

Congressional Budget Justification Fiscal Year 2021

Budget in Brief



UNITED STATES
INSTITUTE OF PEACE
Making Peace Possible

PHOTOGRAPHS ON THE COVER:

At left, Sudanese citizens rally in support of civilian rule, part of a grassroots movement that ousted the military leader in 2019. USIP has trained Sudanese civic groups in nonviolent methods to seek change and resolve conflicts. (AP/Hussein Malla)

At center, Afghan women at a USIP workshop discuss their role in an eventual national peace process to include the Taliban. The Institute is sponsoring discussions across Afghanistan to help build consensus on peace talks and women's role. (USIP photo)

At right, African peacekeeping troops in Djibouti take a USIP training course on ways to peacefully resolve conflicts before joining the African Union peacekeeping mission in Somalia. (USIP photo)



UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

February 10, 2020

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 FY 2021 Congressional Budget Justification for \$45,000,000. This request is equal to the enacted FY 2020 appropriation and supports USIP's ability to effectively advance its congressional mission as an independent, nonpartisan, federally funded institute dedicated to reducing violent international conflict.

Congress created USIP in 1984 as a vital investment in reducing violent international conflicts that threaten U.S. national security. Since then, USIP has adjusted its work to address urgent challenges to U.S. security, including this century's civil wars and violent extremism rooted in fragile states, and the rising threats from strategic competitors. Today, USIP's 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 2021, USIP will sustain its focus on the increasing complexity driving violent upheavals abroad: the violence of fragile states, competition for scarce resources, and the exploitation of conflict by regional and great powers. USIP will continue to guide fragile societies and nations in achieving their own nonviolent solutions to conflict through its education, training, analysis, and skills for conflict resolution and reconciliation, notably in Iraq, Tunisia, Afghanistan, Burma, Colombia, Sudan, and South Sudan. USIP will prioritize its distinct capabilities in convening, research, and analysis to improve conflict resolution options, reduce violent conflict abroad, and inform Congress and U.S. policymakers.

We respectfully request \$45,000,000 in FY 2021 funding for USIP. The Institute's FY 2021 budget priorities will continue investments that are cost-effective contributions to our national security.

Sincerely yours,

Handwritten signature of Nancy Lindborg in black ink.

Nancy Lindborg
President

Handwritten signature of Stephen J. Hadley in black ink.

Stephen J. Hadley
Chair of the Board

FY 2021 Budget Request

APPROPRIATION	FY 2019 ENACTED	FY 2020 ENACTED	FY 2021 REQUEST	INCREASE / (DECREASE)
United States Institute of Peace Appropriation	38,634,000	45,000,000	45,000,000	-

USIP: Investment in Peace and National Security

The United States Institute of Peace requests \$45,000,000 for Fiscal Year (FY) 2021, equal to its most recently enacted appropriation, in FY 2020. 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 states have been the primary drivers of global violence and instability: civil wars, extremism and terrorism, and historic numbers of refugees and migrants. These "fragile-state conflicts" increasingly are complicated by the interplay of rising trends: resurgent competition among regional and major powers, particularly China and Russia; accelerating environmental shocks; and fast-growing, younger populations. A distinct, growing threat is the weakening of strategic stability as global dangers from nuclear arms, cyber warfare, and new technologies outstrip mechanisms for identifying and implementing solutions. USIP foresees that these trends will escalate in the years ahead and has shifted its priorities to address them. This FY 2021 budget request reflects these adjusted priorities.

NEW COMPLEXITIES OF VIOLENT CONFLICT: HOW USIP RESPONDS

Amid the world's violent conflicts and humanitarian crises, **USIP fieldwork targets violence in selected fragile states that are vital to U.S. interests**—from Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan to Ukraine, Tunisia, Colombia, and Nigeria. In these 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. Because many root causes of conflicts cross national borders, USIP's responses do so as well, working at regional levels. 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, using core tools of mediation, negotiation, and dialogue. In countries facing violent conflict, USIP researchers and analysts help identify root causes of the violence as well as strategies to end it. USIP specialists mentor local mediators who help negotiate peace accords at both community and national levels. USIP trainers help local citizens' groups to 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 trains, equips, and supports frontline peacebuilders within fragile states, bolstering those nations' abilities to *manage their own conflicts peacefully*. It builds the resilience of these states and societies against the predations of extremist groups, transnational criminal networks, and competitor states.

