



UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

# *Passing the* BATON

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

Final Event Report

Passing the Baton 2009:  
National Security and Foreign Policy Challenges  
Facing the New Administration

A U.S. Institute of Peace Conference  
Marking the Institute's 25<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Year

January 8, 2009



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

## **Introduction**

Passing the Baton 2009 was a one-day conference convened by the United States Institute of Peace to examine critical foreign policy challenges and opportunities facing the Obama administration as it transitions into power. It took place January 8, 2009 at the Walter E. Washington Convention Center in Washington, D.C.

A high-level, bipartisan group of current and former U.S. foreign policy officials, scholars, and other experts made presentations to nearly 1900 participants. The discussed specific options or recommendations for the Obama administration on such important international topics as the Arab-Israeli peace process, the way forward in Afghanistan, and countering nuclear proliferation.

Passing the Baton 2009 was a reprise of an event by the same name that USIP sponsored in January 2001 as the country made the transition from the Clinton to the Bush administration. Today, our country is in another leadership transition, but in significantly changed – and evermore challenging – international and domestic circumstances.

In 2001 the United States saw itself as part of a “post-Cold War” world, struggling to relate to post-Soviet Union Russia, trying to stabilize the Balkans, and considering how to reorganize America’s national security management in a world moving beyond the era of superpower confrontation.

Within nine months of the Bush administration taking office, however, September 11th transformed for Americans, and for the world, their conception of international challenges. Our national security and foreign policy agenda was dramatically altered, producing a paradigm shift in the issues and approaches to protecting America’s security and promoting our interests abroad.

Today the United States finds itself in a post-9/11 world rather than a post-Cold War world. Our country has spent the last eight years dealing with catastrophic terrorism perpetrated by non-state organizations, trying to prevent mass atrocities in weak and failed states, and confronting the heightened challenge of countering the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the failure of peace processes, and the burdens of stabilizing and reconstructing societies torn by war, ethnic conflict and religious extremism.

Passing the Baton 2009 was an occasion to highlight these challenges in a world much changed since 2001. On the one hand, the Middle East is again engulfed with the violence of that seemingly endless, intractable conflict between Palestinians and Israelis. Enduring hatreds are now amplified by new technologies of destruction and the intervention of regional powers and their surrogates opposed to peacemaking. On the other hand, the president-elect has a unique opportunity to restore American leadership abroad on issues ranging from the threat of nuclear proliferation to the effects of global climate change.



# *Passing the* BATON

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

Passing the Baton's presentations and panels were organized around major issues in the new national security and foreign policy agenda. This event was not a comprehensive survey, but rather one that drew on projects central to the work of the U.S. Institute of Peace, which celebrates in 2009 25 years of work on international conflict management and peacebuilding. With its broad and flexible charter from Congress, the Institute focuses on issues of war and peace, on approaches to managing international conflict by non-violent means, and on ways of strengthening our national capacity to prevent, manage and resolve conflicts abroad.

This report serves as a brief overview of the day's events and, importantly, the specific policy recommendations made by panelists. On the following pages, readers will find a short synopsis of each panel and plenary presentation from the day's events. A more comprehensive record of the event is available at USIP's website, [www.usip.org](http://www.usip.org), where users can access more than 14 hours of video and audio files from the conference, as well as links to supplementary documents, photo galleries, and other features. The panel descriptions in this report are intended to serve as overviews only. The video and audio files available online should be considered the official record of all speakers' remarks.

It is the Institute's hope that by providing these analyses of the international challenges facing the Obama administration as it begins its tenure, we will help policymakers and citizens alike understand the depth and complexity of the foreign policy issues the country faces. The Institute does so not in an effort to overwhelm its audience with the scale of the effort needed, but to highlight policy alternatives facing the country. It is the Institute's purpose to find nonviolent solutions to managing or resolving international conflicts. Hopefully, conflicts can be prevented from reaching a violent stage, but if not, there are techniques of managing crises and promoting post-conflict stabilization and reconstruction. That is the fundamental purpose of the work of the United States Institute of Peace and the focus of Passing the Baton 2009.



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

## **Session One: “Today’s World, Tomorrow’s Challenges”**

Speaker: **Henrietta Fore**, Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development

### **Main Issues**

Administrator Fore spoke on behalf of Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, who was scheduled to speak at Passing the Baton but was detained at the United Nations Security Council in New York to continue discussions on recent violence in the Gaza Strip.

The administrator used her address to focus on the Bush administration’s transformational diplomacy agenda, which she said includes a strong emphasis on foreign assistance and development. For development strategies to be successful, she said, there must be improved accountability, increased numbers of staff working on development issues, and partnering with the private sector. The Bush administration agenda has been to build and sustain democratic, well-governed states that will respond to the needs of the people.

Ultimately, the administration’s agenda led to the most ambitious development strategy since the Marshall Plan. This has been accomplished through traditional means such as assistance grants, but also through effective partnering with the private sector, improving accountability, and increasing the number of international development officers through the Development Leadership Initiative. Accountability has been improved through the work of the Millennium Challenge Corporation and foreign aid reform.

The U.S. is dedicated to building lasting peace through multiple means, including partnering with the private sector, said Fore, pointing out that USAID has created 225 new partnerships in the last year, leveraging almost \$650 million dollars in private sector contributions.

She also pointed out that the Bush administration has worked to make change in the Middle East. The administration believes that a chance for a better future in the region exists as a result of positive changes fostered by the president in other parts of the region, including Iraq, Lebanon, and Afghanistan.

The U.S. strives to create a Middle East that moves away from the status quo and toward a durable and sustainable peace, she said, but it must proceed according to the Annapolis process. Fore identified Gaza as a particularly important issue for U.S. foreign policy, saying that the U.S. is greatly concerned about the recent violence -- especially the humanitarian situation that continues -- and is earnestly trying to bring about an end to the current conflict.

She went on to highlight administration efforts in other parts of the region and the world. Specifically, she pointed out that:



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

1. Iraq now has a democratically elected prime minister, and the country is friend of the U.S.;
2. Syrian forces have left Lebanon;
3. A democratically elected government is in place in Afghanistan;
4. The U.S. has established strong bilateral relationships where they did not exist previously;
5. The U.S. continues its effort to denuclearize the Korean Peninsula by promoting Six Party Talks.

## **Policy Conclusions**

Administrator Fore identified several lessons that can be gleaned from the work of the Bush administration. These include:

1. An emphasis on planning and integrating defense, diplomatic, and development strategies - all essential to U.S. national security.
2. The importance of investing in a secure future by continuing current development commitments, notwithstanding the global economic slowdown.
3. The need to continue commitments to rebuilding diplomatic and development staff throughout the world.
4. Prioritizing essential partnerships with the private sector in the long term. Fore indicated, "This is the strongest trend for our shared future and in it lie the seeds for a safer, more peaceful and prosperous world."



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

## **Session Two: “Proliferation, Catastrophic Terrorism, and a New Security Paradigm”**

Speaker: **William J. Perry**, Former Secretary of Defense

### **Main Issues**

Using his experiences as one who was involved in developing America’s nuclear arsenal as the source of his motivation to alert the nation and the world to the rapidly growing danger of nuclear terrorism, Dr. Perry provided a list of actions the Obama administration could take that would make the nation safer. These actions would place the United States once again in the leadership role of an effort to “dismantle the nuclear legacy of the Cold War.”

Dismayed that little has been done by the Bush administration, Dr. Perry cited the dangers of nuclear proliferation in the world today with emphasis on both North Korea and Iran. Bluntly stating that North Korea’s development of plutonium and its testing of a nuclear device signal the most dangerous development to peace since the end of the Cold War, Perry remains convinced that only with strong U.S. leadership, diplomatic efforts can resolve that crisis and halt North Korean proliferation activities.

However, Perry is less sanguine about Iran’s good intentions and programs. He believes the current efforts underway are based on weak strategies and can be easily thwarted by Iran. Absent U.S. willingness to engage with Iran, the situation can become dangerous and could provoke Israel to take unilateral action to seek an end to Iran’s nuclear programs. For this reason, he believes the Obama administration will face a crisis with Iran within the administration’s first year in office.

Secretary Perry noted that he is in full agreement with the stated Obama policy that the U.S. seeks a world free of nuclear weapons but that as long as nuclear weapons exist, the U.S. must maintain a credible, safe, secure and reliable deterrent force. The current U.S. program aimed at ensuring our stockpile reliability without the need for explosive testing has proven successful, he said. Additionally, our program designed to extend the life and safety of our nuclear weapons has also proven successful, though support for both programs appears to be waning in Congress.

Dr. Perry expressed a great concern about the diminishing source of both nuclear policy and technical experts. Those experts who devised America’s nuclear policies, researched, built, tested, and sustained the nation’s nuclear arsenal are retiring without an adequate amount of younger replacement personnel. Within five years, every American ever involved in a nuclear explosive test will have retired. While explosive testing is not a policy goal, these experts possessed a wealth of unique knowledge that will be lost, Perry said.



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

Perry expressed concern that the world is at the tipping point on nuclear proliferation and that if passed, there will be no turning back. “If the world does tip,” he said, “it will be irreversible and dangerous beyond most people’s imagination.”

## **Policy Conclusions**

Dr. Perry cited several actions the Obama administration could take that would be vital to protecting the United States:

1. Use the bully pulpit of the presidency to awaken the world to the grave danger to security posed by the proliferation of nuclear weapons and related technologies.
2. Invite Russia to negotiate a new treaty entailing significant nuclear arms reductions.
3. Seek a return to active cooperation between Russia and the United States in mitigating the dangers of nuclear terrorism.
4. Work with the Senate for the ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.
5. Propose a new Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty, to include verification procedures.
6. Increase support of the International Atomic Energy Agency in its efforts to strengthen the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

## **Session Three: “Questions & Answers on Countering Proliferation”**

Speakers: **Eric Edelman**, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy;  
**Bob Joseph**, former Bush administration senior director at the National Security Council;  
**Dan Poneman**, former Clinton and Bush administration senior director at the National Security Council;  
**Wendy Sherman**, former counselor to Secretary of State Madeleine Albright

### **Main Issues**

This session was convened as an opportunity for senior national security analysts to respond to Secretary Perry’s speech on “Proliferation, Catastrophic Terrorism and a New Security Paradigm”, which was delivered immediately prior to the session.

Panelists unanimously called for bipartisan support for dealing with the nuclear proliferation threat, especially that posed by Iran. While the Obama administration has not yet articulated its strategy, panelists called for reengagement with Russia as a key element of that strategy. Not only has Russia been cooperative in the Cooperative Threat Reduction program, also known as the Nunn-Lugar Act, it has also worked with the U.S. on countering terrorist threats.

However, several panelists pointed out that Russo-U.S. relations are currently at a relative low point for the post-Cold War period due to increasing Russian perceptions that proposed missile defense plans in Europe are not intended to counter an Iranian threat as has been stated, but rather present an emerging threat to Russia. Additionally, Russia sees the expansion of NATO as a threat.

From the U.S. perspective, Russia appears to be backsliding in its efforts to democratize and has adopted Soviet-style actions when dealing with its neighbors in the region. These facts must be considered when the Obama administration attempts to craft a nuclear nonproliferation strategy. One former Bush official cautioned against making any “grand gesture” toward Russia, as it might be misinterpreted as a sign of weakness.

Generally agreeing with Dr. Perry’s conclusion that nuclear terrorism constitutes the gravest threat facing the United States, panelists stressed that the window of opportunity is open now but that no assumptions can be made that it will remain open. Making the most of this opportunity requires a multitude of actions by the United States, some of which are domestically oriented while others require distinct international support.



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

Two panelists indicated that support for ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) will require a great deal of work with the Senate and could result in the need for separate protocols with Russia on several issues. The Obama administration will need to initiate steps immediately to work with Russia on extending the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty I (START I), which is due to expire in December 2009. Two panelists also called for work to begin on a new effort to craft, negotiate and implement a Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty (FMCT), which would bring nuclear commercial fuel under tighter controls and reduce the chances for it to be covertly used to produce plutonium.

Panelists differed to some degree as to which tools might work best to achieve these goals. One panelist stated that economic sanctions against Iran have failed and that halting its nuclear programs will require “direct and intrusive actions” sanctioned by the UN Security Council. Another panelist disagreed and thought economic sanctions required greater use but that Russia remains reluctant to pursue that line because of its close economic ties to Iran, despite the fact that Russia does not want Iran to develop nuclear weapons.

Another panelist took a more comprehensive view and noted that world power requirements will drive the proliferation of nuclear power plants around the world. Actions by the U.S. to implement treaties with states seeking nuclear power are vital, and without such controls the threat of terrorists acquiring nuclear materials grows. The panelist also noted that climate change will increasingly force the move to nuclear power because states will seek to avoid the increased use of fossil fuels.

As with Iran, panelists also agreed with Dr. Perry’s point that the North Korean nuclear program must be dismantled.

## **Policy Conclusions\***

1. The time to act on nonproliferation is now – while bipartisan support remains available to the Obama administration. The administration should not allow the window of opportunity to become a window of vulnerability.
2. Russia must be reengaged as an equal partner in an American effort to motivate the international community to halt the threat of nuclear proliferation. Emphasis must be placed on extending START I.

---

\* Policy Conclusions from Group Panel Discussions at Passing the Baton 2009 were not necessarily achieved by group consensus. In some instances, individual panel members may have been in disagreement with the larger group. For specific information on each panel’s contents, please see the comprehensive online archive at [www.usip.org/baton2009](http://www.usip.org/baton2009).



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

3. The U.S. must consider Russian concerns over missile defense and NATO expansion. The Russians will link these issues to any other bilateral issue with the U.S.
4. Steps must be taken to improve the controls over fissile material and prevent its use to build nuclear weapons.
5. The U.S. must take steps to assert its international leadership role on this issue by engaging Iran, preferably in a multilateral venue, and pushing for ratification of the CTBT.
6. The U.S. must continue to work within the Six Party framework for the nuclear disarmament of North Korea.
7. The U.S. must take the lead in the development, negotiation, and implementation of a Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty.
8. The new administration must begin work immediately on preparing its positions for the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference in 2010. The U.S. will need as much international support as possible in advance of the conference.



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

## **Session Four: “Preventing Genocide: A Blueprint for U.S. Policymakers”**

Speakers: **Madeleine K. Albright**, Former Secretary of State;  
**General Anthony C. Zinni** (USMC, ret.), former Commander in Chief, U.S.  
Central Command

### **Main Issues**

Despite past efforts, the international community still remains ineffective in its attempts to prevent and halt the occurrence of mass civilian atrocities and genocide. The establishment of the Genocide Prevention Task Force (GPTF) reflected a shared interest among its convening institutions—the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, the American Academy of Diplomacy, and the U.S. Institute of Peace—to build a practical framework that could help the U.S. government better respond to threats of genocide and mass atrocities. Secretary Albright and General Zinni discussed the Task Force’s “blueprint for action,” which outlines a comprehensive strategy emphasizing the role of leadership and the need for effective early warning, early prevention, preventive diplomacy, military options, and international action.

Apart from the moral obligation to act against these crimes and the threat they pose to core American values – such as democracy and the basic human right to life – genocide and mass atrocities also threaten U.S. national interests. Genocides may further destabilize weak regimes, thereby increasing the potential for terrorist recruitment, human trafficking, civil strife, and refugee flows. Such security risks have spill over effects and require investments with a cost far exceeding that of early prevention. Prevention is thus a lot less costly in blood and treasure than dealing with crisis situations reactively.

In her address, Secretary Albright said the central premise of the GPTF report is that genocide is unacceptable and that we can and should do more to prevent it. While the United States does not bear this burden alone, it does have a profound duty and a capability to do more.

Albright spoke about four imperatives for genocide prevention, beginning with American leadership. Preventing genocide and mass atrocities, she said, should be a top foreign policy priority of the new administration and should be part of the job description of every foreign policy professional.

Albright’s second imperative is funding. The task force proposed an additional annual U.S. appropriation of \$250 million for targeted prevention efforts. This is a modest investment, but could have a significant impact.



# *Passing the BATON*

## *Foreign Policy Challenges and Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

Her third imperative is preparation. The new administration will find many places where the “kindling” for genocide or mass atrocities exists and a spark could trigger a conflagration. The U.S. therefore needs to be prepared to respond quickly with robust diplomacy and flexible military options.

The fourth imperative is to fully integrate crisis prevention into national security decision-making. This will require asking key questions that early and rigorously test critical assumptions. The United States must beware unintended consequences and keep options open.

In his comments, General Zinni described the challenges he faced in Operation Provide Comfort, which was tasked with the protection of hundreds of thousands of Kurds living in brutal conditions and at risk of mass violence from Saddam Hussein’s regime. This experience underscored for him the need to further develop strategies and tactics for preventing mass atrocities against civilian populations.

Zinni said it is vital to integrate American soft power with the hard power of its military. On the military side, the task force urged the Defense Department to think more deeply about the specific strategies, tactics, and procedures necessary for the prevention of mass atrocities. He said the United States has not done enough to build the capacities of regional organizations like the African Union to effectively prevent and halt mass atrocities. It is much wiser to empower local actors that are willing to deploy their troops early in an atrocity than for the United States to wring its hands about the deployment of its troops later. Along with security assistance programs, the U.S. should help build local and regional capacity for effective diplomatic and political action, Zinni said.

### **Policy Conclusions\***

1. The President should demonstrate that preventing genocide and mass atrocities is a top national priority.
2. Congress should appropriate increased and more flexible funding for crisis prevention projects tailored to reduce risks of genocide.
3. The administration must prepare itself for potential genocidal crises.
  - a. The Defense Department should develop guidance on how U.S. military assets can be used to prevent and halt mass atrocities.

---

\* Policy Conclusions from Group Panel Discussions at Passing the Baton 2009 were not necessarily achieved by group consensus. In some instances, individual panel members may have been in disagreement with the larger group. For specific information on each panel’s contents, please see the comprehensive online archive at [www.usip.org/baton2009](http://www.usip.org/baton2009).



# *Passing the* BATON

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

4. Crisis prevention should be fully integrated into national security decision making.
  - a. Both hard and soft power should be marshalled for genocide prevention strategies.
5. The U.S. should enhance programs to build capacity of local and regional partners to prevent and respond to genocide and mass atrocities.



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

## **Morning Panel 1: “Blogs & Bullets: The Power of Online Media in Preventing or Igniting Violent Conflict”**

Speakers: **Sheldon Himelfarb**, Associate Vice President, U.S. Institute of Peace;  
**John Kelly**, Founder, Morningside Analytics;  
**Ivan Sigal**, Executive Director, Global Voices;  
**Duncan MacInnes**, Principal Deputy Coordinator, State Department  
Bureau of International Information Programs;  
**Linton Wells**, Distinguished Research Fellow, National Defense  
University

### **Main Issues**

Modern conflict is a struggle for influence on public opinion in addition to territory and sovereign power – influence that runs increasingly over paths in a digital, networked world. In the last year alone, online tools and user-generated content have been used to track election violence in Kenya, provide a steady stream of news from Gaza in the midst of the war, and mobilize millions of people to protest the FARC in Colombia. At the same time, organizations like al-Qaeda recruit people and resources over the Internet with ever-greater efficiency, while Mumbai terrorists connect with one another over internet-based phone networks to evade detection.

This time of disruption in the expanding information landscape presents new challenges and opportunities for the United States. Building a more peaceful world will require a better understanding of how online media can be used to prevent and ignite conflict.

Duncan MacInnes, Principal Deputy Coordinator of the State Department’s Bureau of International Information Programs, stated that U.S. public diplomacy uses traditional and new online media to not only represent interests and advocate policy, but also to promote values of civil society, tolerance, rule of law, free markets and respect for human rights – precisely the values that are the foundation of efforts to prevent conflict, counter violent extremism, and promote peace. New media enables active audience participation that is ideally suited to track-two diplomacy and people-to-people conflict resolution programs – directly engaging local communities in a dialogue of values and ideals.

But new online media is equally powerful for the threats that it poses to U.S. security, observed Linton Wells of the National Defense University. Online media can facilitate targeted cyber attacks and flash mobs, recruit activists, raise fund for violent organizations, highlight and inflame grievances, and even foment the conduct of violent conflict.



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

Wells described how the 2001 spy plane collision between the U.S. and China sparked online hacking exchanges between citizens of both countries and how non-state actors and terrorists groups have been early adopters of new media technology, posting online propaganda of attacks on Coalition forces and how-to manuals for aspiring suicide bombers. While access to the information world can be liberating, he said, it also allows people to form closed groups that reinforce pre-existing views. Finally, Wells highlighted a U.S. government tendency to protect itself from such vulnerabilities by establishing a bunker mentality that prevents U.S. employees from blogging or otherwise using new media tools to counter online misinformation. Wells cautioned that this tendency can have serious national security ramifications given that the rest of the world is already using and shaping this developing medium.

Two private sector experts demonstrated the state of the art in mapping the blogosphere and understanding its constituents and their motivations. John Kelly of Morningside Analytics showed how his company is mapping linkages among bloggers to uncover relationships and interest clusters. A Taliban network isolated from mainstream discussion in Afghanistan, the existence of 60,000 Persian-language blogs despite Iranian government censorship, and inter-group blog postings on shared topics during ongoing tensions in India and Pakistan are just a few examples he referenced.

Successfully understanding relationships in the public network is the first step in influencing its development, Kelly said. “We need to think about nurturing and shaping these networks when they are small, as they grow very large very fast.”

Speaking as the Executive Director of Global Voices, an organization of bloggers in more than 150 countries, Ivan Sigal emphasized that media are no longer focused primarily on reporting conflict but rather have become actors that influence it. Where it was once assumed that the world’s 60 fragile states invariably suffered from a scarcity of information, this is no longer a given: Somalia has five cell phone networks and reliable Internet connections, but it effectively has no government. Similarly, Afghanistan had no bloggers four years ago, but it has four thousand today.

Sigal acknowledged that such statistics can be misleading, as even a handful of bloggers can be extremely influential by serving as the information elite of a particular society. Moreover, they can provide better information than traditional media, as a Harvard Humanitarian Initiative Study showed of Ushahidi.com in Kenya. These trends represent a fundamental shift toward an environment of information abundance, he concluded, that reinforces the importance of developing online engagement strategies.



# *Passing the* BATON

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

## **Policy Conclusions\***

1. Mapping relationships within the blogosphere provides insight into social networks and their potential to promote peace or ignite violence. Increasing the intensive study of the networked public sphere is essential.
2. Engage early and often to shape development of online media to promote U.S. public diplomacy, democracy, and sustainable local peacebuilding efforts.
3. Prepare for the use of online media for incitement by encouraging government employee education and engagement with online social networking.
4. Provide digitally deprived societies with resources and assist them in opposing online censorship. This can empower individuals and organizations seeking to harness the power of the Internet to promote peace.
5. Build conflict resolution models that incorporate social networking and new online media into a strategic framework for online engagement.

---

\* Policy Conclusions from Group Panel Discussions at Passing the Baton 2009 were not necessarily achieved by group consensus. In some instances, individual panel members may have been in disagreement with the larger group. For specific information on each panel's contents, please see the comprehensive online archive at [www.usip.org/baton2009](http://www.usip.org/baton2009).



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

## **Morning Panel 2: “Reinvigorating Prospects for Arab-Israeli Peacemaking”**

Speakers: **Daniel Kurtzer**, former U.S. ambassador to Egypt and Israel;  
**Ziad Asali**, President, American Task Force on Palestine;  
**David Makovsky**, Director, Project on the Middle East Peace Process, The Washington Institute;  
**Samuel Lewis**, Former U.S. ambassador to Israel, Former president, United States Institute of Peace

### **Main Issues**

On January 20, President-elect Barack Obama will take office and face the challenge of a stagnating Arab-Israeli peace process. Invigorating the stalled peacemaking process is made more urgent by the worsening crisis in Gaza, where the large-scale Israeli military campaign has so far failed to stop Hamas rocket attacks and has led to a massive civilian and humanitarian crisis for Gaza’s 1.5 million residents.

Recent events notwithstanding, however, resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict remains vital to American national interests. If the Gaza crisis can be resolved, and a durable cease-fire is reached, the Obama administration may be able to take steps to transcend the current administration’s modest goal of conflict management and reengage in full-scale peacemaking efforts between Arabs and Israelis.

One of Israel’s principal objectives, said David Makovsky, is to stop the smuggling of rockets and arms from Egypt into Gaza. Makovsky said the Egyptian position on the “Philadelphi” corridor—the area on the Gaza side of the Egypt-Gaza border--could have a major effect on the Israeli elections. He also suggested that if the smuggling does not stop, Israel may expand its ground campaign into the area, including the town of Rafah.

Ziad Asali addressed internal Palestinian political dynamics, saying the current crisis is adding further strains to an already dire situation of ideological and geographical division in Palestine. The terms of a potential ceasefire may dramatically affect the current Fatah-Hamas political standoff. For example, if a ceasefire appears to give concessions to Hamas, the Palestinian public may view the Hamas position as paying off, which would undoubtedly have a negative effect on future prospects for peacemaking.

According to Daniel Kurtzer, Hamas and Israel seemed to have shared at least one common position: they both viewed the pre-war status quo as unacceptable. The two parties otherwise have interests that appear to be completely contradictory. Hamas has tried to legitimize itself as a



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

government for all Palestinians while maintaining its credentials as a resistance movement. Israel has been looking for ways to prevent Hamas' legitimization.

