The government of the United States has a vital interest in the correct performance of both fundamental long-term assistance and instrumental, short-term assistance. We have to have a bureaucratic structure which protects both of those missions.”

Dr. Brigety also proposed creating a cabinet-level development agency: “At the Center for American Progress, we are on record in stating that we think the best way to go forward is to have a cabinet-level development agency, not unlike what the British have in DFID [Department for International Development].” In terms of moving forward, Dr. Brigety proposed training more development professionals to be tactical development advisors. The practical aim, he argued, should be to provide each “tactical unit that is deployed to the field [with] on-site development expertise.”

Dr. Brigety ended emphatically by stating, “We are not going to be able to get an effective 3D balance unless we change our bureaucratic structures; the optimal way to do that is with a cabinet-level development agency. ...The most important things that need to happen near-term are an increase in development of professional staff, changing resources, and...a national strategy for global development.”

**Barak Salmoni**, a political scientist at the RAND Corporation, focused on the training elements needed for new leaders within the human security field: “We definitely need to have development education from the tactical to strategic level—at all levels of security... leaders of the different agencies in the U.S. should be versatile and agile. They should be endowed with new types of skills, including cultural and linguistic skills, and work effectively with other agencies.”

Dr. Salmoni continued, “I’d like to suggest a few different kinds of approaches to education, one of which is to make joint- and non-traditional military education the norm....in order to broaden a military person’s worldview, understand how interagency partners work differently from the military, with different goals... You cannot aggregate your joint- and interagency task-force when you get into zone; it has to be [done] in the educational and training environment... What’s missing is not enough repeated, diverse civilian education... not enough regional expertise sustained over time, and not enough representation of non-combat military in occupational specialties.”

Dr. Salmoni concluded by acknowledging that these types of educational experiences have previously occurred almost by accident: “Many have had opportunities to expand their education beyond merely military education serendipitously, but how do we institutionalize these opportunities? We need to create opportunity spaces, and institutionalize [those] opportunities.”

**Lt. Col. Shannon Beebe** from the Department of Defense concluded the forum with an emphasis on the need for changing the security narrative amongst the different organizational parties involved, including the military: “I would contend that our strategic security narrative that we have today fails at identifying and understanding the challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. We are failing right now as a nation to ask the first order questions of what security is... Security is not defense, defense does not equal security. It is not about kinetics, it is about conditions.”

Lt. Col. Beebe continued with several examples of new security threats: “When was the last time that a mosquito was a threat to the United States? When was the last time that dirty water was a threat to the United States? When was the last time that someone living on less than a dollar a day was a threat to the United States?...I would contend probably not until now. These challenges are not going to be won at the point of a gun. This is the challenge that we have...our security narrative. The narrative has to change.”

“Is it possibly the case that we are creating more terrorists than we can possibly kill by allowing these creeping vulnerabilities to continue to grow until they are a kinetic threat?” continued Lt. Col Beebe. “Right now we do not have the context to bring communities of interest together. We have to have a language between NGOs and the military where they can talk to each other and understand each other.”

From his own experience as a former Africa Analyst for the Office of United States Army Deputy Chief of Staff, Lt. Col. Beebe noted “...the four top challenges according to Africans in Africa for security are security sector reform (including reform of the military, police, and the judiciary), the environment, poverty, and health crises. We don’t have a tank or a plane that will counter these problems.”

Lt. Col. Beebe concluded by stating “the world has systemically changed on three axes. It has changed *politically* from a bi-polar to a multi-polar world, creating inherently more instability. It has changed *economically* to a [globalized world] that we still do not understand the ramifications of. And *technologically* it has changed. This is not about the Department of Defense; this is about a more collective type of effort.” (Emphasis added.)

The Lt. Col. emphasized that “this is not Department of Defense trying to invade humanitarian space; this also should not be a scenario in which Department of Defense pushes a plough at the point of a spear. We need to work together. It’s better to be the world’s policemen than to be the world’s firemen—putting out all the fires we created.”

## Crisis and Opportunity: A 3D Approach to Humanitarian Aid in Pakistan

14 July 2009

**LEENA EL-ALI (MODERATOR)** – Program Director, Partners in Humanity, Search for Common Ground  
**AZHAR HUSSAIN** – Vice President, Preventive Diplomacy, International Center for Religion & Diplomacy (ICRD)

**MUKHTAR KHAN** – Analyst, The Jamestown Foundation

**AMBASSADOR RIAZ MOHAMMAD KHAN** – Pakistani Scholar, The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars; Former Ambassador to China, European Union

**REBECCA WINTHROP** – Fellow in Global Economy and Development, Brookings Institution; Former Head of Education, International Rescue Committee

*As Pakistan's armed forces braced for increased operations in the Waziristan tribal region, an estimated 3 million people had already been displaced by the conflict. Pakistani Prime Minister Yousuf Raza Gilani told the Pakistan Parliament that the refugee situation was "the largest internal displacement of Pakistanis since the country's creation in 1947". The international community – and the United States in particular – was called to help. But how best to effectively address the growing humanitarian crisis in the region? What are the best strategies and mechanisms for delivering aid and providing relevant training and support to local institutions? What are the long-term, regional solutions for stability and development? This sixth forum explored how the U.S. and Pakistani governments might partner with non-governmental and community-based organizations in an effort to resolve this crisis.*



The July CPRF commenced with Pakistani journalist and Jamestown Foundation analyst **Mukhtar Khan** describing the immense nature of the crisis in North-West Pakistan. Mr. Khan cited two major factors that have contributed to what he called "the most serious crisis in the history of Pakistan." First, he noted the Pakistani government's lack of preparedness to effectively handle the influx of refugees into surrounding areas; and second, Khan identified the international community's poor commitment to delivering aid money.