Increasingly, regional and major powers are competing in ways that intensify violence in fragile regions. Russia's military engagements have complicated the war in **Syria**, sought to dismember **Ukraine**, and fed turmoil in **Venezuela** and **Libya**. China's investment strategies, seeking resources and influence, deepen debts and instability in African and Asian countries. **China, Saudi Arabia, Iran, and Turkey** compete



USIP's Afghanistan team briefs the commander of the Army's 10th Mountain Division, Major General Brian Mennes (second from right), and his staff as the division prepared a deployment to Afghanistan in 2019. The Institute offers briefings and training to U.S. military units on ways to reduce conflict abroad. USIP and the 10th Mountain Division have collaborated repeatedly since 2007, when they helped end tribal fighting in Iraq's "Triangle of Death," south of Baghdad. That success permitted an 80-percent drawdown of U.S. forces in that sector, reducing U.S. casualties and costs. (USIP Photo)

across the Red Sea region and in Libya in ways that weaken states, worsen violence, and impede peace processes.

The Institute expands the options for the U.S. government to address these challenges with USIP's specialized capacity for unofficial dialogues that complement formal diplomacy. The Institute's track-two and track-1.5 dialogues helped develop ideas for ending the war in Ukraine that the United States used in a formal proposal to Russia that remains on the table. USIP-sponsored dialogues with Chinese interlocutors and experts from around the world have offered U.S. officials insight into Chinese initiatives in areas of U.S.-China competition: Burma, North Korea, Afghanistan, South and Southeast Asia, the Middle East, Latin America, and Africa. USIP works, through unofficial dialogues or field operations, on four conflicts for which the United States currently deploys special envoys: Afghanistan, North Korea, Sudan, and Syria. **USIP provides insights through independent**

research, analyses, and working groups that gather U.S. policymakers with a range of other experts. The Institute's expert, bipartisan Senior Study Groups have reported on China's roles in the internal conflicts of Burma and in negotiations with North Korea. Other USIP analyses and working groups recommend steps on China's roles in Nigeria and the Red Sea region, and on Russian actions in Ukraine.

USIP helps to frame options for shoring up arms control and strategic stability in relations among the United States, Russia, and China. A quickening confluence of changes has weakened the safeguards that helped to secure the world for decades against war between the globe's most powerful nuclear powers. Cold War-era arms agreements are deteriorating, notably with the collapse of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty. Accelerating technologies have yielded new cybernetic and hybrid forms of warfare. This could threaten strategic stability and has created the need

“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

for new concepts of arms control and nonproliferation—two issues at the center of USIP’s earlier years of work during the Cold War. USIP will apply its expertise and experience—in facilitating unofficial dialogues, in research and analysis with U.S. government partners on strategic stability problems, and in productive dialogue with Russian interlocutors—to help fill a dangerous gap in efforts to preserve and strengthen a stable strategic relationship with Russia.

USIP works to improve analysis and solutions in conflicts inflamed by changes in the natural environment. This effort builds on USIP’s years of fieldwork in such conflicts. In fragile regions, USIP works to reduce violent conflict over shrinking resources as basic as water and land, which is intensifying among growing and younger populations. For example, the Institute is helping Nigeria apply USIP-designed dialogue methods to reduce violent land-use battles between herding and farming communities (see page 23).

