



UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

PREVENTION

PREVENTION NEWSLETTER

JULY 2013

MISSION

USIP's *Prevention Newsletter* underscores the importance of preventive action, highlights the Institute's analytical and operational prevention work, and contributes to the design of prevention tools and strategies applicable in conflict situations worldwide.

CALENDAR

July 14-20: Cohen Center for Holocaust and Genocide Studies Summer Institute for Teachers, Keene State College

July 17: World Day for International Justice

July 23: USIP/USHMM/Brookings Symposium: Report Rollout, Working Group on the Responsibility to Protect

July 28: First Round Presidential Election in Mali

July 28: Parliamentary Elections in Cambodia

July 31: Presidential Elections in Zimbabwe

August 9: International Day of the World's Indigenous People

August 11: Second Round Presidential Election in Mali

August 19: World Humanitarian Day

August 30: International Day for the Disappeared

PUBLICATIONS

- "Sectarian Violence in Syria's Civil War: Causes, Consequences, and Recommendations for Mitigation" *Report from the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum* by Ambassador Frederic C. Hof and Alex Simon, March 25, 2013
- "The Responsibility to Protect: Towards a 'Living Reality'" *Report from the United Nations Association-United Kingdom* by Alex J. Bellamy, April 2013
- "Midterm Challenges in Nigeria: Elections, Parties, and Regional Conflict" *USIP Special Report* by John Paden, May 2013
- "Contingency Planning Memorandum No. 19: Political Instability in Jordan" *Council on Foreign Relations's Center for Preventive Action Memo* by Robert Satloff and David Schenker, May 2013

continued on page 6

United States Institute of Peace • www.usip.org • Tel. 202.457.1700 • Fax. 202.429.6063

Letter from the Editor

The prevention of genocide and other forms of mass violence constitutes a key component of our work at the U.S. Institute of Peace. One way the Institute aims to advance this field is by convening high-level bipartisan task forces or study groups that bring the country's best minds and most experienced practitioners together to overcome the political hurdles of preventive action. Important recommendations from previous Task Force Reports have been realized, like the creation of an interagency Atrocities Prevention Board mandated to assess situations at risk and formulate actionable recommendations, a proposal made by the Genocide Prevention Task Force in 2008.

On July 22nd and 23rd, the U.S. Institute of Peace will release the report of its Working Group on the Responsibility to Protect, co-chaired by former Secretary Madeleine Albright and Ambassador Richard Williamson, and in partnership with the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum and the Brookings Institution. The Report is the first of its kind in approaching U.S. atrocity prevention efforts through the lens of the Responsibility to Protect or R2P, a political norm committing states to the prevention of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity. Since it first emerged in 2001, the R2P principle has gradually moved from aspiration to practice, illustrated by the unanimous affirmation of the principle by Heads of State and Government at the 2005 UN World Summit. The international response to imminent or ongoing mass killing remains inconsistent though, as recent events in Libya, Sudan, and Syria painfully demonstrate.

The Report highlights that preventive action allows for a wide array of options and reduces both the financial and human costs of intervention, whatever form it takes. U.S. support for the principle, both politically and operationally, is in the security interest of our nation and complements ongoing domestic initiatives to enhance U.S. atrocity prevention capabilities.

Kind Regards,

Jonas Claes

Program Officer

Center for Conflict Management

U.S. Institute of Peace



PREVENTION IN PRACTICE

Opportunity in the Arab-Israeli Conflict?

Lucy Kurtzer-Ellenbogen, Senior Program Officer, U.S. Institute of Peace



U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry
Source: USIP Website

U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry has tirelessly prioritized the Israeli-Palestinian conflict since taking office, sounding the alarm on the urgency of resuming a process before the opportunity for a two-state solution is lost, while managing expectations of an imminent breakthrough. This latter component serves as a recognition that the already tenuous stability on the West Bank would be significantly compromised by yet another unfulfilled promise of progress towards an end of the conflict. Opposition to resuming negotiations or any engagement with the Israelis continues to grow among the younger generation of Palestinians. Meanwhile, Netanyahu's governing coalition is rife with hardline voices who, with growing confidence, voice their opposition to the very legitimacy of a two state solution as an Israeli policy. Against the backdrop of increasing skepticism among Israelis that there is a Palestinian partner for peace; growth of Israeli presence on the West Bank through settlement expansion; rising conviction among Palestinian youth that the answer is resistance rather than engagement; and a deteriorating Palestinian economy, violence has already been on the rise in the West Bank over the past six months – both settler violence against Palestinians, and Palestinian attacks against settlers. These are not static conditions – they will only worsen for as long as political and diplomatic efforts fail to gain traction or bear fruit.

