PREVENTION NEWSLETTER

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

MARCH 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

March 4: Presidential and Parliamentary Elections in Kenya

March 6: The EU and the prevention of mass atrocities, CEPS Event, Brussels.

April: Genocide Prevention month.

April 12: USIP Event: Preventing Violent Conflict: Can Innovative Technology Make Conflict Prevention More Effective?

Publications

- "Peace is Everybody's Business: A Strategy for Conflict Prevention" Sage Publications Book by Arjun Ray, 2012
- "Preventive Priorities Survey: 2013" Report by Council on Foreign Relations, 20 December 2012.
- "The Brilliant Art of Peace" USIP Book edited by Abiodun Williams, January 2013.
- "The Peace Puzzle" USIP and Cornell University Book edited by Daniel C. Kurtzer, Scott B. Lasensky, et al, January 2013.
- "Conflict Dynamics in Gilgit-Baltistan" USIP Special Report by Izhar Hunzai, January 2013.
- "The Israeli-Palestinian Standoff: More Risks Emerging," USIP News Feature by Thomas Omestadt, 5 February 2013.
- "Natural Disasters as Threats to Peace" USIP Special Report by Frederick S. Tipson, February 2013.
- "Toward a European Institute of Peace" USIP Peace Brief by Jonas Claes, February 2013.

Letter from the Editor

Since July 2010, USIP's *Prevention Newsletter* has highlighted the Institute's analytical and operational prevention work on a bi-monthly basis, reaching over 8,000 subscribers in 140 countries. After 15 editions we decided to sharpen the focus of this periodical, paying particular attention to *primary prevention* efforts. This practice aims to prevent early instability or low-level disputes from escalating to large-scale violence prior to the initial conflict onset. The Newsletter will address several topics as they relate to the field of prevention: *relevant institutional reform; potential triggers for violent conflict or escalation; local or external initiatives to alleviate growing tensions.* In addition to relevant updates on USIP activities, each Newsletter will feature a prevention tool, include a brief interview with senior prevention practitioners, and offer facilitated online access.

Looking into 2013, USIP's prevention team will closely examine the progress made by recent institutional structures mandated to prevent violent conflict or atrocities, like the State Department's Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization Operations (S/CSO), the inter-agency Atrocities Prevention Board, the European External Action Service (EEAS), or the UN Joint Office for the Prevention of Genocide and the Responsibility to Protect. Together with the prioritization of prevention in key strategic policy documents, these promising developments illustrate how the prevention community has advanced the case for preventive action. The time has come to learn from previous success and failure, and explore the modalities for effective implementation.

We appreciate your continued interest in our Newsletter, and appreciate any thoughts or feedback at prevention@usip.org.

Kind regards,

Jonas Claes

Program Officer

Center for Conflict Management

U.S. Institute of Peace

PREVENTION IN PRACTICE

USIP Grants in Pakistan

Barmak Pazhwak, Senior Program Officer, U.S. Institute of Peace

Pakistan is at a critical juncture. As a nuclear weapons state with a dwindling economy and frail democratic dispositions, Pakistan suffers from internal and inter-state conflict. While Pakistan's historical dynamics and its unsettled social, political, and economic profiles draw a bleak picture of its future trajectories, the country has a vibrant civil society sector that provides much needed socio-economic services in the absence of competent state institutions. Local civil society organizations have the potential to contribute to conflict prevention efforts and the promotion of greater tolerance throughout Pakistan. Since 2007, USIP has awarded more than 20 grants to civil society organizations for projects aimed at bolstering local capacities for peacebuilding and conflict prevention. USIP support has allowed local organizations to highlight key conflict dynamics at the macro policy level and engage men and women at the community level to strengthen local conflict prevention capacities. A series of dialogues between Pakistan's civilian and military leaders to improve relations and address contentious issues can be cited as one example. Another noteworthy USIP-funded project aims at developing women leader's capacities, as individuals and community leaders, to prevent youth from becoming entrapped by religious fanatics.