Because violent conflicts increasingly are crossing borders, USIP has intensified its work at regional levels. Across Africa’s Sahel region, the Institute conducts community-level dialogues in four countries, and now is convening national-level officials to apply the resulting lessons to improve 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 and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations to manage and resolve conflicts peacefully. In the Red Sea region, local conflicts are being exacerbated by competition among regional and major powers competing for influence there and in the adjacent regions of the Middle East. Yet policymaking on the Red Sea region often is poorly coordinated because this zone falls geographically between the African and Middle East bureaus of federal agencies. USIP’s current initiative on the Red Sea region, convening U.S. government and international partners in a region-wide working group, offers a way to more comprehensively address these problems across those organizational seams.

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 71 million people, more than in World War II. In six years, from 2012 to 2018, these escalating crises drove a doubling of appropriated U.S. humanitarian assistance—from \$4.3 billion to more than \$9 billion per year. Humanitarian crises have nearly doubled in duration—from five years to nine years—since 2014. USIP’s conflict-prevention work seeks to mitigate 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, seven local peace accords guided by USIP have allowed more than 600,000 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.

Even the most determined diplomatic, military, or conflict resolution efforts cannot always end bloodshed in the short term.

“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.)

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 and women mediators who have achieved local peace accords 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 our nation’s security and interests abroad. Civilian foreign policy leaders from 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.

USIP: AN INDEPENDENT GOVERNMENT PARTNER

Congress established USIP as a national, statutorily nonpartisan institute 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 mandated that the Institute’s work be federally funded through direct appropriations, ensuring that USIP serves national priorities rather than any private or foreign interest. These provisions give the Institute the independence and organizational agility to respond quickly to the shifts in international violence and its threats. They enable USIP to fulfill its vital roles:

Unofficial dialogues that complement and support formal, government-to-government diplomacy. USIP’s status as a nonpartisan national institute allows it to convene track-two and track-1.5 negotiations, and other unofficial dialogues, for the benefit of U.S. government partners and U.S.-supported peace processes. These dialogues, undertaken in close coordination with executive agencies, can explore causes and potential solutions in sensitive conflicts, yielding recommendations and options for U.S. policymakers. In the past two years, USIP has convened nongovernment experts with current and former officials—U.S., Russian, Chinese, and others—for such unofficial dialogues. The USIP dialogue project



Ethiopian women exercise before their work shift at a textile factory in a Chinese-built industrial park at Hassawa. China has become Ethiopia's largest investor, bringing industries, transport links, and social change as the East African country tries to democratize peacefully from its years of single-party rule and communal violence. USIP is expanding its training of Ethiopian women, youth, and civil society leaders working for nonviolence and transparent, accountable governance. USIP analysis and fieldwork helps people in Africa and Asia seek greater accountability as their countries receive heavy Chinese investments. (Joerg Boethling/Alamy)

on Ukraine, in consultation with the State Department, yielded ideas taken up in formal U.S. diplomacy to resolve the conflict in Ukraine's Donbas region. On Afghanistan, USIP's independence allows it to facilitate intra-Afghan dialogues—among political leaders, women, and youth—to strengthen foundations for eventual peace negotiations with the Taliban. It also sponsors track-two discussions among Afghanistan's neighbors to promote their cooperation in helping to stabilize Afghanistan. Other USIP dialogue projects engage Russian, Chinese, and other partners on tensions around Burma, South Asia, 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, and Nigeria, USIP's small teams maintain critical relationships of trust with 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. In Iraq, USIP's consistent, modest appropriation has enabled the Institute to develop focused programs and partnerships over 16 years that have yielded local peace accords and the return home of many war-displaced Iraqis (see page 17). In Afghanistan, USIP's nearly two decades of building relationships and expertise enabled it to pivot quickly, beginning in 2018, to support emerging moves toward peace (see page 28). This work is enabled by the Institute's independence and direct appropriations.

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 and military stabilization missions abroad—who seek and receive them. The Institute’s 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 annual 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 developing new peacebuilding ideas. Congressional and administration leaders, foreign government officials, nongovernmental organizations, and scholars value USIP as a nonpartisan venue for policy 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 provides briefings to members of Congress and executive branch partner agencies.