Mr. Khan, who maintains contact with refugees from his home region, described how only 20% of all refugees are housed in camps. "Some of those refugees have not been given the financial assistance they were supposed to get. The amount is insufficient; even then they have not received [assistance] because of the government's mismanagement and corruption...and the lack of donor funding." Mr. Khan went on to say, "The UN mandated \$549 million [and the refugees] have received only about 40% [of that sum]." Despite the lack of resources available to them, Mr. Khan stated, "[Internally displaced persons (IDPs)] are reluctant to go back [because] there is no security in the Swat region [and] the Taliban are still at-large."

According to Mr. Khan, Western governments missed a monumental opportunity to effectively engage with the people of the region. "Every crisis is an opportunity," he said. "It was the first time that the people in Pakistan felt that the Taliban was the enemy. This [was] the first time the civilian leadership and military leadership were on the same page... The [United States'] war on terror was also their war on terror."

Mr. Khan concluded by offering some suggestions for future aid efforts. Along with government-led infrastructure and rehabilitation projects, "we should have strategic communication for the refugees on their way back [to their homes]." He continued, "If there is no communication wired in the region, again [the IDPs] will fall into the hands of the Taliban and they will exploit the refugees' weaknesses."

**Rebecca Winthrop**, a Fellow in Global Economy and Development at the Brookings Institution, spoke about the importance of educating the Pakistani women and young girls who will be returning to their homes. At present, only three to eighteen percent of women in the region are literate. The situation is

particularly dire because “560,000 children have been displaced” and “over 285 schools have been destroyed, most of them girls’ schools.”

Amidst the destruction, Ms. Winthrop identified a number of opportunities aid organizations can pursue. “Despite the really dire humanitarian context... there is an opportunity to lay the foundation for long-term socioeconomic development in the region.” Ms. Winthrop described the “ripple effects” of increasing female education: in addition to developing girls’ critical thinking and writing skills, there is a marked improvement in children’s health and general economic well-being when women and girls have access to education.

Pakistani education officials and Western aid organizations also have the opportunity to apply lessons learned from other, similar crises. For example, “in Darfur, despite the humanitarian crisis, more girls are in school [now] than before the conflict began.” Education officials also have the opportunity to implement innovative programs such as home-based and village-based schooling, which could be supplemented by the UN or other aid organizations.

Finally, Ms. Winthrop called on the international community to continue their commitment to funding education while modifying their methods of distribution. “\$300 million has been pledged for education... and only 17% has been delivered.”

**Ambassador Riaz Mohammad Khan**, a Pakistan Scholar at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, spoke about the ramifications this large-scale displacement will have on the future legitimacy of Pakistan’s government. “The people must return to their homes, otherwise it [will] be an even greater failure for the government,” Ambassador Khan said, referring to the steep decline in public support following the conflict; specifically, public frustration vis-à-vis the delay in military response. “Public opinion is very important to the Pakistani Government...The government is committed to taking a long-term approach to addressing the extremism in the North-West region,” including the problems with neighboring Afghanistan.

Amb. Khan called for a strategic campaign against Taliban propaganda as a primary method of establishing peace. He is concerned about the likelihood of Pakistanis being exploited by detractors unless they are “mobilized against extremists” through effective communication strategies by the government. There are many challenges to successfully defeating the Taliban propaganda machine. According to Amb. Khan, the “largest impediment [to] Pakistan’s capacity” to be on guard against extreme factions is their insulation from outside influences and ideas. He also argued that protracted military engagement with the Taliban is ineffective; instead, the focus needs to be redirected towards efforts to restore the economy.

Wrapping up the CPRF was the Vice President of Preventative Diplomacy at the International Center for Religion and Diplomacy, **Azhar Hussain**. Mr. Hussain spoke about the need for a robust, wide-reaching, multi-faceted approach to addressing the conflict in North-West Pakistan, specifically in the vein of democratic reforms vis-à-vis educational development, infrastructure projects, and judicial reform. He advocated for increasing investment in educational centers, particularly vocational and skills-based initiatives. Mr. Hussain also cited the archaic justice system of the region as a primary impediment to civic engagement.

Finally, Mr. Hussain spoke about the role of religious institutions in times of crisis, and the tendency for such institutions to assume the responsibility of providing civilian welfare services. He suggested that the West work with clergy leaders to deliver aid and services and “provide productive systems,” thereby abating the potential spread of religious extremism and militancy.