Finding common ground to achieve a ceasefire will no doubt prove exceedingly difficult. If some mutuality of interests between Arabs and Israelis can be identified, the new U.S. administration could use this as the basis to renew the peace process. While Palestinians are divided regarding a peace settlement, there is always the option of pursuing an agreement and then subjecting it to a Palestinian referendum.

Kurtzer said Palestinians and Israelis both perceive the human costs as unacceptable. Asali emphasized that behind the media images of this conflict lie real and widespread suffering and that more attention is needed to prevent the current crisis from spiraling out of control. Asali added that the graphic images coming out of Gaza could help convince the Israeli people that it is in their interest to achieve a two-state solution—and that an Israeli Prime Minister who would freeze settlements should be rewarded.

On the question of Syrian-Israeli peace negotiations, Makovsky argued that both Syria and Israel see negotiations as in their interest. If they did not, they would not have resumed talks in 2008. In Israel, the greatest advocates for renewing the Syria track are members of the national security elite – the upper military echelons who believe that peace with Syria could lead to a strategic reordering that would help contain Iran and undermine Hezbollah and Hamas. Peace could represent a fresh start for Syria, since the regime has been increasingly isolated regionally as the Arab world becomes increasingly uneasy about the country's close ties with Iran.

## **Policy Conclusions\***

1. The panelists agreed that the demonization and denigration that occur in the media on both sides of the conflict are toxic and must come to an end. Makovsky argued that the trend toward demonization is much stronger in the Arab media than in the Israeli media.
2. The panelists agreed that for progress to be made, the new U.S. administration must develop a comprehensive approach for resolving the conflict rather than merely trying to manage it.

---

\* Policy Conclusions from Group Panel Discussions at Passing the Baton 2009 were not necessarily achieved by group consensus. In some instances, individual panel members may have been in disagreement with the larger group. For specific information on each panel's contents, please see the comprehensive online archive at [www.usip.org/baton2009](http://www.usip.org/baton2009).



# Passing the BATON

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

## Morning Panel 3: “Stabilizing War-Torn States: Goals and Guidance for a New Administration”

Speakers: **Brigadier General Ed Cardon**, Deputy Commandant, Command and General Staff College, Combined Arms Center;  
**Beth Ellen Cole**, Senior Program Officer, United States Institute of Peace;  
**Janine Davidson**, Assistant Professor, George Mason University School of Public Policy

### Main Issues

Seven years after entering Afghanistan, the United States is still in search of a winning strategy. In the absence of a basic framework to guide strategy and execution, civilian and military actors have stumbled through peace and stability operations time and again.

At the dawn of a new presidential administration, however, two new doctrinal manuals seek to fill that gap – the U.S. Army’s new *Field Manual 3-07 Stability Operations* and the U.S. Institute of Peace’s (USIP) draft *Guiding Principles for Peace Operations*. Both manuals are unprecedented in scope and provide a baseline set of principles for engaging in these missions – *FM 3-07* for the U.S. military and the *Guiding Principles* for U.S. civilians. The documents also embrace a common strategic framework resting on five common end states for peace and stability operations: a safe and secure environment, the rule of law, stable governance, sustainable economy and social well being.

Released in October 2008, *FM 3-07* represents a major milestone for Army doctrine. The manual provides the first practical roadmap from conflict to peace and describes the role of military forces in supporting broader U.S. efforts in these missions. The process of developing *FM 3-07* was notable for its unprecedented engagement of U.S. civilian agencies and non-governmental organizations, which enabled a healthy dialogue about the issues and helped get disparate actors on the same page, said Dr. Janine Davidson, session moderator and professor at George Mason University.

USIP’s *Guiding Principles*, meanwhile, provides the first-ever comprehensive set of strategic-level guidance for civilian decision makers and practitioners engaged in peace and stability operations. Built on the experience of multiple agencies involved in these missions, the manual extracts overarching principles and guidance from hundreds of doctrinal documents. “It is disturbing that 13 years after U.S. troops and agencies entered Bosnia and seven years after the U.S. went to Afghanistan, no official comprehensive guidance exists for civilians,” said Beth Cole, session panelist and director of the Civilian Doctrine Project at USIP. The manual also identifies key gaps that exist in current knowledge and doctrine, along with critical tradeoffs and



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

linkages that must be considered in these missions. Like *FM 3-07, Guiding Principles* is now being vetted by a wide range of U.S. and international agencies with publication expected in the spring of 2009.

While the panelists recognized the two manuals as major achievements in the long path to increasing U.S. success in war-torn countries, they also cautioned that the manuals are not meant to be a panacea for the inordinate challenges that still exist. The common strategic framework provides direction but must always be carefully tailored to the cultural and historical context and needs of the local population.

The concept of doctrine often evokes apprehension from the civilian community as being overly prescriptive and neglecting local context. Looking to clarify misconceptions, Davidson described military doctrine as “fundamental principles that guide employment of military forces in coordinated action toward a common objective.” It is authoritative in its guidance, but not prescriptive. And even if the doctrine is not perfect, offering a baseline set of principles helps to coordinate the efforts of otherwise disparate actors and frees decision makers, planners and practitioners from ad hoc approaches.

Additionally, increased success in future missions will depend on improving U.S. civilian capacity to operate in these missions and allow the military to assume its support role. While many solid steps have been taken in this direction, more must be developed to create an enhanced foundation for civilian operations in these missions if a truly whole-of-government approach is to work, said Brig. Gen. Ed Cardon, session panelist and Deputy Commandant of the U.S. Army Command & General Staff College. Improvements in civilian response capabilities include the State Department’s new Civilian Response Corps (CRC) and new peace and education training initiatives.

## **Policy Conclusions\***

1. The panelists suggested that the new administration should consider bolstering and elevating the current interagency structure for U.S. government agencies involved in peace and stability operations. Only then can a truly whole-of-government approach be effectively employed.
2. Planning expertise and numbers of experts available for these missions in critical U.S. civilian agencies is very weak. The panelists agreed that more funding should reside

---

\* Policy Conclusions from Group Panel Discussions at Passing the Baton 2009 were not necessarily achieved by group consensus. In some instances, individual panel members may have been in disagreement with the larger group. For specific information on each panel’s contents, please see the comprehensive online archive at [www.usip.org/baton2009](http://www.usip.org/baton2009).



# *Passing the* BATON

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

- with civilian agencies, rather than the military, to build more capacity and better train and equip civilians for these missions.
3. Rather than starting from scratch, the panelists suggested that the new administration build on current progress to conduct whole-of-government assessment, planning and training and deploy integrated teams to missions.
  4. It is imperative that the new strategic framework be contextualized to the specific needs and culture of local affected populations, rather than strictly applied or imposed. Essentially, the framework must “belong” to the local population.



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

## **Morning Panel 4: “Confronting or Engaging Iran”**

**Speakers:** **Daniel Brumberg**, Special Advisor, Muslim World Initiative, United States Institute of Peace;  
**Qamar-ul Huda**, Senior Program Officer, Center for Religion and Peacemaking, United States Institute of Peace;  
**Suzanne Maloney**, Former policy advisor, U.S. Department of State;  
**Avner Cohen**, Former Senior Fellow, United States Institute of Peace;  
**Bill Luers**, President, United Nations Association of the United States;  
**Frank Wisner**, Vice Chairman, American International Group

### **Main Issues**

In light of growing calls in Washington for diplomatic engagement of Tehran, this panel discussed the challenges and choices confronting the United States in managing its relations with Iran under the Obama administration. The discussion revolved around the regional and global obstacles to successful US-Iranian talks; how the two countries should address their various points of disagreements, most notably the nuclear issue; and what relevant lessons can be drawn from previous US policies vis-à-vis Iran.

Panelists identified three potential options for dealing with Iran: military options, sanctions, and diplomatic engagement. Most panelists agreed that the military option is highly unattractive, if not wholly unacceptable, given the current regional state of affairs. Meanwhile, sanctions have historically had a poor record in extracting concessions from Tehran, according to Suzanne Maloney. Avner Cohen, however, suggested that the option of a naval blockade should not be dismissed. Panelists generally agreed that diplomatic engagement is the most viable option, a perspective that evidently prevails in both Washington and Tehran policy circles.

Achieving a mutually acceptable compromise on Iran’s nuclear program is not impossible, says Cohen, but all possible solutions will require tolerating some level of Iranian nuclear enrichment. Iran is unlikely to eliminate its nuclear program, yet there is evidence that it would be willing to compromise within the parameters of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). Like Japan and others, Iran would like to retain the capacity to develop a nuclear weapon within a relatively short period of time – in the order of weeks to months -- while technically adhering to the NPT.

Iran’s desire to stay within the grey-zone of nuclear capability provides a small window of opportunity for resolving this dispute. Japan and other US allies are allowed to remain in this zone because their intent is perceived to be peaceful. In the mid-term, however, Cohen proposes installing firewall devices that could provide the U.S. with early warning signs of any non-peaceful use of Iran’s nuclear resources, and William H. Luers proposed an internationally coordinated inspection program of Iranian nuclear capabilities.



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

Future attempts to engage Iran must incorporate a keener interpretation of Iran's ever changing internal dynamics, said Maloney. Successive American administrations have consistently misinterpreted Iran's domestic politics, misreading many critical turns such as the Iranian revolution, the political ascendance of former President Mohammad Khatami and the election of President Mahmoud Ahmedinejad.

One political community that is often misunderstood by Washington is Iran's religious clergy, according to USIP's Qamar-ul Huda. Given their vast influence over the domestic political arena, understanding Iranian religious leaders' diverse worldviews and assessments of American policies will be a critical task for decision-makers in Washington. Some prominent religious leaders who had adhered to anti-Western stances in the past have shifted their positions on engagement with the United States. Even some leaders who continue to engage in anti-American rhetoric have expressed privately that they support diplomatic dialogue with the U.S.

## **Policy Conclusions\***

Panelists generally agreed that the U.S. must engage in direct dialogue with Iranian officials. To ensure the success of engagement efforts, panelists recommend the following actions by the Obama administration:

1. Announce explicitly that military options are not under consideration.
2. Reiterate that the U.S. will talk to any nation without preconditions.
3. Do not link overtures to Iran to changes in its leadership.
4. Create clear incentives and concrete rewards for Iranian concessions.
5. Devise a strategy that takes into account the unpredictability of Iranian politics.
6. Deploy confidence-building measures, such as releasing Iranian prisoners in Iraq.
7. Use a multi-track approach in engaging Tehran on various points of disagreements.
8. Renew talks with Tehran on Iraq and include Iran in a regional consortium of states to build and coordinate broad support for stability and peace Iraq.

---

\* Policy Conclusions from Group Panel Discussions at Passing the Baton 2009 were not necessarily achieved by group consensus. In some instances, individual panel members may have been in disagreement with the larger group. For specific information on each panel's contents, please see the comprehensive online archive at [www.usip.org/baton2009](http://www.usip.org/baton2009).



# *Passing the* BATON

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

9. Explore options of inspections and firewalls for monitoring Iran's nuclear resources.
10. Preserve the integrity and credibility of the NPT while devising solutions for resolving Iran's nuclear issue.
11. Consider ethical as well as strategic motivations behind Iran's quest for nuclear capacity.
12. Deal with Iran as a nation and not as a regime or a basket of threats.



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

**Luncheon Speaker: Robert B. Zoellick, President, The World Bank Group**

## **Main Issues**

Lasting economic development is an important dimension of global security because multifarious problems associated with fragile economies could undermine prospects for world peace. However, recent efforts to address development within the framework of global security have had limited effectiveness. Refocusing strategies to secure development would not only balance the 3 “D”s of defense, diplomacy and development, but would also lay a more robust foundation for sustainable and equitable economic growth. Achieving this would require targeted, sustained and adequate support from the incoming Obama administration.

The traumas of fragile states and the interconnections of globalization require a rethink of the economics, governance and security nexus, said Zoellick. Fragile states suffer from a “sovereignty gap.” We must secure development, he said, because “fragile states can create fragile regions. And fragile regions can become global threats.”

Securing development is not development as usual, nor is it simply a more complex strategy for development. It is the exercise of smart power -- synthesizing security, governance and economics for the most effective results. It is a long-term, sustained effort that could break cycles of fragility and violence.

Moreover, according to Zoellick, securing development requires a new multidisciplinary policy framework to smooth the transition from fragility and establish lasting stability. Key aspects of this framework include:

1. Building state legitimacy by delivering basic services, strengthening institutional capacity and empowering competent nationals. Capacity building in the areas of economic management and public financial management is crucial.
2. Ensuring that security and development are mutually reinforcing. The focus should not be on sequencing, it should be on simultaneity.
3. Establishing the rule of law and guaranteeing property rights, as this safeguards against the criminalization of the state and curtails corruption.
4. Promoting macroeconomic stability, as this underpins effective economic recovery. Adequate and quick-disbursing assistance should be available to help reforming countries weather sudden shocks.
5. Paying attention to the political economy by understanding relationships between power and wealth in societies. Key economic players benefit from conflict where links develop between political power and illegal economic activity.



# *Passing the BATON*

## *Foreign Policy Challenges and Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

6. Encouraging private sector development, as this triggers investment, creates jobs and fosters an environment of business optimism.
7. Improving coordination across institutions and actors because failure to do so becomes counter-productive, as well-intentioned actions overwhelm the recipients. Regional approaches could also enhance coordination.
8. Committing resources for the long-term because there are no quick-fix solutions. Programs should be designed to last beyond the “CNN moment.”

Afghanistan, Haiti and Liberia offer examples of lessons learned, missteps and sound practice in securing development. Imbalance among the 3Ds traded tactical wins for strategic losses in Afghanistan. Weak institutions and poor governance in Haiti stymied development, relief and state-building initiatives. Strong democratic leadership, coupled with measures to improve public financial management, appear to have put Liberia on the path toward political and economic progress.

### **Policy Conclusions**

1. Develop new mechanisms and frameworks to secure development. Traditional toolkits are ill equipped to address current and emerging development challenges.
2. Prioritize reforming countries. Do not try to do it all at once.
3. Increase resources to support long-term development projects. Where feasible, consider pooling resources to minimize administrative burdens on recipient countries.
4. Incorporate some flexibility in development programs because performance will vary.
5. Do not retreat from risk. Increase U.S. capacity to mitigate and manage risks to the fullest extent possible.



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

## **Session Five: “Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan and Pakistan: Identifying Priorities”**

Speakers: **Zbigniew Brzezinski**, Former National Security Advisor  
**Lakhdar Brahimi**, Former Special Advisor to the Secretary-General, United Nations;  
**Daniel Serwer**, Vice President, Center for Post-Conflict Peace and Stability Operations, United States Institute of Peace  
**Mowaffak al Rubai**, Iraqi National Security Advisor

### **Main Issues**

The panel considered four Middle East countries that separately and together present a critical foreign policy and national security challenge to the United States. Each country has a discrete bilateral relationship with the U.S. that includes issues of importance to both countries. However, these countries are linked in many respects to each other, to other regional states and to U.S. interests collectively.

The panel members focused on how the U.S. should deal with each country, while maintaining a constant awareness of how its actions will affect the larger whole. Brzezinski said he could think of only one eventuality that would turn U.S. relations with these four states into a single policy issue – a US-Iran war. This would involve the U.S. in a military conflict with four countries with a total population of 300 million people, a prospect the United States should avoid.

In addressing U.S. relations with each of these states, the panel did, however, identify some common themes. These included the overwhelming importance of national ownership and meeting the needs of each country’s population; the necessity of combining diplomatic with military initiatives; the need to engage all the neighboring states in a dialogue on security, development and other issues; and the requirement for international legitimacy for U.S. actions.

### **Policy Conclusions\***

In addressing these countries individually, the panelists drew the following conclusions about U.S. policy toward the countries:

#### Iraq

---

\* Policy Conclusions from Group Panel Discussions at Passing the Baton 2009 were not necessarily achieved by group consensus. In some instances, individual panel members may have been in disagreement with the larger group. For specific information on each panel’s contents, please see the comprehensive online archive at [www.usip.org/baton2009](http://www.usip.org/baton2009).



# *Passing the BATON*

## *Foreign Policy Challenges and Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

1. The drop in violence in Iraq is the result of Iraqi rejection of al Qaeda's foreign ideology and brutal tactics, the increased efficiency of Iraqi Security Forces, the surge of U.S. forces and the adoption of new tactics.
2. The debate in Iraq has moved from sectarian to political issues, which will be at the core of the forthcoming elections.
3. Signing of the Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA) has confirmed the restoration of Iraqi sovereignty and general agreement on a date certain for a U.S. military withdrawal.
4. The next step is agreement on a plan for U.S. drawdown that will protect U.S. and Iraqi interests and include a dialogue with regional states.
5. Al Rubaie said the Bush era was about liberation and security. The Obama era should result in a comprehensive strategic relationship between the U.S. and a democratic Iraq.

### Iran

1. Iran has the means to obstruct any regional peace effort it sees as detrimental to its interests or its regional agenda.
2. Before U.S. withdrawal from Iraq, the U.S. should engage in dialogue with Iran to mitigate possible consequences.
3. Bilateral U.S.-Iranian relations cannot be disentangled from other regional issues.
4. Negotiations with Iran should not be conditioned on Iran's termination of nuclear enrichment, which will be the primary subject for negotiations.
5. Dialogue with Iran could contribute to a helpful Iranian posture regarding Afghanistan.

### Afghanistan

1. Mistakes by the international community led to several current problems in Afghanistan. Some of these mistakes include the initial refusal to expand the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) beyond Kabul; the exclusion of all Taliban from the peace process; inadequate assistance in building local institutions; and failure to deal with incompetence and corruption in the Afghan government.
2. The invasion of Iraq absorbed resources and distracted attention from Afghanistan.
3. Afghans welcomed the arrival of U.S. forces and the defeat of the Taliban. However, instability and casualties from U.S. air raids have caused growing Afghan hostility toward foreign forces.
4. The U.S. needs to avoid mistakes made by the USSR, in particular attempting to defeat the insurgency exclusively by military means.



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

5. NATO forces must convince the Afghans that they intend to assist the Afghan government to rebuild and deliver essential services.
6. The US should seek a decentralized political settlement with moderate Taliban who are willing to reach accommodation with the Afghan government.

## Pakistan

1. No peace is possible in Afghanistan without Pakistan's cooperation, but Pakistan alone cannot bring peace in Afghanistan. Peace must be accomplished by the Afghan government.
2. The U.S. must avoid a war against the Pashtuns, who live on both sides of an unrecognized border between Afghanistan and Pakistan.



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

## **Afternoon Panel One: “Security and Political Reform in the Greater Middle East”**

Speakers: **Mona Yacoubian**, Special Advisor, Muslim World Initiative, United States Institute of Peace;  
**Samer Shehata**, Assistant Professor of Arab Politics, Georgetown University;  
**Shuja Nawaz**, Director of the South Asia Center at The Atlantic Council of the United States.  
**Daniel Brumberg**, Special Advisor, Muslim World Initiative, United States Institute of Peace

### **Main Issues**

Against a backdrop of escalating domestic, regional and global security challenges, this panel considered the future of U.S. efforts to promote political reform in the Greater Middle East. Panelists present the findings and recommendations of USIP’s Study Group on Reform and Security in the Muslim World. Co-chaired by Larry Diamond and Francis Fukuyama, the Group first convened in February 2008 to offer decision makers recommendations on how the United States can best promote political reform in the Muslim World while safeguarding American security interests.

Despite growing doubts that democracy promotion can be reconciled with competing U.S. security concerns in the Middle East, the Group’s findings, as articulated by Daniel Brumberg, suggest that political reform in the Muslim world provides a durable basis for domestic and regional political stability. Thus, the United States should not uncritically abandon the freedom agenda in favor of *realpolitik*-driven policies. Rather, Washington must devise ways to reinvent its democracy promotion strategies by addressing past shortcomings; most notably, by pursuing regional security interests and reform in tandem. Resolving the Arab-Israeli conflict could pave the way for more substantive political reforms in the Arab region. Yet Washington must not pursue a peace process at the expense of democratization.

The following paragraphs identify country-specific issues discussed by the panelists.

### Egypt

American pressures on the Egyptian regime between 2003 and 2005, though failing to achieve meaningful democratic change, contributed to significant openings in Egypt’s political space. There is no evidence that this pressure undermined Egypt’s cooperation with Washington on critical issues. Egypt has an interest in Arab-Israeli peace, a stable Iraq and curbing Iranian threats independently of US interests, says Samer Shehata. There is also no evidence that the stability of the Egyptian government was or will be in any way compromised by political reform.



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

Despite doubts about its commitment to democratic principles, there is no evidence that the Muslim Brotherhood, Egypt's largest Islamist group, has the organizational capacity or ideological inclination to come to power through force.

## Lebanon

In Lebanon, domestic security and reform are complementary, and one cannot be pursued without the other, said Mona Yacoubian. Many see Hezbollah as the biggest obstacle to pursuing the two objectives. Its dubious commitment to democratic politics and to building strong state institutions, its insistence on maintaining arms, and its frequent recklessness as evidenced by its role in instigating a war with Israel in 2006 contribute to this perception. However, Hezbollah is viewed in Lebanon as a credible and legitimate representative of the country's Shi'a community, and therefore it cannot be ostracized from the political process.

At the same time, the current power-sharing formula in Lebanon is becoming increasingly incompatible with the country's political and demographic realities. Thus, long-term stability and successful reform demand recalculating Lebanon's current political formula in order to bring Hezbollah into the realm of peaceful politics and to integrate its military capabilities into the national military.

## Pakistan

The U.S. relationship with former Pakistani President Pervez Musharraf exemplifies the transactional relationships that Washington maintains with many autocrats who receive US support in exchange for security cooperation. This pattern has pronounced itself at every turn in the history of U.S.-Pakistan relations, starting from the U.S. tacit support for the 1958 coup to U.S. silence over Musharraf's democratic transgressions. The United States must move beyond a transactional relationship with Islamabad and shift to a long-term strategic relationship with the democratically chosen representatives of the Pakistani people whomever they may be and not with individual autocrats.

## **Policy Conclusions\***

Panelists offered the following general and country-specific recommendations on how U.S. policymakers can pursue an effective strategy for promoting reform in the Muslim world:

---

\* Policy Conclusions from Group Panel Discussions at Passing the Baton 2009 were not necessarily achieved by group consensus. In some instances, individual panel members may have been in disagreement with the larger group. For specific information on each panel's contents, please see the comprehensive online archive at [www.usip.org/baton2009](http://www.usip.org/baton2009).



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

1. Resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict without putting demands for Arab reform on hold.
2. Support democratic principles and norms, but not individual figures and groups.
3. Respect democratic outcomes and recognize elected leaders whomever they may be.
4. Promote reform in an even-handed way without picking winners and losers.
5. Maintain a credible, consistent rhetoric on issues of reform and human rights.
6. Improve US credibility as a promoter of democracy in the Middle East by resolving major conflicts and by promoting democracy at home.
7. Support indigenous proposals for democratic reform rather than Washington-centric strategies.
8. In Egypt, do not support individual contenders in the country's political succession and use any potential succession as an opportunity to promote structural political reforms.
9. In Pakistan, support the withdrawal of the army from politics.
10. In Lebanon:
  - a. Do not support one faction against the other.
  - b. Seek a better understanding of Hezbollah's long-term interests instead of reducing it to a Syrian or an Iranian proxy.
  - c. Promote political reforms that can help Lebanon move beyond feudal politics.
  - d. Engage Syria and seek its support for Lebanese sovereignty and stability.



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

## **Afternoon Panel Two: “Building Civilian Capacity to Meet 21<sup>st</sup> Century Challenges”**

Speakers: **James Dobbins**, Director, International Security and Defense Policy Centre, the RAND Corporation;  
**Jean-Marie Guéhenno**, Former UN Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, United Nations;  
**Nancy Lindborg**, President, Mercy Corps;  
**Chester A. Crocker**, Former Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, Board Member, United States Institute of Peace

### **Main Issues**

The UN, regional organizations, individual states, and non-governmental organizations all play a critical role in preventing conflict and rebuilding war-torn societies. While militaries educate and train their personnel for engaging in conflict zones, civilian institutions ask their staffs to learn by doing. Experiences in Iraq and Afghanistan confirm the high cost of failing to increase civilian capacity. Key conflict management institutions - both in the United States and abroad – have recognized the need to build civilian capacity to operate effectively in conflict zones. This panel assessed what has been learned and why greater progress has not been made over the last decade. It also considered the next steps for preparing civilians for the difficult work of preventing, ending, and settling conflicts.

Panelists agreed with Chester Crocker’s observation that another engagement like the war in Iraq was unlikely, and the era of outsiders running a state, e.g. Iraq and Timor-Leste, is over. International involvement in fragile states will continue to be essential, but the international role will shift to building the legitimacy and capacity of local institutions and authorities to operate effectively.

There is a window of opportunity after conflict in which progress in political, social and economic reconstruction must be apparent, or the post-conflict rebuilding effort will lose legitimacy. National governments, international organizations, and NGOs are all part of this effort to transfer knowledge and skills in rule of law, security sector reform, and governance. These institutions may have to reconsider whether their own structures are fit for the nature and scope of future interventions. At the same time, they will have to think how best to educate and train their personnel to operate in challenging conflict environments. In addition, they will have to find ways to institutionalize the lessons they have learned in using civilian capacities in conflict management, including how to work together at all levels, in the field and at headquarters.



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

## **Policy Conclusions\***

Given that peace and stability operations will likely be a central and enduring element of U.S. and international overseas engagement, the panelists emphasized the need to build a more robust capacity for civilian leadership of such missions. As Dobbins noted, we should stop conducting these missions as if each were the first such occasion. Key objectives that were suggested by at least one of the panelists:

1. Reassign missions to appropriate institutions.
  - a. Enhance USAID's capabilities through increased funding and personnel and/or by moving assistance and development operational responsibilities from State to USAID, with State retaining overall policy oversight.
  - b. Do not subordinate civilian social, political and economic development goals to military "hearts and minds" strategies, which limit the effectiveness of civilian development professionals as has occurred too frequently with Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs).
2. Orchestrate efforts to maximize impact during post-conflict "windows of opportunity."
  - a. Coordinate U.S. and international policies within and between clusters of security, finance, administration, and planning.
  - b. Empower a mission head or senior representative on the ground to orchestrate the civilian and military efforts.
  - c. Coordinate efforts at local, national, and regional levels.
  - d. Understand and account for political consequences of technical interventions.
3. Build host country capacity from the outset.
  - a. Transfer skills in problem-solving, planning and project implementation as well as decision-making authority for project leadership to host country staff.
  - b. At the same time, build international capacity to oversee and support this local staff, including remote management, assessment and analysis of social, political and economic conditions.

---

\* Policy Conclusions from Group Panel Discussions at Passing the Baton 2009 were not necessarily achieved by group consensus. In some instances, individual panel members may have been in disagreement with the larger group. For specific information on each panel's contents, please see the comprehensive online archive at [www.usip.org/baton2009](http://www.usip.org/baton2009).



# *Passing the* BATON

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

4. Create civilian-led education and training programs for civilian and military personnel involved in peacebuilding missions.
  - a. Educate and train at all levels, from policy planners to managers to those carrying out projects on the ground.
  - b. Provide education and training on project leadership and coordination, planning, negotiation, conflict analysis, and mentoring and training.
  - c. Use joint training programs to foster integrated communities of practice among diverse governments, IOs, and NGOs.



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

## **Afternoon Panel Three: New Strategies for International Cooperation**

Speakers: **Anne-Marie Slaughter**, Dean, Woodrow Wilson School of Public Affairs, Princeton University;  
**Bob Orr**, Assistant Secretary-General for Strategic Planning and Policy Coordination, United Nations;  
**Richard Armitage**, Former Deputy Secretary of State;  
**Abiodun Williams**, Vice President, Center for Conflict Analysis and Prevention, United States Institute of Peace

### **Main Issues**

The election of Senator Barack Obama has increased expectations for a change in the U.S. role in the international system. During this panel, Ambassador Armitage observed that the 2008 election put “the wind in the sails of international cooperation.” To that end, as the new administration takes office, the question is no longer if the United States will engage in international cooperation, but how it will do so. International cooperation is essential not only to promote U.S. interests and enhance U.S. legitimacy, but also to meet the new geopolitical challenges of a globalized world.

The panelists agreed that the task facing the new administration was how to combine power and principle in these very challenging times. To that end, the strategies for international cooperation focused primarily in two areas: cooperation through formal institutions and through informal networks. All of the panelists agreed that both formal institutions and informal networks, as well as non-state actors, had a critical role to play in fostering multilateralism and international cooperation.

The panelists first examined the existing international institutions and assessed their ability to promote cooperation. Dr. Orr noted that the uniqueness of the United Nations derives from its legitimacy, its global forum and operational capacity. He stressed that many of the “new” strategies in international cooperation could actually be achieved by using established multilateral instruments such as the UN. In a globalized world, he stressed, the legitimacy of operations has become more important than it was in the past. He argued that only by using formal institutions such as the UN, with its truly global mandate, could universal responses to global public goods problems—such as energy crises, non-proliferation and disarmament, and global terrorism—be crafted. He highlighted that the operational capacity of the UN has substantially increased over the last decade and that it is well poised to meet these global challenges.



# Passing the BATON

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

While Dr. Slaughter agreed with Orr that formal institutions would continue to play a key role in international cooperation, she noted that only through dramatic reform could the UN continue to be perceived as legitimate in the international system. According to Slaughter, as long as the Security Council does not reflect Twenty-First Century power realities, it will become less and less relevant for major decision-making. She argued that it is incumbent upon the United States to recognize that many international institutions cannot do what we want and need them to do unless they are more representative.

Armitage agreed with Slaughter that significant UN reform was needed and also suggested that the role of the Secretary General should focus more on being the chief administrative officer of the UN as stated in the UN Charter.

The panelists then addressed the advantages of fostering international cooperation through informal networks. Slaughter argued that informal networks lack the institutional inertia and impediments of formal institutions. In addition, she pointed out that these informal networks already exist and that it is the job of policy makers to harness the power of digital media and emerging technologies to promote increased linkages. As an example, she discussed the importance of the recent meeting of finance ministers from the G20 countries. The success of that informal grouping and, as she argues, the *de facto* end of the G8, demonstrates that the potential exists for other G20 groups to emerge around various functional domains. She proposed a G20 for food ministers, a G20 for CT officials, and a G20 for energy officials. In this way, the table for global decision making will be expanded.

Armitage echoed Slaughter's belief in the importance of informal networks for cooperation and her belief that the United States should establish functional coalitions. He argued that the United States should decide the global issues on which we want to take the lead and those on which others can take the lead. This sort of "strategic leadership" requires looking for partners and knowing when to ask them to take on a leadership role. Armitage concluded by stating that U.S. credibility could be enhanced by empowering other states and even other non-state actors to take the lead in tackling global issues.

## Policy Conclusions\*

1. The panelists agreed that, with the election of Senator Obama, the United States faces an opportunity to reclaim its credibility in the international system.

---

\* Policy Conclusions from Group Panel Discussions at Passing the Baton 2009 were not necessarily achieved by group consensus. In some instances, individual panel members may have been in disagreement with the larger group. For specific information on each panel's contents, please see the comprehensive online archive at [www.usip.org/baton2009](http://www.usip.org/baton2009).



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

2. All of the panelists agreed that the future international cooperation required not just formal institutions but also the participation of informal networks and non-state actors.
3. The panelists affirmed that President-elect Obama needs to take immediate actions to demonstrate his dedication to international cooperation and restore U.S. credibility in the international system.
  - a. Dr. Orr recommended that the ratification of the CTBT would substantially increase U.S. prestige.
  - b. Ambassador Armitage recommended that the new administration should immediately ratify the Law of the Sea Treaty and close the U.S. prison at Guantanamo Bay.
4. In addition, the new administration needs to reaffirm the importance of public diplomacy in all aspects of foreign policy promotion.
5. The level of U.S. power is less important than the manner in which it exercises that power in the international system.



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

## **Afternoon Panel Four: “Economic Development and State Building”**

Speakers: **Henrietta Fore**, Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development;  
**Steve Radelet**, Senior Fellow, Center for Global Development;  
**David Litt**, Former Associate Director for International Liaison, George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies;  
**John Sullivan**, \_\_\_\_\_;  
**Raymond Gilpin**, Associate Vice President, Sustainable Economies Center of Innovation, United States Institute of Peace

### **Main Issues**

Although economic development is a cornerstone of state building in fragile environments, relatively little is known about the design, implementation and monitoring of effective programs. Recent programs in countries like Liberia, Iraq and Timor-Leste suggest that the international community still has much to learn. However, looming collapse in countries like North Korea and Zimbabwe and growing fragility in many other countries demand that the lessons must be learned and implemented quickly. The incoming administration should consider updating relevant legislation, rationalizing the organizational structure to deliver economic assistance, and providing adequate resources for long-term programs in order to bring about much needed change in this area. The United States should build on its current leadership position in the delivery of development and humanitarian assistance.

The fragility of governance systems in a growing number of countries highlights the timeliness and importance of effective and lasting international state-building initiatives. Although definitions of state building differ, there is some consensus among scholars that successful efforts to building and sustaining well-governed states able to respond to the needs of their people must be based on a balanced application of the 3 “D”s -- development, diplomacy and defense. However, much more is known about defense and diplomacy in fragile states than is known about development in this context.

The United States leads the world in the provision of aid in aggregate terms. Since 2001, U.S. foreign assistance has tripled worldwide. While funding has increased, the administration has also taken steps toward strengthening the effectiveness of U.S. foreign assistance through projects such as the creation of the Millennium Challenge Corporation, the creation of new partnerships with the private sector, and the launch of foreign aid reform. These projects have all been undertaken with the goal of cultivating economic growth and good governance. However, many challenges apparently prevent the United States from exercising effective leadership. These include outdated foreign assistance legislation, interagency stovepipes, inadequate resource allocation, and short-term approaches to complex problems.



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

## U.S. Foreign Assistance Act

The U.S. Foreign Assistance Act should be updated to respond to current and emerging problems in a rapidly globalizing world. The legislation is further weakened by an apparent lack of focus; since it has more than 50 objectives. Fewer objectives could sharpen focus and enhance effectiveness. The legislative process for the allocation of foreign assistance is somewhat constrained by earmarks, in the opinion of some panelists. A more streamlined process could both expedite and enhance the process.

## Organizational Reform

The organizational structure of America's development organizations was devised in the 1960s. The government has made a number of recent attempts to address this problem, albeit in an ad hoc manner. New initiatives and programs such as the Millennium Challenge Corporation and PEPFAR have been introduced to address gaps, but more comprehensive reforms are needed to allow the U.S. to improve the effectiveness of foreign assistance. Such reforms will require vision, time, energy, ingenuity and ultimately more resources.

## Transition from Humanitarian Assistance to Economic Development

Most economic development programs are affected by the "CNN Moment." Donor states like the U.S. are very interested and pour in substantial resources when fragile states are in crisis and generating media exposure, but interest wanes when the country is no longer in the headlines. More thought should be given to smoothing the transition between the providing of short-term assistance and the onset of programs that lead to long-term economic progress.

## Encouraging Private Sector Development

Economic development in fragile states goes beyond humanitarian and development assistance. It must also focus on the emergence of a viable and productive private sector. The successful recovery of a democratic market economy requires both the public and private sectors to take root simultaneously. The private sector should also engage in making decisions, advise the government, provide feedback and help create accountability. The private sector is not only an engine of growth; it is also a proven route to self-sustained economic development.

## Adequate Resources

The ongoing global financial crisis, economic downturns in most donor countries, and donor fatigue mean that the development community will have to learn to do more with less. While



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

every effort must be made to improve efficiency, the reality is that effective development plans are costly. Increased resources must be made available.

## Capacity Building for Development Professionals

The U.S. interagency is becoming more involved in development and humanitarian programs in fragile states. However, most strategists lack the training to fully appreciate the ramifications of the 3 Ds or how to plan development optimally. Ongoing professional education programs are necessary to build and retain core competencies in this field. Appropriate training could improve interagency collaboration, enhance coordination and improve development outcomes.

## **Policy Conclusions\***

1. Modernize enabling legislation for more effective development assistance. The set of recommendations proposed by the Modernizing Foreign Assistance Network provides a helpful blueprint.
2. Reorganize the interagency and consolidate programs, where necessary. USAID's new economic growth strategy provides a workable template.
3. Reform funding for economic development assistance by ensuring adequacy for long-term support and removing earmarks to ensure flexibility.
4. Adopt mechanisms for early decision-making and quick disbursements. Stabilization needs are urgent and delay is very costly.
5. Prioritize multidisciplinary training programs to improve skills, encourage cross-fertilization of ideas and reduce stove piping.
6. Increased funding for the hiring of new development personnel is essential for increasing development capacity and skill. Particular support should be given to USAID recently launched Development Leadership Initiative (DLI) with the aim of quadrupling its Foreign Service workforce over the next few years.

---

\* Policy Conclusions from Group Panel Discussions at Passing the Baton 2009 were not necessarily achieved by group consensus. In some instances, individual panel members may have been in disagreement with the larger group. For specific information on each panel's contents, please see the comprehensive online archive at [www.usip.org/baton2009](http://www.usip.org/baton2009).



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

## **Session Six: “The Way Forward in Afghanistan”**

**Speakers:** **General David H. Petraeus**, United States Central Command;  
**Ashraf Ghani**, Chairman, Institute for State Effectiveness;  
**Francesc Vendrell**, Special Representative for Afghanistan, European Union;  
**Congressman Tom Perriello**, D-VA;  
**J. Alexander Their**, Senior Advisor, Rule of Law, United States Institute of Peace

### **Main Issues**

The stabilization of Afghanistan is a top foreign policy and national security priority of the United States. Extremist elements in the border region between Afghanistan and Pakistan continue to pose a direct threat to US and international security more than seven years after 9/11 and the ensuing American invasion of Afghanistan. The U.S. and its international partners have been engaged in establishing a stable, legitimate Afghan government that adheres to the rule of law and fulfills its basic international obligations as the long-term solution to combating militancy. Yet in the last three years there has been a serious deterioration in security, a failure to meet basic development goals, and a corresponding loss of popular confidence in the Afghan government and the international coalition.

An increasingly unstable and violent Pakistan has raised the specter of even greater regional instability, including possible confrontation between nuclear-armed rivals India and Pakistan. This panel explored what critical steps must be taken in the areas of security, governance, rule of law, political reconciliation, and development to put Afghanistan back on the path to peace and stability.

### Use of Force

In 2001, Afghans enthusiastically welcomed international security forces into their country. Today, the failure of the NATO-led International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) and Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) to create a secure and stable environment has led to a lack of confidence and questioning of the utility of international troops by the Afghan population. This conflict cannot be solved by a military solution alone, although the current situation requires more coalition and Afghan security forces on the ground to quell violence and train and support Afghan security forces. Civilian casualties, a lightning-rod issue that increases anti-American sentiment and serves as a recruiting tool for insurgents, must be minimized.

### Establishing the Rule of Law



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

U.S. counterinsurgency efforts must make the population the center of gravity for the mission, focusing much more on state building and rule of law. Afghanistan is highly decentralized, and much capacity resides at the local level, so efforts must also be at the village, district, municipality, and provincial levels. Local governance structures and community and civil society organizations should be empowered. The Afghan government and international community must address corruption and impunity by improving accountability measures and supporting efforts to remove bad actors from positions of power.

## 2009 Elections

The upcoming presidential and provincial council elections in 2009 are an opportunity for a renewed contract between the Afghan people and the government. These elections must be free and fair, as elections that are viewed as illegitimate will further destabilize the country. A legitimate vetting process is needed to remove corrupt actors or the Afghan population will lose faith in the democratic process.

## Afghanistan is not Iraq

It is important to learn lessons for Afghanistan from Iraq (and other contexts), but every case is unique and requires a carefully calibrated approach based on local understanding and leadership. There are vast differences between Afghanistan and Iraq with regard to topography, weather, infrastructure, literacy, natural resources, experience with centralized government, and ethnic and tribal structures.

## A Regional Approach

To succeed in Afghanistan, the U.S. must address regional challenges. Much of the Afghan insurgency is based in Pakistan, which is facing its own internal security challenges. It is essential to involve Pakistan, Iran, India, the Central Asian states and other regional actors to address each state's security concerns. Afghanistan currently produces more than 90 percent of the world's opium, which funds insurgents and criminal networks throughout the region while also creating a public health catastrophe in Iran and Pakistan. Trade, border security, economic, and agricultural policies must all be multilateralized and tailored to address this situation. Iran played a helpful role in Afghanistan in 2001-2002 and has legitimate interests in Afghanistan. Counter-narcotics cooperation may be the first step in broader US-Iran cooperation.

## Role of the International Community

The U.S. effort in Afghanistan requires a comprehensive and coordinated international strategy and must include both near and long-term strategies. The international community should be a catalyst for development, and should not assume the role of providing public services. The



# *Passing the BATON*

*Foreign Policy Challenges and  
Opportunities Facing the New Administration*

American transition to the Obama administration may increase European willingness to contribute more to the mission in Afghanistan, however, the longer the war goes on, the more unwilling EU countries will be to send troops to Afghanistan.

## **Policy Conclusions\***

1. Success in Afghanistan will not be through military power alone, and a sustained and coordinated international approach is essential.
2. Afghanistan needs a tailored strategy – one that includes increased Afghan leadership and capacity in all aspects of the mission.
3. The international coalition should focus on governance and the rule of law at the local and national levels in order to regain legitimacy. Radical measures to end corruption and the embedded culture of impunity are also necessary.
4. Upcoming elections must be perceived as free and fair. Together with the Afghans, we must ensure a legitimate outcome and sideline bad actors that tarnish the face of the government to an increasingly skeptical population.
5. A regional strategy that includes Pakistan, India, the Central Asian states, and even China, Russia and Iran is essential in order to stabilize Afghanistan.
6. The international community must recommit to investing in Afghanistan and the region for the long-term.

---

\* Policy Conclusions from Group Panel Discussions at Passing the Baton 2009 were not necessarily achieved by group consensus. In some instances, individual panel members may have been in disagreement with the larger group. For specific information on each panel's contents, please see the comprehensive online archive at [www.usip.org/baton2009](http://www.usip.org/baton2009).