Nonpartisan, high-level reviews of national security problems. Congress frequently entrusts USIP with high-level policy inquiries that would not be possible within a privately funded organization or a policy-implementing agency. These studies have included:

- **An Afghanistan Peace Process Study Group.** In December 2019, Congress directed USIP to facilitate a study of the implications for “U.S. policy, resources, and commitments in Afghanistan” of “a peace settlement, or the failure to reach a settlement.”
- **The Syria Study Group (2018–2019).** Congress directed USIP to facilitate this bipartisan expert group’s review of “the current United States military and diplomatic strategy” in the conflict in Syria. It was chaired by experts Michael Singh and Dana Stroul.
- **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 Institute established the bipartisan task force, co-chaired by former Governor Thomas Kean and former Representative Lee Hamilton, to produce the plan.
- **The Commission on the National Defense Strategy for the United States (2017–2018).** USIP facilitated

this legislatively mandated study, chaired by former Undersecretary of Defense Eric Edelman and retired Navy Admiral Gary Roughead, “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, led 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. The Institute offers courses, in classrooms and online, that teach skills from mediating violent conflict and designing community dialogues to coordinating civilian-military crises response. USIP’s instruction reaches U.S. diplomats and military personnel, U.S. and international conflict resolution practitioners, and tens of thousands of university, high school, and middle school students throughout the United States.

FISCAL YEAR 2021 PRIORITIES

For Fiscal Year 2021, the Institute will prioritize its work to reduce the increasingly complex violent upheavals in fragile states, and will add a new focus on the rising threat to peace and security from the weakening of global strategic stability. This prioritization will mean sustaining USIP’s field operations in fragile states while augmenting its unofficial dialogues and analysis work on areas of rising threat. The Institute’s priority tasks are these:

USIP will analyze, and will expand on its recent years of unofficial dialogue work with Russia and China to address, issues of strategic stability.

- USIP will conduct track-two dialogues on issues vital to strategic stability.
- USIP will analyze ways in which emerging patterns of “hybrid” or “gray zone” conflict, including new technologies and media, can be mined for concepts applicable to the cause of building peace in both fragile states and major power relationships.

“Seeing all these successes by these USIP-trained youth leaders working for peace makes you feel so optimistic about the future of the world. They are dedicated, they believe in their dreams, and it’s not only words, it’s actions. People are working in their communities to make a change in this world; they don’t wait for this change to happen.”

—Soukaina Hamia, Moroccan civil society leader and USIP Generation Change Fellow

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

- USIP will sustain its analyses and continue to pursue unofficial dialogues to provide policymakers greater visibility on the impacts of **China’s** roles in zones of strategic interest to the United States across Africa, Asia, and Latin America. USIP will follow up recent high-level, unofficial U.S.-Chinese dialogues that seek strategies for managing conflicts in **Burma, Afghanistan, and South Asia.**
- USIP will continue to promote a peaceful end to Russia’s occupation of **Ukraine’s** Donbas region. The Institute will support community-level dialogues across the military front lines in Donbas to address tensions among Ukrainians divided by the conflict.
- Amid **Libya’s** turmoil, and the complicating role of multiple outside powers, USIP will advance field operations that strengthen Libyan partner organizations in reducing violence. This includes training of women and youth civic leaders who lead local dialogues and mediation to end violent conflicts in their locales, notably in the south. USIP research and fieldwork will support Libyan-led reforms in local law enforcement, criminal justice, and prison systems.
- On **Venezuela**, where Russia’s support for an authoritarian regime has complicated a citizens’ campaign for more democratic governance, USIP will expand its training and mentoring of youth civil society leaders working for peaceful change and against armed conflict. The Institute will convene U.S. officials and non-government experts with Colombian and Venezuelan representatives to analyze ways to improve opportunities for a peaceful democratic transition in Venezuela.
- In **Southeast Asia** and the **Horn of Africa**, where Chinese investment and influence in fragile states has the potential to exacerbate local conflicts, USIP will

work with local civil society organizations to strengthen their capacity to engage with their governments to promote transparency and accountability, notably in major development and infrastructure projects.