Map of Pakistan. Source: USIP Website

The Arab-Israeli Conflict

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

Several factors have renewed interest in the possibility of a revitalized peace process: A second term for President Obama; a new U.S. Secretary of State; and Israeli election results that raise the potential for a stronger centrist influence in government. Diplomatic traction is far from assured amid heavy obstacles, but these fresh political realities present opportunities that should be seized in the interest of preventing a violent deterioration of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Few U.S. policy-makers would deny the importance of resolving the Israeli-Palestinian and broader Arab-Israeli conflict. Yet America's quest for Arab-Israeli peace often takes a backseat to more pressing challenges, such as the nuclear capabilities of Iran. Although the status quo may not be desirable, it has been holding with relative quiet, for now. The West Bank faces a dire economic crisis, raising questions about the Palestinian Authority's continuing ability to ensure stability. Meanwhile, Iranian-backed Hamas is gaining popularity at the expense of the nonviolence-committed West Bank leadership, portraying its November 2012 military confrontation with Israel as a victory. At the same time, unrest in Egypt bodes ill for President Morsi's ability to play an effective role as pragmatic mediator. The Israeli and Palestinian leaderships, heavily enabled by the U.S., must act now to recommit to a two-state solution and to bolster that commitment with meaningful confidence building measures. The conflict is certainly not the region's sole problem. But with its perennial flare-ups, it remains a distraction from the U.S.'s and other regional actors' ability to deal with the threats that emanate from Iran and its regional proxies.

realities present opportunities that should be seized in the interest of preventing a violent deterioration of the Arablaraeli conflict.

U.S. Congress and Conflict Prevention

Mary Stata, Legislative Associate for Peaceful Prevention of Deadly Conflict, Friends Coalition on National Legislation

This year not only marks the beginning of the second Obama Administration, but also the start of a new session of Congress. In addition to a jam packed agenda on domestic issues, there has been a huge shake up in Congressional leadership on foreign policy. The House Foreign Affairs and Senate Foreign Relations Committees look very different than they did last year, as both committees have new Chairs and Ranking Members. A slew of newly elected Members of Congress have also been recently appointed to the committees.

What will this transition mean for policies related to conflict prevention in the coming months? While neither committee has clearly outlined its agenda, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will hold a series of confirmation hearings this winter and spring for newly appointed State and USAID officials. Further, the House Foreign Affairs Committee will hold hearings on the Administration's International Affairs budget request. These sets of hearings should include a focus on how the U.S. can strengthen and better invest in civilian capacities to prevent conflict and mass atrocities.



Source: Wikipedia Commons

Electoral Violence Prevention by the USIP Academy

Nina Sughrue, Senior Program Officer, U.S. Institute of Peace, and Jacki Wilson, Senior Program Officer, U.S. Institute of Peace

Stemming electoral violence in transition and fragile environments requires understanding of the broader conflict landscape. With important elections on the horizon in 2013, USIP's Academy for International Conflict and Peacebuilding examines specific cases in which electoral violence may be prevented or mitigated through effective strategic planning and policymaking. In January, the Academy conducted electoral violence prevention workshops in Kenya, both in Nairobi and in Nakuru in the Rift Valley. The workshops facilitated the analysis of gaps and opportunities in preventive actions as well as preparation of action plans to grasp upcoming opportunities to prevent electoral violence. The Academy offers an oncampus course in Washington, D.C. on preventing electoral violence in Africa and the Middle East which incorporates much of the Academy's field work in Kenya, South Sudan, Libya, and Tunisia. The course helps practitioners identify triggers of electoral violence and develop an action plan to help stem this violence. Participants learn how to build positive relationships among civil society, local and national government agencies, and regional and international organizations. The next running of the course will be in December 2013 and will focus on preventing electoral violence in the Middle East.



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 *Regional Integration* as a tool for preventive action.

Conflict Prevention Tool

Conflict Prevention Tool: Regional Integration

Prevention Tool	Regional Integration
Tool Description	The process through which states enter into formal cooperative agreements with neighboring states of a particular (sub-) region to meet shared interests, pool capacities, engage in healthy competition, and form legal institutional entities identified by the geographic locale of their members
Prevention Type	Structural Prevention
Preventive Function	Regional integration involves the strengthening of inter-state relations and shared commitment to common economic, political, security, and cultural standards, a process conducive to increased interdependence, mutual understanding, peaceful international relations, and the creation of joint instruments for preventive diplomacy or crisis management
Institutional Manifestations	African Union - Association of Southeast Asian Nations - European Union - League of Arab States - Organization of American States
Strengths	 Sustainability or 'stickiness' Ability to alleviate inter-state tensions Cross-national scope Local knowledge, access and legitimacy of regional institutions
Weakness	 Slow build-up Perceived interference in internal state affairs Donor-dependency Failure to meet objectives or expectations may generate inter-state tensions
Accomplishments	 Stabilization, liberalization, and democratization of underdeveloped or autocratic regimes in Southern, Eastern and Central Europe facilitated by regional European and North Atlantic organizations Mediation by the CSCE (now OSCE) to prevent escalation of tensions in the Baltic States in the early 1990s Mediation and deployment of a fact-finding mission by UNASUR in 2008 to prevent escalation or spill-over of violence in the Pando province in Bolivia
Failures	 Failure of European institutions to prevent mass atrocities in Bosnia-Herzegovina in the early 1990s Failure of regional organizations in Central Asia to prevent conflict relapse in Kyrgyzstan in 2010 Weak regional integration in Northeast Asia

A&O

On the Importance of Preventive Action, with Jim Marshall

In 2013, each *Prevention Newsletter* will feature a brief interview with senior policymakers or prevention practitioners. In this edition, the president of the United States Institute of Peace, Jim Marshall, will reflect on the role of the U.S. government and USIP in preventing violent conflict. A former member of the U.S. House of Representatives, Marshall is also a decorated veteran of the Vietnam War.

Mr. Marshall, thank you for agreeing to this interview.

JIM MARSHALL: You're welcome.

Consecutive U.S. administrations have expressed their commitment to conflict prevention as an approach preferable to reactive measures. Yet surely no president can realize this goal without support from the legislative branch. As a former Congressman, how do you think peacebuilding practitioners can effectively make the case for prevention in Congress?

JM: I see you are raising the easiest questions first. Well, as a sergeant who served in Vietnam I experienced the human cost of conflict first-handedly. And like any member of the U.S. armed forces, most Congressmen appreciate the merits of preventive action prior to military involvement. The cost-effective potential and strategic benefits of conflict prevention resonate particularly well within Congress in these times of austerity and global tumult. The commitment within Congress to prevent deadly conflict was illustrated in December 2010, when the Senate approved a resolution calling on the U.S. government to support the early prevention of genocide and mass atrocities. It is widely understood that as a nation, we have a responsibility to help shield countries from failure, and protect civilians from mass violence.

As the head of a peacebuilding organization your role in realizing this objective has evidently changed. How can USIP best advance this stated priority?

JM: I believe this Institute is well-positioned to design prevention tools and strategies that are applicable in different conflict situations worldwide, while playing an agenda-setting role in Washington and beyond. Given its unique position, USIP can highlight areas that are not necessarily on the radar of our colleagues across the street (U.S. Department of State), and train practitioners in prevention skills. Given our history with the Genocide Prevention Task Force, we also continue to pay well-deserved attention to the prevention of mass violence in our analytical work.

During your swearing-in ceremony at USIP back in September, you mentioned that "by taking down barbed wire" one can more easily "substitute for peaceful and positive relationships." Does this image represent your approach to conflict prevention?

JM: I'm glad you've paid close attention to my speech. Well, I'm convinced that this anecdote, which refers to my time as mayor of Macon, Georgia, certainly applies to our work at USIP and foreign policy more broadly. You simply catch more flies with honey. The use of cooperative or non-coercive measures creates a benign atmosphere that is prone to peaceful conflict resolution. That being said, the use of force remains an important part of our nation's toolkit, particularly when warring parties perceive no interest in stable peace and have chosen the path of violence and destruction.



USIP President Jim Marshall



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