## The 3Ds in Action: A System-Wide Approach to 21<sup>st</sup> Century Security

8 September 2009

**SUSAN COLLIN MARKS (MODERATOR)** – Senior Vice President, Search for Common Ground

**LOUISE DIAMOND, PH. D.** – President, Global Systems Initiative

**CYNTHIA IRMER** – Senior Conflict Prevention Officer, Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization (S/CRS), U.S. Department of State

**LISA SCHIRCH** – Director, 3D Security Initiative, Eastern Mennonite University

*In her essay 12 Simple Rules of Systems Thinking for Complex Global Issues, Dr. Louise Diamond argues that we face complex and interconnected challenges related to global security, and that “understanding the nature and dynamics of living systems can shed light on how we think about our problems and our resources, and the assumptions and choices we make.” The final forum in this series on defense, diplomacy, and development looked at what is needed to take the 3D approach to scale. What are the organizational challenges to a more coordinated, whole-of-government response to global security challenges? What is the role of civil society? And what might a cohesive foreign policy system look like?*



The September CPRF was the 100<sup>th</sup> session since its inception in 1999. Moderator and Senior Vice President of Search for Common Ground, Susan Collin Marks, opened the discussion by drawing attention to the unique role the CPRF plays in Washington: “There are over 200 forums on any given day in Washington... but we didn’t find any that were focused on finding the commonality between people.” This led SFCG to develop the CPRF, which provides information from a wide variety of perspectives; explores possible solutions to complex conflicts; and provides a secure venue for stakeholders from various disciplines to engage in cross-sector and multi-track problem-solving. In this spirit, the panelists in this forum discuss how security policy can be developed “not from silos, but how each piece of security policy can be linked and strengthened,” acting on the commonalities between each department bureau and agency.

The first panelist, **Dr. Louise Diamond**, President of Global Systems Initiative, spoke about “what is needed to take a systems approach” to addressing global security. Dr. Diamond outlined three major principles related to systems that can help explain how to address security challenges. First is the idea that “all living systems exist within their own unique context: emotional, political, human, et cetera. And [the most important component] within the human context [is] the narrative.” In order to address security throughout a globalized and interconnected world system, Dr. Diamond calls for decision-makers to “challenge the assumptions within those narratives.” In order to fully understand a specific conflict situation, Dr. Diamond suggested “we must articulate and challenge the stories we tell ourselves” about the victims and the oppressors—as well as those roles we assign ourselves as observers.

The second principle related to the new conception of international systems encapsulated by the election of President Obama. “We chose a new worldview,” explained Dr. Diamond. “During the campaign, Obama said over and over again, ‘we’re all in this together.’ We are coming out of a worldview that said ‘it’s us-against-them’ ...based on a ‘scientific’ view of everything being separate.” The latter statement is contrary to the notion that our world is now, more than ever, shaped by web-like systems. Dr. Diamond continued, “we live in an interdependent and interconnected world. [In order to] efficiently work with the world system [we must] look for the places where things have been disconnected... Power [now] lies with who has the greatest number of connections, not who has the largest army.” Specifically, Dr. Diamond noted that the U.S. Department of State has focused many of their projects on empowering disenfranchised women. In essence, this brings nearly half of the world’s population to the table and addresses their narrative.

The final principle put forth by Dr. Diamond was the concept of “emergence” and adaptation to change. “Whole systems are on or over the edge of chaos,” Dr. Diamond stated. Examples include climate systems, biodiversity systems, economic systems, and the system around rogue actors and nuclear weapons. These are old “systems [that] are based on assumptions and premises that no longer exist in a

globalized world.” Dr. Diamond concluded that we must be able to adapt and work with emerging systems.

The next panelist was **Cynthia Irmer**, a Senior Conflict Prevention Officer at the U.S. Department of State, whose presentation and own work represents a holistic government approach to international security. Elaborating on the President's call that we are all in this together, Dr. Irmer argued, “we have a great deal of responsibility, each one of us, [to bring interconnectedness] into our own work...We are a part of an international system.” In a brief critique of past policies, Dr. Irmer spoke about how the United States has previously interacted with the international system as an “other” and not as an integral part of it. Dr. Irmer explained that we cannot battle against it, “we cannot make it what we want but we can constructively work with and influence it.”

Dr. Irmer then highlighted her work in developing the “Interagency Conflict Assessment Framework.” The group brought a “systems perspective into the U.S. government for thinking about how to address conflict in other parts of the world.” Dr. Irmer’s multi-stakeholder group was able to “tell the narratives from departments, agencies and bureaus, identifying core grievances” in conflict situations around the world in an effort to holistically address “the [root] cause of people’s unhappiness.”

Dr. Irmer highlighted one of the group’s key findings, which was the importance of working with the “existing resilience” displayed by people living amidst traumatic conflict. The question for government officials to contemplate in determining their strategies and tactics, explained Dr. Irmer, is “not how do we decapitate a terrorist group, not how to bring down drivers of conflict—but how do we search for and understand the existing resilience [and capacity for peace within a given context] and work with that.”

Dr. Irmer concluded by summarizing her own five principles for dealing with conflict from the systems perspective:

1. The system is a given, and it will only change with influence, not necessarily from abrupt action;
2. One must include the unknown and the unknowable into planning;
3. We must learn how to work with the dynamism of the system, to feed and interact with it;
4. The components of the system are interdependent; and finally
5. Thought and action feed the system—not only what we do, but what we think.