- On **the Red Sea region**, USIP will continue to convene U.S. government and international partners to help build more coordinated, effective responses to the recent years’ increase in violent conflict, including the roles of major and regional powers. Current efforts to moderate competition and conflicts in the Red Sea region are fragmented. USIP’s initiative seeks 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. One focus of this initiative is **Sudan**, where the involvement of competing states in the Middle East risks undermining the U.S. interest in Sudan’s transition to more stable, democratic governance.

USIP will continue its fieldwork to help fragile states and their citizens develop capacities to reduce 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 **Afghanistan**, USIP will continue sponsoring unofficial dialogues—within Afghanistan and among countries in the region—to improve conditions for reconciliation and a peace process in the country’s war. The Institute will sustain district-level and provincial-level dialogues to clarify what Afghans want from a peace process. The dialogues amplify voices from typically marginalized groups, notably women and youth. USIP will continue its training of those groups to more effectively participate in eventual peace talks with the Taliban. USIP will continue its fieldwork to strengthen citizen anti-corruption



Afghan women in the city of Mazar-i-Sharif discuss how to build a nationwide consensus on protecting women's rights in peace negotiations with the Taliban. Their conference was one of a series by USIP at local, provincial, and national levels to broaden representation of women and youth leaders in an Afghan peace process. In 2019, USIP convened Afghan women leaders to train with experienced, USIP-trained, Colombian women who achieved unprecedented levels of participation in their country's peace process. Helping women broaden their role in peacemaking is a priority for the Institute's work worldwide (see page 32). (USIP Photo)

campaigners. It will continue to expand the teaching of Afghanistan's first university-level courses in conflict resolution, shaped by USIP, which the government now has authorized for use at every university nationwide.

- In **Nigeria** and the **Sahel region**, USIP will sustain its community-level dialogues among citizens, government officials, and police—and will help state and national governments adopt the reforms promoted by those dialogues in state, national, and regional policies.
- In **Sudan**, USIP will provide further training to strengthen civil society groups promoting nonviolence and dialogue to peacefully advance a transition toward democratic rule. The Institute also will help the transitional government, at its request, with support for dialogues among Sudanese groups to prevent violence and the spread of extremism. In **South Sudan**, USIP will continue training and mentoring for a network of

75-plus nonviolent civil society groups to foster reconciliation from the years of civil war and promote nonviolence in campaigning for more democratic rule.

- In **East Africa**, USIP will work with the Kenyan partner organization it has cultivated to build a regional network of women-led civil society groups across Tanzania, Uganda, and Ethiopia as well as Kenya to promote programs and policies at community and national levels to reduce violent extremism. USIP will continue its training of Kenyan border police, who play a significant role against extremism and terrorism, and will expand its support for youth and civil society leaders working to ensure peace in Ethiopia.
- In **Colombia**, USIP will expand local-level dialogues among police, local officials, and residents to resolve security problems. It will advance training for civil society leaders working for peace. These steps help to

Peace in a Libyan City: USIP-Backed Women Halt Tribal Warfare

Even amid violence, low-cost interventions equip frontline builders of peace.

When tribal warfare threatened the Libyan city of Ubari in 2019, bloodshed was averted largely by a dedicated band of women. For months, USIP and a local partner organization had been training citizens, many of them women, who were opposing tribal violence at the city's schools. In September, a local tribesman killed a rival, and armed fighters took over the streets. Residents locked themselves inside their homes.

But the dead man's mother was part of the USIP-backed campaign against violence. "We are done with war, even if the person killed is my son, my flesh and blood," she told her tribe's elders. She urged them "not to burn a house for me or kill an innocent." Ubari's peace campaigners had used dialogue among the tribes to shape an accord to halt violence in the schools—and now they pressed tribal elders to sign it. The elders did so, surrounded by applauding residents. The city's fearful lockdown ended and Libya's Red Crescent society, long barred from Ubari by violence, began planning its return. The United Nations announced an aid project to build on the USIP-guided peace initiative.