Secretary Kerry has put forward a plan for Palestinian economic development, but any meaningful U.S. diplomatic push must also involve civil society engagement – outreach to a broad and diverse set of Israeli and Palestinian stakeholders who have the ability to push their leaderships towards (or hold them back from) bold decisions. Encouraging those who are both already “sold” on the advantages to their own societies of active pursuit of a two-state solution and –more importantly– listening to and engaging those who are skeptical or actively opposed will be key to preparing the ground for a diplomatic push that to succeed will need to be broadly understood as in the interests of both sides. To ignore the skepticism, and to dismiss the mutual fears and concerns, incentivizes spoiler behaviors: a recipe for long-term violence.

U.S. Atrocity Prevention Policy

Mary Stata, Senior Associate, Humanity United

In April 2012, President Obama announced the creation of the Atrocities Prevention Board (APB) during a speech at the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum. Housed within the National Security Council, the APB is a high-level interagency panel that monitors emerging threats of atrocities and develops new tools to prevent such violence. The Center for American Progress recently released a report outlining the APB's first year and made recommendations to strengthen its structure and agenda. In order to institutionalize the APB as a structure and to further entrench the norm of atrocity prevention throughout policymaking processes, a civil society coalition called the Prevention and Protection Working Group has pressed the Obama Administration to release information on the Board's work and consult meaningfully with Congress.

Over the past few months, the APB has made progress in increasing its transparency and engaging champions on Capitol Hill. In late April, the White House released a fact sheet that identified key activities and success stories of the Administration's work to prevent mass atrocities. Further, officials from the State Department and U.S. Agency for International Development participated in an on-the-record briefing on the APB hosted by Representative

“The APB is a high-level interagency panel that monitors emerging threats of atrocities and develops new tools to prevent such violence.”

Debbie Wasserman-Schultz's (D-FL) office in early May. These recent developments are encouraging, but much work remains to ensure that the Atrocities Prevention Board continues its consultations with stakeholders outside of the Administration.

The Role of Civil Affairs in Conflict Prevention

James Ruf, Civilian-Military Affairs Advisor, U.S. Institute of Peace

Conflict prevention environments feature many actors – both military and civilian personnel share the space to avert newly emerging violent conflicts. Among those in a U.S. uniform will be civil affairs (CA) practitioners consisting of both active and reserve soldiers. Two ways in which civil affairs can play a role in conflict prevention are through their regionally focused education and training programs and as an interlocutor with civilian actors.

First of all, civil affairs soldiers belong to units that are geographically aligned. After receiving core CA education and training that all CA soldiers receive, the practitioners are then given additional regional education and training that is focused on providing greater environmental awareness and cultural and language knowledge of the country in question. Having greater awareness of the operational environment ultimately allows for more informed recommendations to the commander in his efforts to mitigate escalating tensions.

Secondly, CA soldiers play a preventive role through their ability to interact with the civilian actors. This interaction can be done through a civil military operation center or CMOC. The CMOC serves as a place where conflict prevention actors can meet to share and receive information and updates and also air grievances. This opportunity for interaction amongst the civilian – military actors can be useful in mitigating tensions to prevent violent eruptions or strengthen local preventative capacity.

Elections in Pakistan

Hodei Sultan, Program Officer, U.S. Institute of Peace

In the wake of the May 11th Pakistani elections, the country is riddled with mounting challenges: energy shortages, inflation, debt, unemployment, a deteriorating economy, rising youth disenfranchisement, extremism, poverty, and rampant corruption. Despite these challenges, the elections presented a rare opportunity as the first time an elected civilian government in Pakistan peacefully transitioned to another. The veteran politician's Pakistan Muslim League-N won a majority of seats and Nawaz Sharif was elected Pakistan's prime minister for a third term, 14 years since he was removed by a military coup.

To mitigate the threat of violence during the elections, USIP supported public service announcements on ten national and regional channels, radio, billboards, newspaper ads, and a music video to encourage voters, candidates, parties, and party supporters to participate peacefully. Floats traveled through rural areas and small cities to talk to voters and candidates and collect pledges. USIP also seeded a social media-based pilot, PakVotes, aimed at increasing the flow of information from relatively remote, conflict-prone districts through a network of citizen reporters. The reports were verified, mapped, and shared on Twitter and Facebook. Seven videos were picked up by mainstream TV, and #PakVotes became the dominant hashtag associated with elections, trending for several days. Through these tools, USIP aimed to promote peaceful participation in elections in Pakistan through one-way communication and two-way accountability tools. USIP is also supporting research to better understand the drivers, dynamics, and effects of electoral violence in Pakistan.

“Two ways in which civil affairs can play a role in conflict prevention are through their regionally focused education and training programs and as an interlocutor with civilian actors.”



Pakistani Flags on Election Day
Source: USIP Website



PREVENTION TOOL IN THE SPOTLIGHT

In each *Prevention Newsletter* we highlight a conflict prevention tool available to senior leaders and peacebuilding practitioners. This issue will assess the role of *No Fly Zones* as a tool for preventive action.

Conflict Prevention Tool: No Fly Zone

Conflict Prevention Tool	
Prevention Tool	No Fly Zone (NFZ)
Tool Description	A military operation based on defined rules of engagement and designed to restrict or eliminate the aerial capabilities of a targeted armed force or control the use of airspace in a specific geographic area.
Operational Modalities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NFZs can feature a combination of aerial reconnaissance and air defense suppression through first-strike aircrafts, cruise-missile ships, and support assets (like tankers or air refueling capabilities). The mission's legality and legitimacy depends on nature of authorization and execution. Effective NFZs require a grand strategy defining a desired political end state as well as organized regional support among neighbors, allies, regional powers, and international political bodies.
Prevention Type	Operational Prevention
Preventive Function	If executed properly, NFZs provide a deterrent and suppression ability to prevent inter-state conflict, the escalation of intra-state violence, the commission of mass atrocities against civilian populations, or other military objectives contributing to a defined political end state.
Strengths and Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effectively supports deterrence or coercion objectives as part of a broader strategy to control military activities in a particular area. Establishes a monitoring and reporting mechanism informing early warning systems for the prevention of violent conflict or atrocities. Demonstrates considerable level of international political will to meet military or political objectives.
Risks and Limitations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High resource requirements, depending on specific military tasks, geographic scope, or mission duration. Risk of military or political escalation by adversaries due to the highly coercive nature of this operation. Mission creep in case of failure to rapidly achieve military objectives. Difficulty to exert complete control over aerial capabilities, particularly helicopter usage. Potential for collateral casualties or the widespread disruption of economic activity.
Operation Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operation Southern Watch (1991-2003) and Operation Northern Watch (1997-2003) by U.S.-led international coalition to prevent regime repression of the Shi'a and Kurdish population in Iraq. Operations Odyssey Dawn (early 2011) by international coalition authorized through UN Security Council resolution 1973 to protect the civilian population of Libya. Operation Deny Flight (1993-1995), a U.S. operation of the larger NATO coalition force aimed at denying the use of airspace over Bosnia and Herzegovina to facilitate humanitarian assistance and protect the population.



*Working Group Co-Chairs Madeleine K. Albright and Richard S. Williamson
Source: U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum*

Q&A

On the Responsibility to Protect, with Secretary Madeleine K. Albright and Ambassador Richard S. Williamson

Each Prevention Newsletter features a brief interview with senior policy-makers or prevention practitioners. In this edition former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and Ambassador Richard Williamson discuss their role as co-chairs of the Working Group on the Responsibility to Protect (R2P), and reflect on the Working Group report, scheduled for release on July 23rd. Jointly organized by USIP, the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, and the Brookings Institution, this working group seeks to increase understanding of R2P and bolster the political will of U.S. decision-makers to respond in a timely manner to mass atrocities.

Secretary Albright, Ambassador Williamson, thank you for your time. Throughout your political careers you have both made tireless efforts to advance the atrocity prevention agenda. Why should the prevention of mass killing in distant places be of concern to the American people?

Madeleine K. Albright: I am convinced that the prevention of mass violence against innocent civilians, and the protection of human rights more broadly, is in the security interest of our nation. Most Americans would agree that our country cannot ignore the exceptional levels of bloodshed we witnessed in Somalia, the Balkans, and Rwanda. Eventually, these problems come back to our country in one form or another. During the Holocaust, one could still argue that we were not fully aware of the magnitude of the ongoing slaughter. In the 21st century, as a result of technological advances, our knowledge of ongoing conflict has grown tremendously, and that produces a responsibility.

Richard S. Williamson: Often political leaders and the media discuss situations of mass murder and genocide as conflicts far away and little understood. Sometimes they suggest that these carnages are inevitable. They assume these are simply warlike people, and there is nothing to be done. But much can be done to prevent mass violence, and our Report proposes a number of practical measures to further strengthen the responsiveness of our country.

PUBLICATIONS CONT.

- "Understanding Pakistan's Water-Security Nexus" *USIP Peaceworks* by Daanish Mustafa, Majed Akhter, and Natalie Nasralla, May 2013
- "Pakistan Election Victory for Sharif May Spur Change, Experts Say" *USIP News Feature* by Viola Gienger, May 2013
- "Fact Sheet: The Obama Administration's Comprehensive Efforts to Prevent Mass Atrocities Over the Past Year" *White House Fact Sheet*, May 1, 2013
- "Will the Israeli Bombings in Syria Spark a Regional Crisis?" *USIP On the Issues* by Lucy Kurtzer-Ellenbogen, May 8, 2013
- "An Anti-Fraud Strategy for Afghanistan's 2014 Elections" *USIP Peace Brief* by Zekria Barakzai, May 21, 2013
- "Crisis in Mali: Root Causes and Long-Term Solutions" *USIP Peace Brief* by Hannah Armstrong, May 31, 2013
- "Ríos Montt Trial an Example of National, International Courts Working Together" *Feature from the Brookings Institution* by Ashley Miller and Ted Piccone, June 4, 2013
- "Atrocities Prevention Board: Background, Performance, and Options" *Center for American Progress Report* by John Norris and Annie Malknecht, June 13, 2013

How can a concept like the Responsibility to Protect help meet this objective?

MKA: The Responsibility to Protect is an important principle, as it advances international efforts to prevent mass killing. R2P will not immediately bring an end to all cases of mass violence, as we painfully witness in Syria. But in a number of situations, like Côte d'Ivoire, Kenya, and South Sudan, one can see how the emergence of R2P has strengthened international capacity and the willingness to act decisively. R2P is better known in many other parts of the world than it is in the United States. To the extent the phrase is familiar to the U.S. public, it is often misunderstood.

RSW: And let's hope this report will change that. Through this initiative, we aim to broaden the understanding of R2P, and clarify that the principle does not impose any new legal obligations on governments, that most R2P instruments are preventive in nature, and that military force only serves as a final resort.

The Responsibility to Protect presents a response to past atrocity prevention failures. Since the principle was first coined in 2001, has the international community, and the U.S. Government in particular, become better prepared to prevent a future Rwanda or Srebrenica?

MKA: Without a doubt. Thinking back to the way we developed our response to the crisis in the Balkans, we are now more aware of the tools that work, and the ones that don't. The Genocide Prevention Task Force I co-chaired with Bill Cohen (*former Secretary of Defense William Cohen*) encouraged the U.S. Government to create new institutions, and elevate atrocity prevention as a foreign policy priority.

RSW: The threat of mass violence is still real till this day, despite a range of steps that our government and the international community have taken to address the problem and the frequent promise to do better after every episode of mass killing. But many steps remain to be taken. To give just one example, the United States could strengthen its diplomatic engagement with like-minded countries and organizations, understanding that no country can take up this important task by itself.



UNITED STATES
INSTITUTE OF PEACE

2301 Constitution Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20037
202.457.1700

www.usip.org

USIP provides the analysis, training and tools that prevent and end conflicts, promotes stability and professionalizes the field of peacebuilding.

For media inquiries, contact the office of Public Affairs and Communications, 202.429.4725