Lisa Schirch, director of the 3D Security Initiative at Eastern Mennonite University, spoke next about the evolutions of systems theory from its application in computer science and ecology to how it can now help us understand international security. Dr. Schirch opened by stating that, like biological systems, international conflicts are systems with no one “cause” creating the conditions for terrorism. Systems are composed of interrelated parts. Each part of a system can only be understood in relationship with every other part. You cannot remove a part of a system—like a terrorist organization, for example—and hope to understand it. All things are understood and knowable in relationship to other things. Dr. Schirch suggested that one must “look at evil action as emerging from a system of action and reaction over decades,” not necessarily as a one-time event or some essential “evil” that can be destroyed without addressing the whole web of causes.

Mainstream media often provides simple “cause-effect” analyses of international conflicts telling us who are the “good guys” and who are the “bad guys.” A systems approach moves away from a “blame” orientation in conflict that isolates specific leaders (Bin Laden) or groups (Al Qaeda) toward an approach that fosters a look at the entire system of causes and effects and the interplay between groups.

Dr. Schirch stated that because parts of a system are interrelated, interventions to stimulate change in a system often have unintended impacts. “The easiest way to shift a system is to focus on those parts of the system closest to us. Each of us has most control over our own behavior in a system.” Schirch continued, arguing that “Rather than focusing on how to change the other parts of a system, most of our efforts in peacebuilding should go into identifying the wisest, most emotionally intelligent ways for ourselves to behave in our systems. A peacebuilding approach spends far more time examining the



endogenous question of ‘why do they hate us?’ rather than the exogenous question of ‘what can we do to reform them?’”

Furthermore, Schirch noted, “security is more than a military problem; if we want sustainable human security we need to think about investing more in development and diplomacy.” She claims that there “needs to be dialogue between the US government and NGOs about grassroots perspectives, [which offer the] ability to talk about human security for everyone.”

## Human Security and the New Rules of War and Peace: A Strategy for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century

20 October 2010

**MARTIN KIMANI (MODERATOR)** – Acting Director, Ansari Africa Center, The Atlantic Council

**LT. COL. SHANNON BEEBE**– Former Senior Africa Analyst, Office of U.S. Army Deputy Chief of Staff

**MARY KALDOR** – Professor and Director, Centre for the Study of Global Governance, London School of Economics and Political Science

*Security is no longer achievable by traditional military strength. Countries no longer face traditional conflicts with clear-cut nation-state enemies. Lieutenant Colonel Shannon Beebe, an expert on Africa in the Department of Defense, and Mary Kaldor, Professor at the London School of Economics, argue that the best way to a safer world is through human security. In their book *The Ultimate Weapon is No Weapon*, Beebe and Kaldor propose that armies should work together with NGOs, charities and other organizations that provide vital aid in troubled regions to end violence, actively protect individuals and communities, and preemptively work to prevent the circumstances and conditions that might contribute to conflict in the future. The division between military and non-military personnel no longer exists in most cases. Military power is not the solution for today's problems – including terrorism. The military should be trained to protect rather than kill. By examining regional conflicts around the world, Beebe and Kaldor explore the challenges of a new century and clarify the complex demands of human security.*

Human security in Africa defines the security of Western societies. Poverty, health, gender-based violence and climate change are conditions that cause insecurity for a large majority of the world's population. Each of these conditions alone might not constitute a major threat for international security, but taken together, they confront the world with immense and complex challenges. Violence and other insecurities are clearly interrelated.

In *The Ultimate Weapon is No Weapon*, **Mary Kaldor** and **Shannon D. Beebe** elaborate on their vision of security. In their words, they wrote a “book of language” and a “book of prayer.” Moving from a kinetics-based to a conditions-defined security is an enormous paradigm shift; this new reality requires new language. Human security cannot be discussed without focusing on human needs. Prayer refers to the hope of contributing to this shift of paradigm.

A huge security gap characterizes today's world. As a result of poverty, diseases and displacement, billions of people live in insecurity. Kaldor and Beebe argue that a new thinking about defense and security needs to focus on protecting people from these threats. Governments and militaries in Western countries have to understand how people in Africa, Asia and Latin-American define their security. Only filling the security gap will assure security in all parts of the world.

In certain cases, the use of force might be necessary to protect people, but tanks and aircraft are of limited use when it comes to achieving this goal. A human security doctrine provides for a clear set of principle for the use of force. Kaldor and Beebe propose UN-mandated “Global Engagement Brigades,” including police, rule of law experts, firefighters, health specialist, militaries and so forth, to be deployed in parts of the world where the state is unable or unwilling to provide security for their people.

“Human security is about spreading the kind of security that we enjoy at home to the world.” Human security is about protecting people, not about defeating an enemy. While the authors admit that there is something utopian about their vision, they defend themselves against the accusation of promoting humanitarian imperialist intervention. In order to bring about changes in the life of people, Kaldor and Beebe argue human security needs to become more than rhetoric.



## Panelist Biographies

### **GORDON ADAMS –**

Distinguished Fellow, Henry L. Stimson Center; Professor U.S. Foreign Policy, American University

Gordon Adams is a Distinguished Fellow at the Stimson Center and a Professor of the U.S. Foreign Policy at American University. Mr. Adams was most recently a Fellow at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. For the previous seven years, he was a professor at the Elliott School of International Affairs, George Washington University and Director of the Schools Security Policy Studies Program. He was previously Deputy Director of the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London, and served for five years as the Associate Director for National Security and International Affairs Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations. Mr. Adams received the Department of Defense Medal for Distinguished Public Service, and has published books, monographs and articles on defense and national security policy, the defense policy process, and on national security budgets.