Even where warfare may be blocking national-level peace processes, as in Libya, USIP locates, trains, and mentors courageous local partners, like Ubari's women. Thus empowered, these people demand a halt to violence, accountability from their leaders, and government reforms that favor stability. Equipping local communities and countries to peacefully solve their own problems produces more enduring solutions at lower cost. As in Ubari, these frontline peacebuilders often come from groups marginalized in their societies:

- **Women**, whose abilities to help end violent conflict typically are overlooked. The Institute has pursued this work intensively in Colombia, Afghanistan, Nigeria, and Kenya, for example. (See page 43.)
- **Youth**, who are vital assets against extremism and violence in fragile states with massive youth populations. USIP-trained youth leaders work in dozens of countries, including Sudan, Afghanistan, Somalia, Colombia, Nigeria, and Venezuela. (See page 42.)
- **Religious communities**. USIP for three decades has prioritized work on religious facets of conflict resolution, including programs in Burma, Iraq, Pakistan, Nigeria, and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. (See page 41.)
- **Grassroots citizens**. Nonviolent citizens' movements are twice as successful as violent struggles in achieving major changes in governance. USIP trains citizens for peaceful activism in East Africa, Latin America, Tunisia, and Afghanistan. (See page 37.)

improve governance and promote the difficult implementation of the 2016 agreement to end civil warfare. USIP's work in Colombia will be closely coordinated with its expanding work on **Venezuela**, notably to address instability in weakly governed regions along the two countries' border.

- In **Central America**, USIP will increase its support for Nicaraguans' efforts to nonviolently address public grievances and reduce violent instability in **Nicaragua**. The Institute will expand its training of civil society and citizens' groups working for this nonviolent change, and will support new dialogue initiatives to counter polarization and generate consensus on ways to peacefully resolve the political crisis.
- In **Iraq**, the Institute will continue to facilitate local peace agreements that have helped to reduce communal violence, notably following the rollback of rule by the Islamic State (ISIS). These accords, among tribal and community leaders, have helped create the conditions for many Iraqis, including members of vulnerable religious minorities, to return home. Amid Iraq's political crises, USIP will continue to use its relationships at the national and local levels to promote more inclusive and stable governance. The Institute will sustain its work to help minority communities strengthen their advocacy for minority rights.
- In **Tunisia**, USIP will sustain its local dialogues in cities facing violent conflict and its support for reformed police training that helps to prevent violent conflicts. These efforts reduce opportunities by extremists to radicalize and recruit youth, and they improve conditions for the peaceful repatriation, and disengagement from extremist networks, of Tunisians formerly associated with ISIS in Syria.

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 government, as well as regional bodies, work to reverse the recent increase in violence amid herder-farmer conflicts over scarce land and water. The Institute will support Nigeria's young, state-level peacebuilding agencies, as they and civil society groups use USIP-designed dialogue methods to reduce these conflicts.
- The Institute will assess ways to apply lessons of its recent work on Nigeria's herder-farmer conflicts, and findings of its policy analysis with the African Union, 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 research and launch pilot projects, directed at governments and communities, to reduce the risk of violent conflict over the increasingly erratic water supplies in Central and South Asia.
- The Institute will prioritize research on studies that can improve policies and programs to address violent conflicts that are inflamed by climate shocks and competition for scarce resources. This priority will drive USIP's awards of grants and fellowships.

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 the first U.S. survey of Hiroshima's 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. (USIP's current board is listed 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, who signed USIP's founding legislation in 1984. Hatfield and Matsunaga, who worked with Randolph and bipartisan co-sponsors to establish 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)

Stephen E. Biegun, Deputy Secretary of State

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

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, Former Executive Vice President, Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights