

# Congressional Budget Justification Fiscal Year 2020

## Budget in Brief

---



UNITED STATES  
INSTITUTE OF PEACE  
Making Peace Possible

**PHOTOGRAPHS ON THE COVER:**

***At left, U.S. Army soldiers talk with civilians in Afghanistan, where USIP has worked with U.S. forces and Afghan civil society since 2001. (DVIDS)***

***At center, His Holiness the Dalai Lama discusses the power and principles of building peace as he mentors USIP-trained youth leaders from countries facing violent conflict. He met with the Institute's group at his residence in Dharamshala, India. (USIP)***

***At right, Nigerians displaced by violent conflicts over scarce land discuss ways to calm escalating violence between herders and farmers. (USIP)***



## UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

March 11, 2019

Hon. Nita Lowey, Chairwoman  
House Appropriations Subcommittee on  
State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs  
United States House of Representatives

Hon. Lindsey Graham, Chairman  
Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on  
State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs  
United States Senate

Hon. Hal Rogers, Ranking Member  
House Appropriations Subcommittee on  
State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs  
United States House of Representatives

Hon. Patrick Leahy, Ranking Member  
Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on  
State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs  
United States Senate

Dear Representatives and Senators:

On behalf of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace (USIP), we are pleased to present the Institute's Fiscal Year (FY) 2020 Congressional Budget Justification for \$38,634,000. This request is equal to the enacted FY 2019 appropriation and represents a vital investment in reducing violent international conflicts that threaten U.S. national security.

Congress created USIP in 1984 as an independent, nonpartisan, federally funded institute dedicated to reducing violent international conflict. Specialized teams of USIP mediators and trainers work in fragile and dangerous places, critical to American interests, to provide local populations with education, training, analysis, and skills for conflict resolution and reconciliation. These cost-effective efforts build other countries' abilities to resolve their own conflicts, preserve American's hard-won advances for peace and stability abroad, and reduce the need for more-costly U.S. diplomatic, development, and defense interventions.

For FY 2020, USIP will sustain its focus on the increasing complexity driving violent upheavals abroad: the violence emanating from fragile states, competition for increasingly scarce resources, and the exploitation of conflict by regional and major powers. USIP will continue its efforts to help local populations achieve their own nonviolent solutions to conflict, notably in Iraq, Tunisia, South Sudan, Colombia, and Pakistan. USIP will also prioritize its facilitation of track two and track 1.5 dialogues that support official efforts in conflict areas critical to American security interests, including in Ukraine and Afghanistan.

We respectfully request \$38,634,000 in FY 2020 funding for USIP. The Institute's FY 2020 budget priorities will continue investments that are vital and cost-effective contributions to our national security.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Nancy Lindborg".

Nancy Lindborg  
President

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Stephen J. Hadley".

Stephen J. Hadley  
Chair, Board of Directors

# FY 2020 Budget Request

APPROPRIATION	FY 2018 ENACTED	FY 2019 ENACTED	FY 2020 REQUEST	INCREASE / (DECREASE)
United States Institute of Peace Appropriation	37,884,000	38,634,000	38,634,000	-

## USIP: Investment in Peace and National Security

The United States Institute of Peace requests \$38,634,000 for Fiscal Year (FY) 2020, equal to its most recently enacted appropriation in FY 2019. The Institute requests these funds to fulfill its congressional mandate to prevent, mitigate, and resolve violent conflict abroad, a role vital to our nation's security. USIP's work saves lives and money by reducing or averting crises that, once metastasized, would be orders of magnitude more expensive to manage through military or humanitarian interventions.

Congress in 1984 declared a need "for the Nation to develop fully a range of effective options, in addition to armed capacity," to manage international conflict. It created USIP (see page 10) as a nonpartisan, independent "national institute" to promote "the resolution of conflicts among the nations and the peoples of the world without recourse to violence." Since its founding, USIP has adjusted its programs in response to the evolutions in international violence that pose new threats to U.S. security and global stability.