### **RICK BARTON –**

Senior Advisor, Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) International Security Program; Co-Director, Post-Conflict Reconstruction Project

Frederick Barton is a senior advisor in the Center for Strategic and International Studies' International Security Program, and Co-Director of the Post-Conflict Reconstruction Project. He is currently on the World Economic Forum's Global Agenda Council on Humanitarian Assistance, was a member of the Presidential Transition Agency Review Team on Development Assistance, and was the chair of the Obama for President Subgroup on Post Conflict Reconstruction. He was also a member of the CSIS Commission on Smart Power, cochairman of the Working Group on Stabilization and Reconstruction at the U.S. Institute of Peace, cochairman of the Working Group on Reconstruction and Development at the Princeton Project on National Security, and an expert advisor to the Iraq Study Group and the Task Force on the United Nations.

### **LIEUTENANT COLONEL SHANNON BEEBE –**

Former Senior Africa Analyst, Office of U.S. Army Deputy Chief of Staff

As one of the leading thinkers in the United States on the concept of human security, Lieutenant Colonel Beebe's work explores 21<sup>st</sup> Century concepts of security in Africa. Lieutenant Colonel Beebe has traveled extensively in Africa conducting research in 12 African countries, listening to how Africans view their security. Of particular note, his research has placed special emphasis on the environment as a key to stability in Africa and has worked with numerous international environmental agencies, NGOs, think-tanks, and academia in an attempt to find synergistic solutions. Lieutenant Colonel Beebe is a frequent guest lecturer on African security both in the United States and abroad. He has been featured in a National Geographic Television special on environment and security in Africa. Lieutenant Colonel Beebe received his Bachelor's of Art in Political Science from the United States Military Academy in West Point, and his MA from the University of North Carolina. He recently returned from Angola where he served as the Assistant Army Attaché, US Mission Angola.

### **REUBEN BRIGETY –**

Deputy Assistant Secretary of State at U.S. Department of State

Reuben E. Brigety, II is currently Deputy Assistant Secretary of State with responsibility for US refugee programs in Africa and humanitarian partnerships worldwide. He is the former director of the Sustainable Security Program at Center for American Progress. He is a life member of the Council on Foreign Relations and a recipient of the council's prestigious International Affairs Fellowship. He is the author of *Ethics, Technology and the American Way of War* and a variety of other articles and book chapters. Before entering academia, Brigety was a researcher with the Arms Division of Human Rights Watch

(HRW) where he served on research missions in Afghanistan and Iraq. He also served as HRW's coordinator for crisis management during the Iraq war and as an HRW delegate to the Convention on Conventional Weapons negotiations in Geneva. Brigety is a Distinguished Midshipman Graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy and also holds an MA in Philosophy and a Ph.D. in International Relations from Cambridge University.

### **AMBASSADOR WENDY CHAMBERLIN –**

President, Middle East Institute

Wendy Chamberlin is President of the Middle East Institute (MEI) since March 2007. A 29-year veteran of the US Foreign Service, she was US Ambassador to Pakistan from 2001 to 2002. Ambassador Chamberlin has extensive experience in counter-terrorism, having served as Director of Global Affairs and Counter-Terrorism at the National Security Council (1991-1993) and as Deputy in the Bureau of International Counter-Narcotics and Law Programs (1999-2001). As Assistant Administrator in the Asia-Near East Bureau for USAID from 2002 to 2004, Ambassador Chamberlin directed civilian reconstruction programs in Iraq and Afghanistan and development assistance programs in the Middle East and East Asia. Other assignments included US Ambassador to the Laos People's Democratic Republic (1996-1999), Director of Press and Public Affairs for the Near East Bureau (1991-1993), Deputy Chief of Mission in the US Embassy in Kuala Lumpur (1993-1996), Arab-Israeli Affairs (1982-1984) and other postings in Morocco, Pakistan, Malaysia, Laos and Zaire. Prior to joining MEI, Chamberlin served as Deputy High Commissioner for the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (2004-2006) where she supervised the administration of humanitarian operations.

### **KAREN DEYOUNG –**

Associate Editor, *The Washington Post*

Karen DeYoung, author of *Soldier: The Life of Colin Powell*, is an associate editor at The Washington Post. She currently writes about terrorism issues for the National and Foreign Desks. From September 2001 until the summer of 2003, she covered U.S. foreign policy for the paper, writing among other things about the beginning of the counterterrorism struggle and the lead-up to the Iraq war. Before then, she covered global issues including war crimes, the global HIV/AIDS epidemic and narcotics trafficking. Beginning in 1989, she served as national editor, then assistant managing editor for national news, for ten years directing the Post's award-winning coverage of the White House, Congress and national policies and politics as well as the paper's domestic bureaus. From 1977 through 1988, she worked for the foreign news operation, as bureau chief for Latin America, foreign editor, and bureau chief in London. DeYoung joined the Post in 1975 after working as a non-staff stringer in West Africa. She has a degree in journalism and communications from the University of Florida.

### **LOUISE DIAMOND, PH. D. –**

President, Global Systems Initiative

Louise Diamond, Ph.D., founded Global Systems Initiatives to apply transformative whole systems thinking to complex global security and environmental issues. Current projects include Change Power, adding an understanding of the dynamics of systems change to the policy community's toolbox for addressing the challenges and opportunities of these times; The Basics of Life, looking at the inter-relationship of food, water, energy, and climate security; and Beyond Multi-Track Diplomacy, bringing the latest wisdom from the systems sciences to conflict prevention and transformation. Previously, Louise co-founded The Institute of Multi-Track Diplomacy (IMTD) with Ambassador John McDonald, where she worked extensively as a peacebuilder and change agent in conflict zones around the world. A trainer, consultant, and public speaker on a wide range of issues, Louise is the author of four books and innumerable articles. She currently publishes Global Systems Review, a periodic e-newsletter exploring critical world issues through a whole systems lens.

### **LEENA EL-ALI –**

Program Director, Partners in Humanity, Search for Common Ground

Leena El-Ali is a senior Program Director at Search for Common Ground, an international non-profit organization in the field of conflict transformation with offices in 18 countries. She manages the organization's Partners in Humanity program, designing and implementing projects that promote understanding and collaboration between Muslim and Western individuals and groups, with special attention on the use of print and broadcast media. Leena also runs a program for Lebanon launched in 2008, which seeks to provide young Lebanese with the skill-set and role models necessary to transform the country into a peaceful and inclusive society, working through the Ministry of Education as well as the leading television channel, the Lebanese Broadcasting Corporation. Leena grew up in the Middle East, West Africa and Europe, and studied Economics at the American University of Beirut and Oxford University.

### **AZHAR HUSSAIN –**

Vice President, Preventive Diplomacy, International Center for Religion & Diplomacy (ICRD)

A native of Pakistan, Azhar Hussain holds an MA in International/Intercultural Management from the School of International Training in Vermont. He has served as Senior Consultant to Mexico's Ministry of Education and as an adjunct professor at the Tecnológico de Monterrey University in Mexico, where he taught courses on international relations and history and served as a teacher trainer for various university faculty. More recently, Mr. Hussain held the position of Senior Consultant on International Education and Development at the American Association of Retired Persons. Mr. Hussain has served as chair of the Inter-Cultural Seminar on Peace, Tolerance, and Coexistence for the Committee on Cultural Awareness in New Jersey and has collaborated with the United States Institute of Peace to initiate, develop, and deliver a peace education training program for Pakistani religious leaders. Mr. Hussain currently heads ICRD's Pakistan Madrasa Project, working in partnership with various Pakistani civic and religious organizations.

### **CYNTHIA IRMER –**

Senior Conflict Prevention Officer, Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization (S/CRS), U.S. Department of State

Dr. Cynthia Irmer is a conflict specialist and attorney. In her position with the US Department of State's office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization, she leads inter-agency teams conducting conflict analyses in pre- and post-conflict countries, collaborates with interagency planning teams to promote prevention and mitigation of conflict, and provides training for US Government users of an interagency conflict analysis methodology. She has designed and implemented projects to mitigate conflicts within and among communities, governments, and opposition forces through mediation, facilitated dialogue and other "alternative dispute resolution" techniques in Europe, the United States, SE Asia and Africa. She was a trial lawyer for the US Department of Justice's Environmental Enforcement Section and a Senior Conflict Resolution/Legal Specialist for the Environmental Protection Agency's Conflict Prevention and Resolution Center. She is also an adjunct professor at George Mason's Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution.

### **MARY KALDOR —**

Professor and Director of the Centre for the Study of Global Governance, London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE)

Mary Kaldor is highly regarded for her innovative work on new wars, human security, democratization, conflict, and globalization. She was also a founding member of European Nuclear Disarmament (END), is founder and Co-Chair of the Helsinki Citizen's Assembly and was a member of the International Independent Commission to investigate the Kosovo Crisis, established by the Swedish Prime Minister. Dr. Kaldor is the author of *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era*, now in its second edition and translated into twelve languages. At the request of Javier Solana, she is the Convener of the Study Group on European Security Capabilities, which produced the influential Barcelona report, "A Human Security Doctrine for Europe" and the follow-up Madrid Report, "A European Way of Security."

Professor Kaldor's work was recognized with the receipt of Commander of the British Empire (CBE) in 2003 for "services to democracy and global governance."

### **MUKHTAR KHAN –**

Analyst, The Jamestown Foundation

Mukhtar Khan is a Pakistani Pashtun journalist and policy analyst based in Washington, DC. Since 9/11, he has extensively covered Pakistan's troubled frontier, both for the local and international media, including the BBC, Mail on Sunday, and Voice of America, and has visited the region frequently. Currently, he is working on a book on the increasing trends of militancy in the Pakistan-Afghanistan border regions and its spillover to the rest of the world. Mr. Khan is also working as Chief Media Strategist for AfPak Media Solutions and is Senior Advisor to the Pashtun Focus. He also contributes analytical articles to the weekly Terrorism Monitor of The Jamestown Foundation and the CTC Sentinel, a publication of Combating Terrorism Center at West Point, New York. He has also served as Communication Officer for the Sustainable Development Networking Program and The World Conservation Union to help connect and improve the lives of disadvantaged people in Pakistan.

### **AMBASSADOR RIAZ MOHAMMAD KHAN –**

Pakistani Scholar, The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars; Former Ambassador to China, European Union

Ambassador Riaz Khan lectured at Punjab University from 1965-69. He joined the Foreign Service of Pakistan in October 1969, and was appointed Foreign Secretary of Pakistan in February 2005, where he served until April 2008. Amb. Khan served as Pakistan's ambassador to China (2002-05), to the European Union, Belgium and Luxembourg (1995-98) and to Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan (1992-95). He also served as Additional Foreign Secretary responsible for international organizations and arms control and disarmament issues from 1998-2002 (also concurrently Spokesperson 2000-01) and Director General responsible for Afghanistan and Soviet affairs from 1986-92 at the Pakistan Foreign Office. Amb. Khan is author of "Untying the Afghan Knot: Negotiating Soviet Withdrawal," (Duke University Press).

### **MARTIN KIMANI –**

Acting Director of the Ansari Africa Center; Associate Fellow at the Conflict, Security and Development Group at King's College London

Prior to his recent return to London, between 2006 and 2008, Martin served in a senior advisory position to a regional security program for the six member states of the InterGovernmental Authority on Development - a sub-regional organization in the Horn of Africa. He simultaneously held the position of Senior Researcher at the Institute for Security Studies. The stint in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia was preceded by his work as Head of the Africa Division at Exclusive Analysis Ltd., a provider of political risk analysis and forecasting to Lloyd's of London and as a Teaching Fellow at the UK Joint Services Command and Staff College where he taught on the Intermediate Command and Staff courses for the air force and army. Martin has published in the *Guardian*, *Granta Magazine*, *The East African*, *Süddeutschen Zeitung*, *Chimurenga*, *Farafina* and *Juxtapoz*. He also comments on development policy, conflict and terrorism on various BBC television and radio shows and in Australia, New Zealand, Kenya, and Rwanda. He is a fellow of the Africa Leadership Initiative and the Aspen Global Leadership Network.

### **SAMUEL LEWIS –**

Former Director of Policy Planning and Former Ambassador to Israel, U.S. Department of State

Ambassador Samuel Lewis has a long and distinguished career in American diplomacy. At the U.S. Department of State, he held such posts as: Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs (1975-1977), U.S. ambassador to Israel (1977-1985) and Director of Policy Planning (1993-1994). Ambassador Lewis also served as President of the United States Institute of Peace from 1987 through 1993. He is the recipient of six honorary doctoral degrees plus numerous other awards from the White House, the State Department, USAID, and Johns Hopkins University. He coauthored *Making Peace*

among Arabs and Israelis, and has contributed numerous articles to *Foreign Affairs*, the *Middle East Journal*, the *Harvard International Review*, the *Foreign Service Journal*, the *New York Times*, and the *Washington Post*. Ambassador Lewis currently serves as Board Member at the American Academy of Diplomacy, the Institute for the Study of Diplomacy at Georgetown University, the Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training, and the Institute of World Affairs, and as chair of Search for Common Ground's Middle East Advisory Board.

### **SUSAN COLLIN MARKS –**

Senior Vice President, Search for Common Ground

Susan Collin Marks is the senior vice president of Search for Common Ground. She is a South African who served as a peacemaker and peacebuilder during South Africa's transition from apartheid to democracy. Her book, *Watching the Wind: Conflict Resolution during South Africa's Transition to Democracy* (USIP, Washington DC, 2000) was also published in Arabic (Dar Al Ahliyah, Amman, 2004.) She serves on numerous boards, including the Advisory Council of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars Project on Leadership, and as Vice Chair of the Board of the Abraham Path Initiative. She is the founding editor of *Track Two*, a quarterly publication on community and political conflict resolution. She was portrayed in the PBS documentary *Women on the Frontlines*. In 2006, she launched the *Leadership Wisdom Initiative* to offer leadership development and one-on-one support and coaching to political, institutional and civil society leaders. Honors include a 1994/5 Jennings Randolph Peace Fellowship at the United States Institute for Peace, the Institute for Noetic Science's *Creative Altruism* award in 2005, and a Skoll Fellowship for Social Entrepreneurship in 2006. She speaks, teaches, coaches, mentors, writes, facilitates, and supports peace processes and conflict resolution programs internationally.

### **RICHARD MOOSE –**

Former Under Secretary of Management, U.S. Department of State

Mr. Moose was President of the Institute for Public Research at The CNA Corporation, Alexandria, VA from 1999-2003. Earlier, as a Senior Fellow at the Center for Naval Analyses (CNA), he coordinated support for the Department of the Navy's Business Reform Initiatives (1997-1999). In late 1996 Mr. Moose co-directed the work of an independent task force created by the Council of Foreign Relations and the Brookings Institution to study the consequences of the decline in resources for foreign policy. Mr. Moose served an extensive career in foreign relations as Under Secretary of State for Management, Chief Operating Officer of the Department (1993-1996), Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs (1978-1981), member of the Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Foreign Assistance (1974-1976), Senior Staff Member of the U.S. Senate (1969-1974), and Staff Secretary at the National Security Council. Mr. Moose also worked in finance as Senior Vice President, International and Government Affairs, American Express Company (1988-1993), Senior Advisor in the international banking division of Lehman Brothers, and as Managing Director (1981-1988). He was also Special Assistant to National Security Advisor Walt Rostow, and Senior Staff Member at the National Security Council (1966-1968).

### **BARAK A. SALMONI –**

Full Political Scientist, RAND Corporation

Barak Salmoni has been a Full Political Scientist at the RAND Corporation in Washington, DC, since July 2008. He specializes in Middle East intra-state conflict and military education and training for hybrid and complex operations. Before joining the RAND Corporation, Dr. Salmoni was the founder and Deputy Director of the Center for Advanced Operational Culture Learning, Marine Corps Training and Education Command (TECOM). Prior to this, Dr. Salmoni was on the faculty of U.S. Naval Postgraduate School, where he taught courses on Islamic history and religion, Middle Eastern history, as well as politics, religion, identity, and civil-military relations. He worked with the Marines in Iraq during June 2004, August 2005, and October 2006; with the U.S. Army Human Terrain System in February 2008; and as a member of MNF-I Strategy, Plans, and Assessments during March-April 2008. Dr. Salmoni has previously taught

at Harvard University, where he earned his Ph.D. in Middle Eastern History, as well as Holy Cross College, University of Pennsylvania, Swarthmore, and Moravian College.

### **LISA SCHIRCH –**

Director, 3D Security Initiative

Lisa Schirch is the Director of the 3D Security Initiative, which offers a civil society on US security policy. Schirch is also a professor of peacebuilding at Eastern Mennonite University where she teaches conflict assessment and strategic planning at the graduate program in the Center for Justice and Peacebuilding. A former Fulbright Fellow in East and West Africa, Schirch has worked in over 20 countries, including Iraq, Lebanon, Indonesia and Sri Lanka. The author of four books, she holds a B.A. in International Relations from the University of Waterloo, Canada, and a M.S. and Ph.D. in Conflict Analysis and Resolution from George Mason University.

### **RAYMOND SHONHOLTZ –**

Founder and President, Partners for Democratic Change

Raymond Shonholtz, J.D., is the Founder and President of Partners for Democratic Change (Partners), an international organization established in 1989 committed to building sustainable local capacity to advance civil society and a culture of change and conflict management worldwide. Partners is one of the largest change management organizations globally, with 17 independent national Centers in Latin America, the Middle East, Central and Eastern Europe, South Caucasus and Balkan Regions, and three new Centers established in 2009 in Colombia, Serbia, and Yemen. Most recently, Mr. Shonholtz was a Woodrow Wilson Public Policy Scholar working on a new concept of development called “Impact Investing for Sustainable Development.” In 1976, he established and served as President of the award-winning Community Board Program, the first mediation initiative in the United States that brought conflict resolution skills and processes into American neighborhoods and schools, and has been modeled in dozens of other countries. Mr. Shonholtz is an attorney and has an extensive background in legal practice, education, and policy.

### **REBECCA WINTHROP –**

Fellow in Global Economy and Development, Brookings Institution; Former Head of Education, International Rescue Committee

Rebecca Winthrop is a fellow in Global Economy and Development at the Brookings Institution, and is an international expert on education in contexts of armed conflict. Prior to joining Brookings in June 2009, Dr. Winthrop spent 15 years working in the field of education for displaced and migrant communities, most recently in New York as the head of education for the International Rescue Committee, a humanitarian aid NGO. There she was responsible for the organization's education work in over 20 conflict-affected countries. She spearheaded the development of a master's program on education and crisis, the first in the world, at the University of Nairobi's education school, and taught at Columbia University's Teachers College and School of International and Public Affairs, and the University of Ulster, Ireland. She was educated at Columbia University, Teachers College (PhD, 2008), Columbia University, School of International and Public Affairs (MA, 2001), and Swarthmore College, (BA, 1996).



## Acknowledgments

**Writing credit:** Kevin Malone and Evan Schmitt.

**Editing credit:** Shannon Dulaney, Benjamin Gass, and Rachel Lyn Okun.

**Special thanks** to John Marks, Susan Collin Marks, Lisa Schirch, and the CPRF Principals for their ongoing support of the Forum. Thanks also to Susan Koscis for her oversight on the project.

*Effort has been taken to accurately represent the respondents' thoughts as conveyed at the Forums. Any omission or misrepresentation is unintentional and the responsibility of Search for Common Ground.*

**ALLIANCE FOR PEACEBUILDING**

**AMERICAN UNIVERSITY,  
CENTER FOR GLOBAL PEACE**

**COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,  
CENTER FOR PREVENTIVE ACTION**

**EASTERN MENNONITE UNIVERSITY,  
3D SECURITY INITIATIVE**

**GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY,  
CENTER FOR WORLD RELIGIONS,  
DIPLOMACY, AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION**

**UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE**

**WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL  
CENTER FOR SCHOLARS,  
PROJECT ON LEADERSHIP  
AND BUILDING STATE CAPACITY**

**JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF  
ADVANCED INTERNATIONAL STUDIES,  
CONFLICT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM**

**SEARCH FOR COMMON GROUND**

**PARTNERS FOR DEMOCRATIC CHANGE**



1601 Connecticut Ave NW, Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20009-1035  
202-265-4300 (phone) | 202-232-6718 (fax)  
[www.sfcg.org](http://www.sfcg.org)