Such changes are underway. For decades, the world's fragile, or weakly governed, states have been the primary drivers of global violence and instability: civil wars, extremism and terrorism, and historic numbers of refugees and migrants. These conflicts increasingly are complicated by two trends. One is resurgent competition among regional and major powers. The other is the interplay in fragile states of accelerating environmental shocks, poor governance, and fast-growing, younger populations. USIP foresees these evolutions building into the 2020s and has shifted its priorities to address them. That prioritization is advanced in this FY 2020 budget request.

## VIOLENT CONFLICT'S NEW COMPLEXITIES: HOW USIP RESPONDS

These global trends are exacerbating the web of violent conflicts and humanitarian crises in fragile states, largely in an arc across Africa, the Middle East, and Asia, but increasingly spreading worldwide. **USIP fieldwork targets violence in fragile states that are vital to U.S. interests**—from Iraq and Nigeria to Ukraine, Colombia, and Burma (Myanmar). In such countries, the Institute works on the ground with local and U.S. government partners to help restore damaged relations among fragmented populations or between citizens and governments. It works both from the top down, with leaders and governments, and from the bottom up, with community, grassroots and faith-based groups. This combined approach works to disrupt cycles of violence in fragile states and lead to a more sustainable peace.

USIP's low-cost initiatives reduce bloodshed. In countries facing violent conflict, USIP researchers and analysts provide insights into the complex causes of the violence as well as potential solutions. USIP specialists mentor local mediators who help negotiate peace accords at both community and national levels. USIP trainers help local citizens' groups nonviolently seek redress of public grievances. USIP experts guide government officials, police, and civic leaders in dialogues that improve public safety, community policing, and government security policies. In short, the Institute's fieldwork rehabilitates damaged social contracts between populations and their governments. It strengthens public accountability and the rule of law. These changes build fragile states' abilities to manage their own conflicts peacefully. They shrink the opportunities for extremist groups, transnational criminals, and competitor states to exploit and worsen the violence of weakly governed countries.



According to Major General William Piatt (right), “The soldiers of the 10th Mountain Division are indebted to USIP” for the Institute’s briefings before their 2018 deployment in Iraq. “Your presentations were exactly what we needed as we prepare,” Piatt wrote. USIP has worked repeatedly with the 10th Mountain in Iraq, including their achievement of a 2007 peace accord in the “Triangle of Death” that saved soldiers’ lives, allowed a drawdown of troops, and saved hundreds of millions of dollars in military deployment costs. (DVIDS)

Increasingly, **competing regional and major powers are seeking strategic gains that intensify violence in fragile regions.** Russian military engagements have complicated wars in Syria and Ukraine, and turmoil in the Central African Republic (CAR). China’s investment strategies, seeking resources and influence, deepen debts and instability in African and Asian countries. China, Saudi Arabia, Iran, and Turkey compete across the Red Sea region in ways that weaken states, worsen violence, and impede peace processes. Across the fragile regions where USIP works, violence also is exacerbated by **growing and younger populations increasingly competing for shrinking resources** as basic as water and land. An example is Nigeria, where land-use battles between herding and farming communities for years have killed and displaced far more people than the more internationally known Boko Haram insurgency.

USIP addresses these new complexities in part by providing information and policy options for policymakers. In response to China’s roles in fragile states and conflicts, the Institute is convening a series of bipartisan Senior Study Groups. The first group, of 13 experts, produced a 2018 report on China’s role in the internal conflicts of Burma. Other USIP studies recommend steps on China’s role in Nigeria and on Russian actions that heighten risks of violence in Ukraine’s 2019 elections.

**The Institute expands the options for the U.S. government to address these challenges, offering USIP’s specialized capacity for unofficial dialogues that complement formal diplomacy.** USIP’s track two dialogues helped develop ideas for ending the war in Ukraine (see page 9). In the effort to resolve a longstanding unresolved conflict with North Korea, the Institute’s unofficial dialogues with Chinese representatives gave U.S. diplomats broader access to the

“USIP has a record of cost-effective contributions to U.S. national security that saves lives while protecting our military, diplomatic, and development investments worldwide... No national security actor or private nonprofit organization can perform USIP’s congressionally mandated mission, and certainly none has ever done so at such a small cost to the American taxpayer.”

—George P. Shultz, former secretary of state

thinking and attitudes underlying China’s formal positions on North Korea. USIP-sponsored dialogues with Chinese interlocutors have offered U.S. government officials insight into Chinese initiatives in areas of U.S.-China competition: Burma, South Asia, Afghanistan, the Middle East, and Africa. USIP works, whether through its unofficial dialogues or its field operations, on five conflicts for which the United States currently deploys special envoys: Afghanistan, Iraq, North Korea, Syria, and Ukraine.

The Institute also has worked for years on conflicts inflamed by competition for resources. It now is focusing on these disputes with new work to forecast, understand, and prevent the violence that they cause. After a USIP-led dialogue calmed a communal conflict in a major Nigerian city, Nigerian civic leaders and government officials began adapting that process to address their country’s herder-farmer conflicts over land. In Asia, USIP has supported local research and civil society initiatives to help Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Kyrgyzstan resolve rising internal and regional conflicts over scarce water resources.

**Because violent conflicts increasingly are crossing borders, USIP has intensified its work at regional levels.** Across Africa’s Sahel zone, the Institute conducts community-level dialogues in four countries, and now is convening national-level officials to use the resulting lessons in improving justice and security policies that will favor stability regionwide. USIP provides training and technical support to increase the capacity of regional organizations such as the African Union (AU) and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) to manage and resolve conflicts peacefully. In the Red Sea region and the Horn of Africa, local conflicts are being exacerbated by competition among regional and major powers competing for influence there and in the adjacent Gulf region. Yet policymaking on the Red Sea region often is poorly coordinated because this zone falls geographically between the African and Middle East sections of most U.S.

and international bureaucracies. USIP’s initiative offers a platform to more comprehensively address these problems.

USIP’s focus on **conflict resolution is fundamentally crisis prevention—and cost control.** Wars in the past decade have doubled the world’s displaced population to an unprecedented 68.5 million people, more than in World War II. In five years, from 2012 to 2017, they drove a near doubling of appropriated U.S. humanitarian assistance—from \$4.3 billion to \$8.2 billion. Humanitarian crises have nearly doubled in duration—from five years to nine years—since 2014. USIP’s conflict-prevention work seeks to avert such crises and their costs.

When violent conflicts erupt, they often confront the United States with bad options: either intervening with costly military or humanitarian operations or abstaining with the risk of higher costs later. USIP contributes to better options. Its specialized violence-reduction work costs pennies on the dollar, deploying small, low-cost teams of mediators, trainers, and analysts to work in fragile states and conflict zones—often beyond the typical security perimeters of U.S. military and diplomatic engagement—to help nations solve their own problems peacefully. This work reduces the risks of violent conflict that could require costly U.S. or international interventions. In Iraq, six local peace accords guided by USIP have allowed more than a half million uprooted residents to return home (from a peak displaced population of 3.4 million), reducing the billion-dollar annual costs of humanitarian assistance that are borne significantly by the United States.

To ensure cost effectiveness, the current National Security Strategy aims to “prioritize programs that empower reform-minded governments, people, and civil society.” It urges that such programs be tailored with help from local people to “improve the likelihood of enduring solutions, reduce costs, and increase accountability to the American taxpayer.” This is precisely USIP’s long-standing method of work.

“USIP has a long and robust record of working closely with its federal partners—including the Department of Defense—to focus on national security priority areas where it brings distinctive capabilities to bear.... No other agency provides these services, and USIP’s approach is highly cost effective.”

—Gen. George Casey, Jr, USA (Ret.); Lt. Gen. Karl Eikenberry, USA (Ret.); Gen. Carter Ham, USA (Ret.);  
Lt. Gen. Douglas Lute, USA (Ret.); Gen. Gregory Martin, USAF (Ret.);  
Gen. Raymond Odierno, USA (Ret.); and Gen. Charles Wald, USAF (Ret.)

Even the most determined diplomatic, military, or conflict-resolution efforts cannot always end bloodshed in the short term. Some conflicts seem intractable. **Where national-level peace processes remain out of reach, USIP lays foundations for eventual peace by working on parts of the conflicts that can be addressed.** Often, this foundational work strengthens grassroots citizens’ movements for peace while supporting adjustments in formal diplomacy that can make it more effective. USIP followed that dual approach in Colombia for more than a decade to improve conditions for the eventual 2016 peace accord. More recently, it has done so in South Sudan, in support of the 2018 peace agreement. In Libya, USIP trains local youth leaders who have begun local peace efforts across factional lines in their communities. In Syria, the Institute is guiding community-level peace processes in the country’s northeast that—when political and security conditions permit—will provide models and potential leadership for wider reconciliation efforts.

USIP complements the work of America’s military, diplomatic, and development agencies, supporting and preserving their hard-won gains in unstable regions. The most consistent appraisals of the Institute’s contribution to America’s security come from military and civilian professionals who have witnessed its work abroad. “USIP has a long and robust record of working closely with its federal partners—including the Department of Defense—to focus on national security priority areas where it brings distinctive capabilities to bear,” according to military flag officers, who include former theater commanders in Iraq and Afghanistan (see above). “No other agency provides these services, and USIP’s approach is highly cost effective,” they said.

Other current or retired theater commanders, U.S. Combatant Command commanders, and service branch chiefs—including retired Army General John W. Nicholson,

retired Marine Corps General Anthony Zinni, retired Army General and former CIA Director David Petraeus, and retired Navy Admiral and former Supreme Allied Commander Europe James Stavridis—are among the national security professionals who have stated America’s need to sustain USIP’s specialized capacities to contribute to the protection of America’s security and interests abroad. Civilian leaders of both parties, such as former Secretaries of State George P. Shultz and Madeleine Albright, endorse USIP’s value in reducing the causes of conflicts abroad and preventing them from erupting into violent crises.

#### **CREATED BY CONGRESS: AN INDEPENDENT GOVERNMENT PARTNER**

Congress established USIP as a national institute, statutorily nonpartisan and separate from executive agencies, to ensure the independence of its research, analyses, and ideas. At the same time, Congress guaranteed USIP’s role as a trusted partner of government, with visibility by the Executive Branch into its operations, by including the secretaries of state and defense and the president of the National Defense University on the Institute’s bipartisan Board of Directors. Congress further mandated that the Institute’s work be federally funded through direct congressional appropriations ensuring that USIP serves national priorities rather than any private or foreign interest. It is these provisions by Congress that ensure the Institute has the independence and organizational agility to respond quickly to the shifts in international violence and its threats. Congress’ provisions enable USIP to fulfill its vital roles:

**Unofficial dialogues that complement and support formal, government-to-government diplomacy.** Congress’ placement of USIP—close to, but not part of, the Executive Branch—allows the Institute to convene track two and track 1.5 negotiations, and other unofficial dialogues, to explore causes and potential solutions to sensitive conflicts. These



Nigerian herders and farmers uprooted from their homes by land battles between their two communities in Plateau State recount their experiences as part of a USIP-led dialogue to halt violence. USIP's fieldwork in Nigeria, and its engagement of the country's state governors, has led five Nigerian states to form peacebuilding agencies to mediate in communal disputes and prevent violence. (USIP)

dialogues, undertaken in close coordination with executive agencies, can yield recommendations and additional policy options for U.S. policymakers. In the past 16 months, USIP's status as an independent national institute has enabled it to convene nongovernment experts with current and former officials—U.S., Russian, Chinese, and others—for unofficial dialogues. A USIP dialogue project on Ukraine, in consultation with the State Department, yielded ideas for a framework to resolve the conflict in Ukraine's Donbas region. Two other USIP dialogue projects are underway—in support of peace efforts in Afghanistan, and with Chinese interlocutors on tensions on North Korea, Burma, and other sensitive areas.

**A sustained and agile presence in conflict zones vital to U.S. interests.** To reduce violence amid complex conflicts such as those in Afghanistan, Iraq, Tunisia, or Nigeria, USIP's small teams work for years to cultivate critical relationships of trust among local communities, civil society, religious groups, and government. These relationships

are strengthened by the ability of USIP personnel to move beyond U.S. government security perimeters and stay in the field far beyond the one- to two-year staff rotations that are common for State and Defense Department and U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) personnel. USIP's independent status and consistent, modest appropriation have enabled the Institute to develop focused programs and partnerships over 15 years that have yielded local peace accords and the return of war-displaced Iraqis. In 2018, USIP's nearly two decades of relationship networks, expertise, and agility enabled it to pivot quickly to support an emerging peace process in Afghanistan. This work would not be possible under government agencies or with short-term or private funding.

**Independent analyses for policymakers.** Congress' mandate of independence for the Institute strengthens USIP's research, analyses, and recommendations for U.S. policymakers and implementers—including U.S. embassies



Africa's Sahel region confronts insecurity caused by violent extremism and rising conflicts over scarce water and land resources. In Saaba, a rural district of Burkina Faso, police officer Gomogo Saïdou talks with residents as part of a USIP-led dialogue process that improved police-community relations and strengthened security. USIP led such local dialogues across the Sahel—in Burkina Faso, Mali, Niger, and Senegal. The Institute is helping all four nations apply lessons from the dialogues to advance national-level policing reforms and regional security cooperation. (USIP)

and military stabilization missions abroad—who seek and receive them. The Institute's independent-but-national status strengthens its ability to conduct field research through its deeper, longer engagement in conflict zones. It broadens the Institute's ability to convene a full range of government agencies, scholars, nonprofit organizations, and private-sector specialists for discussions and analyses. For example, USIP's tabletop exercises with the Defense Department convene military and civilian officials with nongovernmental and international organization leaders to better inform and coordinate responses to complex, violent crises.

**A nonpartisan forum for facilitating critical policy discussions, building bridges across divides, and surfacing new peacebuilding ideas.** Congressional and administration leaders, foreign government officials,

nongovernmental organizations, and scholars value USIP as a nonpartisan venue for policy speeches and discussions. In recent years, presidents or prime ministers of Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq, Tunisia, Nigeria, Moldova, and Georgia, among others, have asked USIP to host them for public speeches or for private dialogues, often with U.S. officials. USIP convenes hundreds of smaller, off-the-record discussions each year with U.S. and foreign officials. The Institute sponsors Bipartisan Congressional Dialogues on foreign policy and national security concerns, and off-the-record discussions among members of Congress and experts on foreign policy.

**Congressionally mandated, nonpartisan foreign policy reviews.** Having created USIP as an independent, nonpartisan federal institution, Congress entrusts it with high-level, bipartisan examinations of national security problems.

Such independent policy inquiries would not be possible within a privately funded or policy-implementing agency. These studies have included:

- **The Syria Study Group (2018-2019).** Congress directed USIP to facilitate the group's review of "the current United States military and diplomatic strategy" in the conflict in Syria, with a final report due to Congress in 2019.
- **The Task Force on Extremism in Fragile States (2017-2019).** Congress instructed USIP to develop "a comprehensive plan to prevent extremism in the Sahel, Horn of Africa, and Near East." The task force established by the Institute, co-chaired by former Governor Thomas Kean and former Representative Lee Hamilton, delivered its final report to Congress in February 2019.
- **The Commission on the National Defense Strategy for the United States (2016-2018).** USIP facilitated this legislatively mandated study "to examine and make recommendations with respect to the national defense strategy for the United States." The Institute also has facilitated two Quadrennial Defense Reviews, in 2010 and 2014.
- **The Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States (2008-2009).** USIP facilitated this legislatively mandated study led by former Defense Secretaries William Perry and James Schlesinger.
- **The Iraq Study Group (2006).** USIP facilitated this study of U.S. engagement in Iraq, which was headed by former Secretary of State James Baker and former Representative Lee Hamilton.
- **The Task Force on the United Nations (2004-2005).** At Congress' direction, USIP convened this study on U.N. reforms, chaired by former House Speaker Newt Gingrich and former Senator Majority Leader George Mitchell.

#### **Education and training on resolving violent conflict.**

USIP pursues Congress' mandate that it "serve the people and the Government" with education and training on ways to promote international peace. Through its Academy, the Institute offers courses, in classrooms and online, that teach skills from mediating violent conflict to designing community dialogues to coordinating civilian-military crises response. USIP's instruction reaches U.S. diplomats and military personnel, American and international conflict-resolution practitioners, and tens of thousands of university, high school, and middle school students throughout the United States.

#### **FISCAL YEAR 2020 PRIORITIES**

For Fiscal Year 2020, the Institute will prioritize its work to focus on the rising complexity of violent upheavals in fragile states, notably from the destabilizing roles of competing powers, and from rising competition for scarce resources. This prioritization will mean sustaining USIP's field operations to reduce violence in fragile states while augmenting its unofficial dialogues and analysis work on areas of rising danger. The Institute's priorities are these:

**USIP will continue its fieldwork to help fragile states and their citizens develop capacities to manage and resolve their own violent conflicts. The Institute will continue to focus on conflict areas that are of the greatest concern to U.S. national security interests and values, and in which USIP has built expertise and partnerships.**

- In **Iraq**, the Institute will continue to work at both local and national levels to facilitate the local agreements that are helping to consolidate the country's hard-won peace and stability. A half dozen such accords, among tribal and community leaders, already have helped more than a half million Iraqis, including members of vulnerable religious minorities, to return home.
- In **Tunisia**, USIP will pursue local dialogues to reduce conflicts in cities that have been flashpoints for violent outbreaks that continue to facilitate extremists' recruitment of youth and to menace the country's consolidation of a stable democracy.
- In **Libya**, the Institute will extend its training of youth civic leaders working for peace, as well as its reconciliation work in towns of the south. Southern Libya's instability facilitates violence by transnational criminal and extremist groups and undermines peace in nearby states of the Sahel.
- In **Colombia**, USIP will advance training for civil society and local-level dialogues to resolve conflicts. These contribute to improving governance and the implementation of the 2016 peace accord with the main rebel group. The consolidation of peace in Colombia is more urgent, and more burdened, with the presence of more than 1 million Venezuelan refugees from the turmoil in their own country.
- In **South Sudan**, USIP will sustain its work to strengthen civil society groups that promote reconciliation after years of civil war. The Institute will apply its expertise in peace processes to support the implementation of the most recent peace accord among the country's factions.
- In **Pakistan**, USIP is applying lessons from recent work on de-radicalizing former Taliban child soldiers to new youth education to prevent such radicalization.



Ukrainian and American Orthodox priests and scholars discussed the religious dimension of the Russian-Ukraine conflict in 2018. USIP uses such public forums, track two dialogues, and expert analyses to offer U.S. policymakers options in seeking a peaceful end to the Russian attacks on Ukraine. The Institute also conducts field operations in Ukraine to strengthen foundations for an eventual peaceful resolution of the conflict. (USIP)

**USIP will sharpen its focus on the destabilizing impact of regional and major power competition in fragile states, with a renewed emphasis on Russia.**

- USIP will continue to seek a peaceful end to Russia's occupation of the Donbas region, pursuing its track two negotiations, in coordination with the State Department, among European, **Russian**, and **Ukrainian** former officials. On the ground, the Institute will use community-level dialogues across the military front lines in Donbas to address tensions among Ukrainians divided by the conflict.
- In the **Central African Republic**, where Russia recently has entered the conflict with private military resources, the Institute will continue its work in support of the African Union-led peace process, a role it has taken at the request of the State Department.
- Amid the chaos and violence in **Libya**, USIP will expand field operations that are strengthening the capacities of Libyan partner organizations to manage and resolve conflicts. The Institute will continue to provide analysis, with a focus on the implications of Russia's efforts to heighten its role in Libya, and will seek ways to use USIP's expertise to promote international peacemaking.

- In **Afghanistan**, where Russia has recently asserted influence over the peace process, USIP will continue its intensive support for U.S. efforts to achieve, implement, and consolidate an enduring peace agreement. As peace negotiations continue, and as any potential agreement enters an implementation phase, the Institute will continue holding unofficial meetings of senior former Afghan government and Taliban officials to facilitate progress by finding areas of compromise. The Institute will facilitate dialogues among states engaged in Afghanistan, including Russia and China, to promote their cooperation in creating regional conditions for Afghan peace and stability. USIP also will continue its grassroots work with partners across Afghanistan to build support and mechanisms for negotiated, rather than violent, solutions.
- USIP will expand its analyses and unofficial dialogues on **China's** roles in fragile states across Africa and Asia to provide insights on the destabilizing impact of China's engagement. USIP's high-level, unofficial U.S.-Chinese dialogues will identify potential areas of shared interests in violent conflict zones and fragile regions. These include **North Korea, Burma, Afghanistan, South Asia, and Africa**.
- On the **Red Sea region**, USIP will convene U.S. government and international partners to help build more coordinated, effective responses to the recent years' increase in violent conflict. Current efforts to moderate competition and conflicts in the Red Sea region are fragmented. Notably, USIP will seek to unify these efforts across the organizational seam that exists, in most governments and international institutions, between the region's African and Middle Eastern halves.

**USIP will intensify its work to reduce violent conflict that arises from increased competition for resources, building on its existing operations in fragile states and regions.**

- In **Nigeria**, USIP will continue to help communities and the local and national governments, as well as regional bodies, manage the increasingly violent herder-farmer conflicts over scarce land and water. With traditional systems of conflict resolution overwhelmed, USIP will develop more effective ways of resolving conflicts that plague this regional giant and the surrounding region.
- The Institute will assess opportunities to apply lessons of its recent work on Nigeria's herder-farmer conflicts to nearby countries facing similar violence in the **Sahel region** and the **Lake Chad Basin**.
- In **Afghanistan** and **Central Asia**, where adjoining nations face internal and cross-border conflicts over scarce water resources, the Institute will sustain research and promote dialogues on managing conflicting interests without violence.

# Russia-Ukraine: USIP Dialogue Opens an Option for Peace

*A competitor state ignited violence.  
'Track two' talks complement formal diplomacy to stop it.*

Russia's aggression in Ukraine is a high-stakes example of the current resurgence in conflicts among regional and major powers. These powers, notably Russia, are asserting themselves against nearby, often fragile, states. The United States needs an array of responses to prevent or halt violence and reverse aggression. In Ukraine, the optimal outcome to Russia's 2014 annexation of Crimea and military incursion into the Donbas region is a peaceful restoration of Ukrainian sovereignty that prevents further damage to U.S. and European relations with Russia. Yet mainstream international diplomacy has stalled, leaving the Minsk agreements of 2014 and 2015 unimplemented. By 2017, the conflict, and formal diplomacy, reached what the U.S. special representative for Ukraine negotiations called "a stalemate."

The U.S. Institute of Peace offered its capabilities as an independent national institute to explore new policy options, an initiative welcomed by the State Department. Since 2017, the Institute has conducted discreet, exploratory dialogues to open a new avenue to a resolution of the conflict.

In consultation with the State Department and the National Security Council, USIP convened former senior government officials and other representatives from Ukraine, Russia, Germany, France, and the United States. In unpublicized, off-the-record discussions, the participants were able to discuss solutions by reaching beyond the official positions of their respective governments.

These quiet negotiations were enabled by USIP's credibility, both with U.S. executive agencies and with senior foreign interlocutors, as an independent, national institute partnered with the U.S. government. USIP was able to apply an independent convening power and administrative agility (and low cost) that would have been difficult for a policy-implementing federal agency.

USIP was able to offer new ideas to the U.S. government for use in its official diplomatic discussions with Russia. These ideas include a robust international peacekeeping force, disarmament of illegal fighting groups, and the replacement of the Donbas region's two Russian-backed mini-regimes with an interim, international civil administration.

USIP advances prospects for a peaceful resolution of Russia's incursion into Donbas both from the top down and from the bottom up. As the Institute uses unofficial, high-level dialogue to build options for state-to-state diplomacy, it also is working on the ground to resolve local conflicts vulnerable to exploitation by Russia. Its small teams, able to move with relative agility even in the Donbas region, are preparing community-level dialogues across the front line between Ukrainian and Russian control. These dialogues, to be held during FY 2019, can build local political support for a peace process—and refine proposals for such a process to make it better fit ground-level realities.

## About USIP

### *A Legacy of World War II*

Congress established the U.S. Institute of Peace in 1984, led largely by members of Congress who were combat veterans of World War II and who sought to strengthen America's capacity to shape international affairs by preventing and reducing violent conflicts worldwide.

USIP's founders include Senators Mark Hatfield of Oregon and Spark Matsunaga of Hawaii. In World War II, Hatfield commanded Navy landing craft at the beaches of Iwo Jima and Okinawa, and led an initial U.S. military survey team at Hiroshima following its destruction with the atomic bomb. Matsunaga, an Army captain, fought in Europe and North Africa and was awarded the Bronze Star. In sponsoring legislation for the Institute, these senators were supported by World War II and Korean War veterans, including Congressional Medal of Honor laureate and Hawaii Senator Daniel Inouye and leaders in a nationwide citizens' movement.

Congress formed USIP as an independent, nonpartisan, national institution governed by a bipartisan Board of Directors appointed by the president and confirmed by the Senate. (A list of USIP's current board members is on page 11.) USIP's president, Nancy Lindborg, previously served as assistant administrator for democracy, conflict, and humanitarian assistance at the U.S. Agency for International Development and as president of Mercy Corps.

By statute, USIP's programs are exclusively federally funded, like those of other national security institutions. Headquartered in Washington, D.C., USIP maintains field offices in Baghdad and Erbil (Iraq), Kabul (Afghanistan), Islamabad (Pakistan), Tunis (Tunisia), and Yangon (Burma). On any given day, about 40 percent of USIP personnel are deployed abroad on permanent or temporary duty confronting violent conflict or extremism.



Senators Mark Hatfield of Oregon, Spark Matsunaga of Hawaii, and Jennings Randolph of West Virginia greet President Ronald Reagan in 1984 as he prepares to sign USIP's founding legislation. Hatfield and Matsunaga, who worked with Randolph to create the Institute, were motivated by their World War II combat experiences to create USIP as a way to strengthen America's capacity to reduce and prevent costly wars abroad. (The White House)

# USIP Board of Directors

**Stephen J. Hadley**, (Chair) National Security Advisor (2005-2009) and Deputy National Security Advisor (2001-2005) to President George W. Bush; Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Policy (1989-1993)

**George E. Moose**, (Vice Chair) Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs (1993-1997); U.S. Alternate Representative to the United Nations Security Council (1991-1992); U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Senegal (1988-1991) and the Republic of Benin (1983-1986)

**Judy Ansley**, Assistant to the President and Deputy National Security Advisor (2008-2009) to President George W. Bush; Staff Director, Senate Armed Services Committee (1999-2005)

**Eric S. Edelman**, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy (2005-2009); U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Turkey (2003-2005) and the Republic of Finland (1998-2001)

**Joseph Eldridge**, Distinguished Practitioner, School of International Service, American University

**Kerry Kennedy**, President, Robert F. Kennedy Human Rights

**Ikram U. Khan**, President, Quality Care Consultants, LLC

**Stephen D. Krasner**, Director, Policy Planning, U.S. Department of State (2005-2007); Director, Governance and Development, National Security Council (2002)

**John A. Lancaster**, Former Executive Director, National Council on Independent Living; Lieutenant, U.S. Marine Corps (Ret.)

**Jeremy A. Rabkin**, Professor, Antonin Scalia Law School at George Mason University

**Vice Admiral Fritz Roegge**, USN, President, National Defense University

**John C. Rood**, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy

**John J. Sullivan**, Deputy Secretary of State

**J. Robinson West**, (Chair Emeritus) Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Policy, Budget, and Administration (1981-1983); Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Economic Affairs (1976-1977)

**Nancy Zirkin**, Executive Vice President, Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights