Violence and the Peace Process

Conflicts in Northern Ireland, Sri Lanka, and the Middle East provide valuable lessons regarding the causes and effects of political violence.

Violence often continues and sometimes intensifies during peace negotiations, but it needn’t derail them. A U.S. Institute of Peace Current Issues Briefing on May 29 addressed ways to prevent different forms of violence and keep violence from disrupting peace negotiations. “Negotiating with Terrorists: Lessons from Northern Ireland, Sri Lanka, and Israel-Palestine” was moderated by Joseph Klaits, director of the Institute’s fellowship program. The guest
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Right: Disabled combatants in Sri Lanka’s civil war held a procession in June in support of peace efforts between the government and Tamil rebels.
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speakers were John Darby, professor of comparative ethnic studies at the University of Notre Dame’s Kroc Institute, former senior fellow at the U.S. Institute of Peace, and author of The Effects of Violence on Peace Processes (U.S. Institute of Peace Press, 2001); E. Valentine Daniel, professor of anthropology and director of the Southern Asia Institute at Columbia University; and the late John Wallach, president of Seeds of Peace, former senior fellow at the U.S. Institute of Peace, and author of The Enemy Has a Face: The Seeds of Peace Experience (U.S. Institute of Peace Press, 2000). [See the article on Wallach’s death on p. 3]

Darby discussed three forms of violence that can threaten a peace process: violence by the state, by militants, and within the community. Each form requires a different solution, he said.

In Darby’s view, the principal threat to negotiations probably is violence by militants, including violence within militant groups (which often involves a power struggle). There always are people who do not want a ceasefire, he pointed out. These “spoilers” use violence after their colleagues have entered into negotiations. They adopt names—such as “The Real Irish Republican Army”—designed to assert that they (not their colleagues who are negotiating) are the rightful representatives of their cause.

Darby delineated four types of militants: dealers, who will negotiate; zealots, who view compromise as betrayal and therefore regard dealers as traitors; opportunists, but set strong conditions on their participation. Isolate zealots and mavericks as soon as possible. Deal with them through the rule of law.

Darby believes that reducing state violence requires action from external bodies: regional groups, neighboring states, international bodies such as the United Nations, or nongovernmental organizations. Strong, independent media coverage of events also is important in deterring state violence, he said.

Both political and nonpolitical (conventional) violence within the community can threaten peace negotiations. According to Darby, the rate of conventional violent crime often dramatically increases during a ceasefire, partly because weapons abound. Political violence within the community also may remain frequent. Although its 1998 peace agreement continues to hold, Northern Ireland experiences nearly daily incidents of interreligious violence, such as...
The passing of John Wallach on July 10 was considerably more than a deep personal loss to his family and friends. It was a loss of leadership to a global community of those who strive for a less hateful world and inter-communal reconciliation. John was a true entrepreneur of peacemaking. In 1993, at the height of an award-winning career in journalism, he conceived of a summer camp coexistence experience for children of societies divided by hostility and conflict. As Henry Kissinger said at the funeral, “All great things are somebody's dream, . . . and it has been a privilege to be permitted to walk a little bit of the path with him.”

John’s conception was based on a profound insight: The most effective way to break the cycle of distrust and hatred that sustains conflict over generations—the confrontations between Israelis and Palestinians, Greeks and Turks in Cyprus, ethnic groups in the Balkans and Afghanistan, Indians and Pakistanis—was to bring together teenagers and help them confront the personal hostilities and stereotypes that sustain group conflict. As he once observed, the Seeds of Peace experience was a “detox” program for getting rid of hatred before it poisoned the minds of emerging young leaders, before they were trapped in yet another cycle of self-destructive conflict that burdened their elders. (For more on John’s life and work, see “A Letter on Behalf of My Father,” by Michael Wallach, www.seedsofpeace.org.)

John Wallach’s social concerns and compassion found expression through qualities of entrepreneurial genius. He not only had the insight to conceive of an innovative program of reconciliation, he had the promotional skills to generate political and financial support for his concept, and the organizational sense to bring his conception into reality. In less than a decade, John “grew” Seeds of Peace from a modest two-week experience for 45 Israeli, Palestinian, and Egyptian youngsters at a rented facility to an extended summer program for more than 400 campers from 23 countries at a permanent campsite in Maine. And with the support he generated from those who shared his vision, John was able to create a “coexistence center” in Jerusalem and make
Islam and Democracy

Exploring Islam’s compatibility with human rights and democracy leads to suggestions for strengthening institutions in the Muslim world.

What are the relationships between Islam, human rights, and democracy, and how can the United States and the West promote democracy in the Muslim world? The U.S. Institute of Peace and the Center for the Study of Islam and Democracy sponsored a symposium at the Institute on June 18 to explore these issues.

The session was co-chaired by David Smock, director of the Religion and Peacemaking Initiative at the Institute, and Radwan Masmoudi, executive director of the Center for the Study of Islam and Democracy. Featured speakers included Laith Kubba of the National Endowment for Democracy, Muqtedar Khan of the Association of Muslim Social Scientists; Mahmood Monshipouri of the Political Science Department at Quinnipiac University; and Neil Hicks of the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights and a former Institute senior fellow.

The Challenge of Democracy in the Muslim World

Democracy building remains an uphill battle in most Muslim countries, asserted Kubba. Progress in liberalizing society, modernizing institutions, and developing infrastructure is slow and limited. In Kubba’s view, the key to understanding the democracy predicament in Muslim countries does not lie in the texts or in the traditions of Islam but in the context of society, politics, and culture. In short, the basic problem is not about religion but about modernity.

Noting that many Muslim states are stuck in a dysfunctional “deadlock” of corruption and repression, Kubba warned that apathy and despair breed radicalism.

Assessing Islam’s Compatibility with Democracy

According to Khan, “In the minds of nearly one billion Muslims who practice some form of democracy around the globe, there is no dispute between Islam and democracy.” Pointing to the role that Muslims play in civil society in countries from the United States to Pakistan, Khan indicated that the international community is not confronted by a “clash of civilizations” or a clash of Islam versus democracy, but rather a “clash of myths.” These myths are advanced by Islamists and Western ideologues alike. The greatest threats to human rights in the Muslim world, are not religious or theological but political.

To counter these myths, Khan stressed the importance of further examining three issues:

■ The Koranic principle of Shura, a consultative decision-making process encouraged by the Koran, and its commonalities and differences with basic precepts of western democratic theory;

■ The false dichotomy whereby the rule of law in a democratic state (“law of man”) is portrayed as being inherently in conflict with the Sharia or Islamic law (“law of god”); and

■ Democratic institutions and practices from ancient and modern Muslim history, such as the Loya Jirga in Afghanistan or the Constitution of Medina, that may provide useful lessons on how democratic principles can be woven effectively into a modern Islamic society.

A Look at Islam and Human Rights

Fifty-four years after the passage of the UN Universal Declaration

See Islam and Democracy, page 14
Women, Human Rights, and Islam

Poverty and basic security—along with political freedoms—are among priority issues for women in the Muslim world.

A positive fall-out of the September 11 attacks and the demise of Afghanistan’s Taliban regime is the sudden global attention to the problems facing women in the Muslim world.

To grapple with these issues, the U.S. Institute of Peace, with Women in International Security, organized a panel discussion on June 17. Pamela Aall, director of the Institute’s Education Program, introduced the meeting and Richard D. Kauzlarich, director of the Institute’s new Special Initiative on the Muslim World, moderated the event.

The panel included Nayereh Tohidi, associate professor of women’s studies at California State University, Northridge, and presently a research scholar at the Kennan Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars; Amina Rasul-Bernardo, an Institute senior fellow; and Nasreen Mustafa Sideek, minister of reconstruction and development of the Kurdistan Regional Government.

Tohidi said the increased attention to Muslim women’s issues can be used to create a deeper awareness of commonalities, as well as differences, among Muslim and other women. When addressing the issue of women’s rights in Muslim countries, one must not focus only on religion but also on historical, social, and economic factors. While orthodoxy closes some doors for women, it has opened new ones for traditionally marginalized women. The veil, for example, does not always serve the function of seclusion. It also provides a means for the newly urbanized, the first generation to pursue higher education, and the more conservative women to enter public space. “It is a way for women to negotiate modernity,” noted Tohidi.

Focusing on the Mindanao region of the Philippines, which has a largely Muslim population, Rasul-Bernardo explained that martial law and ethnic conflict have increased male dominance of public space, which has eroded women’s status over the past 30 years. This new male-dominated orthodoxy interprets Sharia (Islamic law) in a way that restricts rather than protects women’s rights, particularly in family law.

Rasul-Bernardo stressed that there is a difference between the educated, urbanized women of the elite, who lead the call for political and social freedoms and influence, and the women of the poor and displaced, who are preoccupied with the survival of their families. Interventions should target both these groups.

The good news is that women retain access to education and that politics is not an exclusively male arena, despite the growing orthodoxy. “Whichever individual, male or female, can best assure the survival of the family or the clan is supported by the family, the clan, and the community,” said Rasul-Bernardo.

Sideek spoke about the Kurdish region of Iraq. She noted that women and men there share the same constraints. However, the Kurdish region has international protection and a strong family system.

Kurdish women in Iraq, said Sideek, “are tempered and seasoned, positioned to contribute significantly to improving the quality of life for all Iraqis.” These women have a history of leadership: heading households, leading tribes, and participating in armed struggle.

In spite of the strengths of Kurdish society, the long and continuing struggle with the Iraqi government has taken a toll. Fear and uncertainty remain, as do threats of brutality and of the use of chemical weapons. Education is available but the system is in need of modernization and expansion.

The role of women in the public sector has expanded in the last decade, though their participation remains limited. The 35 members of the ruling Kurdistan Regional Party Central Committee include one woman. Four of sixty parliamentarians are women. Besides Sideek herself, there is one other woman in the 25-member cabinet.
The Institute Covers the Globe

Afghanistan

Two former U.S. ambassadors offer insights into the relationship between Afghanistan and neighboring countries.

How do Pakistan and Central Asian countries perceive their neighbor Afghanistan after nearly a year of U.S.-led military action? What relationship do they wish to have with Afghanistan? Former U.S. ambassador to Pakistan William Milam and former U.S. ambassador to Uzbekistan Joseph Presel addressed these questions in a Current Issues Briefing at the U.S. Institute of Peace on May 21.

Richard Kauzlarich, director of the Institute’s Special Initiative on the Muslim World, moderated the briefing: “Afghanistan: A Regional Perspective.”

For the moment, Pakistan’s stance toward Afghanistan is "relatively benign and passive," Milam said. President Pervez Musharraf wants U.S. security forces to remain in Afghanistan and is using "the opportunity that the situation in Afghanistan gives him to go after [Pakistan’s] extremists." However, Pakistan’s relationship with India strongly affects its view of Afghanistan, Milam noted. If tensions over Kashmir escalate into war between Pakistan and India, Pakistan’s stance toward Afghanistan could change, partly because the Northern Alliance "has some links with India." In the event of a Pakistan-India war, Pakistan would shift its troops from its western border with Afghanistan to its eastern border and, most likely, stop cooperating with the U.S. campaign against terrorism, Milam cautioned.

Presel discussed Afghanistan in relation to former Soviet republics in Central Asia. Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan "don’t want any trouble" from Afghanistan, he said. These countries are glad that U.S. forces are in Afghanistan, and they hope that the U.S. presence will continue there for "quite some time.” They view the U.S. presence in terms of how it might increase their independence from Russia. Presel cited two of Turkmenistan’s incentives for peace with Afghanistan: Turkmenistan’s long border with Afghanistan is “indefensible,” and Turkmenistan wishes to export gas through Afghanistan. Uzbekistan sees itself as a regional power. Tending to view Afghanistan in terms of problems rather than opportunities, Uzbekistan remains wary of Afghanistan, Presel indicated. In the past, terrorists have entered Uzbekistan from Afghanistan, which has a large Uzbek population. While desiring stability and continued trade with Afghanistan, the countries of Central Asia will remain largely passive regarding Afghanistan, Presel believes.

Colombia

Panelists explore the future of the peace process and its economic, security, and political implications.

A new Colombian administration is taking office, led by President Alvaro Uribe Vélez. Conflict among guerrillas, paramilitary groups, and the state is escalating at a time when peace negotiations are stalled. What are the security, economic, and political dimensions of conflict resolution in Colombia in light of these dynamics?

 Colombian and international diplomats and experts gathered to consider these issues and the prognosis for peace at a June 20 conference, jointly organized by the U.S. Institute of Peace, the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, and the International Crisis Group, with the collaboration of the Inter-American Dialogue. The Institute’s Margarita S. Studemeister and Charles E. Nelson were co-organizers of the conference.

To begin the discussion, Lino Gutiérrez, principal deputy assistant secretary of state for Western Hemisphere affairs, presented the current thinking of the U.S. administration. He described the administration’s proposal to extend the use of anti-drug trafficking resources to anti-terror efforts against guerrilla and paramilitary groups.

Institute program officer Michael Dziedzic chaired a panel on “Military and Security Foundations for Peace.” During that panel, Colombian senator-elect Rafael Pardo noted that establishing government control over national territory cessi-
tates providing both security and basic services to communities, and Colombian defense attaché General Néstor Ramirez added that security is also a requirement for successful development to take place.

A panel on economic performance and conflict included representatives of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, as well as the Center for Global Development and the Universidad de los Andes. All recognized Colombia’s strong macro-economic record, but expressed concern about the constraints of international economic policies—in conjunction with the violence—on national development.

Providing a dose of optimism, Canada’s ambassador to Colombia, Guillermo Rishchynski, highlighted the role of the international community, shifting from observation to facilitation, in peace negotiations over the past few years. While not disputing that, other participants stressed that there will be no overnight miracles and that the process of peacemaking and peacebuilding in Colombia will be long, expensive, and difficult.

**Zimbabwe**

Experts discuss the use of torture for political control and ways the international community might respond.

How has the Mugabe government used torture, especially in the aftermath of the flawed March 2002 elections in Zimbabwe, for political control? A June 25 Current Issues Briefing at the U.S. Institute of Peace, organized with the Center for Victims of Torture, focused on “Zimbabwe, the Mugabe Government, and the Politics of Torture.”

Tim Docking, Africa specialist and program officer in the Institute’s fellowship program, moderated the discussion among panelists Tony Reeler (Amani Trust, Harare), Ray Choto (Zimbabwean journalist), and John Prendergast (International Crisis Group, Washington).

Reeler, clinical director of Amani Trust, an organization created to treat torture survivors and document human rights abuses in Zimbabwe, said that the ruling ZANU-PF party and the Mugabe government systematically use torture and other forms of violence to punish their opponents and compel them to accept the March presidential election results.

Reeler pointed out that “torture is the mechanism of oppression; death tolls are low, but torture is at epidemic proportions.” Indeed, he argued, the relatively low number of deaths associated with government human rights abuses in Zimbabwe has contributed to the lack of international attention to the scourge of torture.

Data from the Amani Trust suggest that in 2000, more than 200,000 Zimbabweans were tortured. Among displaced commercial farm workers, a particularly vulnerable group, more than 80 percent suffer psychological disorders due to torture-related trauma. Some 55 percent of children from the same group report having witnessed acts of torture.

Reeler concluded that while the current crisis in Zimbabwe has exacerbated the use of torture as a tool of political oppression, the practice itself and the culture of impunity that surrounds its use have a history that precedes independence, dating to the Ian Smith regime.

One victim of these horrors is Ray Choto, a Zimbabwean journalist with *The Standard* newspaper who is currently at Stanford University as a Knight journalism fellow. Choto was tortured in 1999 after refusing to reveal his sources for a story he published on the arrest of 23 military officials. Describing the media in Zimbabwe, Choto said that “journalism is on trial.” He went on to say that draconian new media laws pushed through by Mugabe are having a devastating effect on Zimbabwe’s free press; journalists risk arrest almost every time they go to print.

Speaking on the policy implications stemming from the current crisis in Zimbabwe, Prendergast, co-director of the Africa Program at the International Crisis Group and former Institute executive fellow, argued that the rhetoric—or “bark”—of various international actors has not matched the “bite” of their actions. Regional powers South Africa and Nigeria pursue quiet diplomacy, but to little effect. He asserted that the European Union, the United States, and the rest of the Group of Eight industrialized nations should do more to cut Mugabe’s regime off from its financial resources by freezing foreign-based assets and banding together to halt the regime’s looting of natural resources in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Other policy recommendations that surfaced during the discussion included supporting unions, civil society, opposition parties, non-governmental organizations, independent journalism, and short-wave radio, particularly for rural populations in Zimbabwe.

The group expressed hope that the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD), a comprehensive reform program sponsored by African government leaders, could be leveraged by Western donors to generate African peer pressure on Zimbabwe to stop its current widespread abuses on its civilian population.

New media laws are having a devastating effect on Zimbabwe’s free press; journalists risk arrest almost every time they go to print.
David Epstein had fewer miles to travel than most of the students participating in the National Peace Essay Contest award week in Washington. But the Pikesville, Maryland junior began the journey as the other high school students from 48 states did: with a 1,500-word essay on the U.S. military’s role in international peacekeeping.

Epstein’s essay—“Safeguarding Human Rights and Preventing Conflict through U.S. Peacekeeping”—was selected the top national winner, garnering him a $10,000 scholarship in this annual contest. The second and third place national winners this year were Prabhu Balasubramanian of Winter Park, Florida and Peter Christodoulou of New York City, who were awarded scholarships of $5,000 and $2,500, respectively.

The award banquet capped a whirlwind week for all the state winners. Activities gave participants a panoramic view of life and work in the nation’s capital.

**Standing in the Shoes of Policymakers**

Each year, the students participate in a political simulation on a timely issue. This year, the simulation put students in a hypothetical case that required them to advise the U.S. president on whether the U.S. should provide peacekeeping troops to monitor a future peace agreement between India and Pakistan over Kashmir. Each student took on a specific role—from cabinet members, such as the secretaries of defense and state, to congressional and military leaders—to debate and ultimately propose a course of action to the president.

The students were briefed by spokespersons from the embassies of India and Pakistan, as well as U.S. Institute of Peace specialists and other experts. They had three intensive days of briefing and deliberation to determine how to advise the president about U.S. interests in relation to Kashmir, terms of engagement if U.S. troops were to be involved, troop deployment costs, the length of the mission, and, finally, the domestic economic, and political consequences of sending soldiers to Kashmir.
The students did not hold back; they fully engaged in their roles. During the simulation a “senator” was expelled for leaking information to the media and a military official was kidnapped but soon released by one of the parties to the conflict.

Pamela Aall, director of the Institute's Education Program, noted that “the challenges of making a durable peace in today's violent international conflicts are some of the most complicated foreign policy problems facing the United States today. Through the essay contest, students not only analyze what these challenges are, but they also design policies that can help.”

After the simulation, students spent a full day on Capitol Hill, where they were addressed by Representative Ralph Regula (R-Ohio), who spoke of the challenges of public service in helping the nation deal with a changed world. The students spent the rest of the day meeting individually with their congressional representatives.

Four students were interviewed on Voice of America’s radio-TV show Talk to America. Vladimir Gutman, from Illinois, was among them and was later asked to give a second interview—in Russian.

**Sampling Washington**

In addition to sampling the policy-making process, the students experienced other facets of life in Washington, D.C. as a center of government, history, and culture. Visits to the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum and the Smithsonian Institution were complemented by an evening of outdoor theater at a production of West Side Story. The students were also treated to the perspectives of Washington insiders such as Colman McCarthy, director of the Center for Teaching Peace; David T. Johnson, coordinator for Afghanistan, U.S. Department of State, who was the keynote speaker for the awards banquet; and U.S. Institute of Peace program staff.
Parliamentarians identify common areas of concern for the new Kosovo Assembly.

Thirty members of the newly established Kosovo Assembly participated in a five-day training workshop on “Developing Good Governance” organized by the U.S. Institute of Peace, at the request of the U.S. Department of State. The workshop was designed to develop a cooperative spirit, improve consensus-building skills, and help identify common areas of concern that could usefully be addressed early in the assembly’s work as the Kosovo government prepares to meet benchmarks set for it by the United Nations Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK).

The workshop, held June 12–17, was the latest meeting in a continuing effort by the U.S. Institute of Peace to bring together leaders from Kosovo. The parliamentarians represented Kosovo’s diverse communities, including Albanian, Serb, Turkish, Roma, and Bosniak. Speakers included Ambassador John Menzies (U.S. Office, Pristina), Greg Schulte (National Security Council), and James Dobbins (RAND). Nikolaus Count Lambsdorff (senior adviser to the special representative of the UN secretary general) attended as a representative of UNMIK. Facilitating the workshop were Daniel Serwer (director of the Balkans Initiative), George Ward (director of the Training Program), Theodore Feifer (program officer in the Training Program), and Michael Dziedzic (Balkans Initiative program officer) of the U.S. Institute of Peace.

Participants agreed on six areas that could usefully be addressed by the assembly:

■ passing laws to ensure protection of human rights and facilitate return of all displaced persons;
■ promoting economic development through a market economy and developing strengths in mining, agriculture, power generation, and light manufacturing;
■ improving the educational system to provide instruction for all in their native language and to promote tolerance and cooperation;
■ providing access to and funding for social welfare programs such as pension plans and unemployment insurance;
■ improving the functioning of the assembly and its cooperation with UNMIK; and
■ promoting dialogue within civil society and between civil society and the assembly.

The full text of a report on the meeting is available on the Institute’s website at www.usip.org, in English, Albanian, and Serbian.
The third major goal is to begin to resolve Kosovo’s political status—this process should start within two to three years, Rexhepi hopes. Resolving Kosovo’s status will increase regional stability and economic growth, Rexhepi believes, whereas unclear status will discourage foreign investment. Some problems within Kosovo’s government threaten to impede progress toward the cabinet’s goals. All levels of the government should be investigated for corruption, Rexhepi said. The courts need to be “much more efficient.” Some judges have “old socialist ideas.” Many Kosovars do not respect particular judges because those judges collaborated with the former Serbian government.

The issue of missing persons remains a big concern. About 3,400 Albanians and 1,300 Serbs still are missing, Rexhepi reported. He proposes that Kosovo and Serbia form a joint commission to resolve this issue.

Maintaining rule of law is another challenge. The Kosovo Protection Corps (KPC), an unarmed civilian agency composed of former members of the Kosovo Liberation Army, is charged with protecting Kosovo citizens and assisting in Kosovo’s rebuilding. However, some KPC members have been accused of continuing to engage in inter-ethnic violence, causing much of the international community to view the KPC as a destabilizing force. The KPC should “take more responsibility,” Rexhepi commented. In any case, he hopes that NATO security forces, especially U.S. troops, will stay in Kosovo “a long time.”

In a related activity, Veton Surroi, chair of the KOHA Media Group in Pristina, spoke to the Balkans Working Group on June 10 on state-building in Kosovo over the past three years. Those years, Surroi said, have allowed Kosovo to reconstruct physically and spiritually, and political conflicts have moved from a military to a political context. However, the constantly changing laws make it difficult to establish an independent judiciary, allowing corruption to flourish. For the next phase, Surroi called for a two-step approach involving self-rule and negotiations leading to self-determination. A U.S. presence, though, is needed as a stabilizing force in the region.

**JOHN T. CRIST**, program officer in the Jennings Randolph fellowship program, coordinated a team-taught master’s-level course on “Principles and Practice of Conflict Management” for the 2002 summer session of Johns Hopkins University’s School of Advanced International Studies. Several Institute staff and senior fellows lectured on relevant topics. Students included staff members from the U.S. Agency for International Development, Catholic Relief Services, the Center for Strategic and International Studies, *The Economist*, the National Geographic Society, and PricewaterhouseCoopers.

On August 2, program officer **TIM DOCKING** addressed some 50 people at a Current Issues Forum in Bay View, Michigan. He spoke about the U.S. Institute of Peace, as well as AIDS and conflict in Africa.

**JEFFREY HELSING**, program officer in the Education Program, gave the keynote address at a week-long secondary school teachers’ conference in Austin, Texas, sponsored by the University of Texas. His presentation, on July 4, was entitled, “The Challenges of Teaching about Peace and Conflict in an Interdependent World.”

Senior fellow **MICHAEL MATHESON** published an essay on the use of U.S. military commissions to try detainees from the Afghan conflict in the latest issue of the *American Journal of International Law*.

**COLETTE RAUSCH**, program officer in the Rule of Law Program, was part of the expert panel advising the drafting committee of “Practical Guidelines for the Establishment of Correctional Services Within the United Nations Peace Operations,” published at the end of June by the International Corrections and Prisons Association. Rausch’s focus was on the legal framework for peace operations, international norms and standards, and understanding one’s responsibility in administering the law.

**ERIC SCHWARTZ** discussed the International Criminal Court on BBC’s *World News Tonight*, the Canadian Broadcasting Company’s national morning news program, and National Public Radio’s *Diane Rehm Show*.

Institute president **RICHARD H. SOLOMON** traveled to Southeast Asia in early June to assess regional developments. In Singapore he participated in discussions with some 120 regional security experts at the International Institute for Strategic Studies’ Asia Security Conference. Among other stops, he visited Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia for the Institute of Strategic and International Studies’ 16th Asia Pacific Roundtable, where he presented a paper on “9/11 and Asia’s Future: Security Cooperation, or a Clash of Civilizations?” The tour concluded with visits to Jakarta, Indonesia and Manila, Philippines in his capacity as a member of the U.S. Chief of Naval Operations’ Executive Panel.
Although Israel has been in a state of war with neighboring states for its entire 54-year history, the country has defied predictions that it would become a garrison state dominated by its military, says Yoram Peri, a senior fellow at the U.S. Institute of Peace.

Instead, he says, Israel remains a strong democracy in which the “political-military partnership” is under the control of elected civilians.

But Peri, the author of many studies of civilian-military relations in Israel and a frequent lecturer at the Israeli Defense Force’s National Military Academy and at Hebrew University, says that during the past 20 years the military side of this partnership has gradually become more powerful.

“Civilian supervision of the military has weakened, and military involvement in political decision making has reached a point that democracies are usually not prepared to endure,” he says. “This is not healthy either for the future of Israeli-Palestinian relations or for the democratic process in Israel itself.” Peri discussed his fellowship project, “Guns and Olive Branches: The Israeli Defense Forces and the Palestinians,” at an Institute briefing in the spring, before the recent Israeli incursions into the West Bank.

The change in Israeli political-military relations has taken place within a democratic context, Peri said. The military is a stepping stone to the top of Israel’s political system, with retired senior military officers making up approximately 10 percent of the Knesset and 20 percent of the government.

Peri stressed that the military influence in Israeli politics is not consistently partisan or one-sided but has shifted with changes in political circumstances. For example, in the late 1980s and early 1990s much of the military leadership decided to back peace processes with Jordan, Syria, and the Palestinians, because the military’s analysis of Israeli national security saw a greater threat on the horizon from Iran and Iraq, which were developing nuclear capabilities, and wanted to be free to focus on those threats.

The military worked within the political system to persuade the Israeli electorate that the government needed to be changed in order to advance the peace process.

But when the peace talks at Camp David stalled in 2000 and the latest Intifada began, the military blamed Yassir Arafat, Peri said. “Arafat violated the fundamental principle on which the Oslo Accords were based—that disputes between Israel and the Palestinian Authority would be settled in negotiations without the use of force.” Military leaders argued to political leaders and the public that peace negotiations should not resume until Palestinians learned that the use of violence could not be a successful strategy.

The struggle for civilian control of the military in Israel is not a special case, Peri cautioned. Indeed, similar problems are likely to emerge elsewhere in the new era of low-intensity warfare. In such wars, the distinctions between political and military dimensions are much hazier than they were in conventional wars, he said.

Nevertheless, Peri remains optimistic about democracy in Israel. “The country has experienced numerous terrorist attacks, and still we have a democracy. The glass is still half full.”
Creative Scenarios for Education in SE Asia

More than 40 conflict resolution educators from eight conflict-affected Southeast Asian countries brought their experiences to an Institute seminar (“Ethnic, Religious, and Cultural Conflict in the ASEAN Region”) in Singapore, April 12–17.

Alan Tidwell and Pamela Aall of the Institute’s Education Program organized the seminar and presented their current work. The program’s Education in Zones of Conflict initiative supports faculty who teach conflict resolution at the university level in conflict-prone areas. The seminar was conducted in partnership with the Institute for Defense and Strategic Studies, Nanyang Technological University. The agenda featured case studies from Mindanao, Philippines; Ambon/Maluku, Indonesia; and Bougainville, Papua New Guinea.

Michael Oppenheimer of Global Solutions (New York) led an exercise that introduced the concept of “scenario development” as an educational and planning tool. The Mindanao and Maluku case studies were the focus of the exercise, which called on participants to think creatively about possible outcomes. After selecting a hypothetical outcome for each case, participants worked backward to define steps to the outcome. The exercise won several converts to the concept from among initially skeptical participants.

Globalization and the Arab-Israeli Conflict

Among Israeli Jews, does socioeconomic status correlate with support for policies that advance Israeli-Palestinian peace? At the Institute on June 4, Uri Ram asserted that, in general, it does. A senior lecturer at Ben Gurion University in Israel, Ram spoke at the roundtable “Globalization and the Arab-Israeli Conflict: The Impact of Economic Forces in Israel on Conflict and Peacemaking,” which was moderated by Judy Barsalou, director of the Institute’s Grant Program. Israel has a highly globalized economy, heavily concentrated on information and communications technologies. But globalization has left many Israelis behind, Ram said, and poorer Israeli Jews are more likely than affluent ones to oppose policies that advance Israeli-Palestinian peace. Ram believes that improving the socioeconomic status of poor Israeli Jews “would bring much more popular support to the peace process.”

The UN and Legal Authority for Peace

Senior fellow Michael Matheson presented a project report on June 13: “Legal Authority for Peace: International Law, the Security Council, and Armed Conflict in the Post–Cold War Period.” Matheson identified four main issues: the authority to intervene in internal conflict; the authority to govern; the delegation of the use of force; and international criminal prosecution. Of the last, Matheson argued that although the International Criminal Court is now formally a reality, its effectiveness will ultimately depend on its obtaining the support of the UN Security Council, which means that the court must act prudently and judiciously. He contended that U.S. interests would be best served by a cooperative rather than an antagonistic relationship with the court, even if the United States does not become a party to its statute.

Democratization in Post-Conflict Settings

Charles T. Call, grantee and guest scholar, provided a project report June 19 on “Recent Thinking about Democratization in Post-Conflict Settings.” He drew upon a conference of international experts on democratization and peacebuilding to highlight several ideas, including: (1) both the concepts and policies associated with international post-war peacebuilding have broadened in recent years; (2) the prevailing “democratic reconstruction model” faces serious challenges of resources and contextual sensitivity; and (3) reconceptualizing the democratic reconstruction model to incorporate specific and local contexts merits further exploration.

Short Takes

Michael Matheson

Senior fellow HAZEL SMITH served on the Honorary Committee of AmeriCares’ “2002 Celebration of Hope Gala” held in New York City on May 21. Smith is shown here with former president George H. W. Bush and Barbara Bush.
Violence
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and protect the rights of the Tamil minority would facilitate the emergence of a peace process. For decades, the government has favored the country’s Sinhalese majority and marginalized its Tamil minority. For example, the government has restricted acceptance of Tamils into universities and the civil service, and has suppressed nonviolent Tamil demonstrations. Within a few months of government-organized and private attacks on Tamil citizens in 1983, thousands of Tamils joined militant groups, Daniel stated.

Similarly, among Palestinians there is strong support for a Palestinian state and for militant groups, like Hamas, that demand such a state. In the West Bank and Gaza, support for Hamas rivals support for the Palestinian Authority (PA), Wallach said, asserting that “terrorism will continue” as long as Israelis and Palestinians fail to negotiate. A May poll conducted by the Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey Research buttresses this view. The survey polled 1,317 Palestinians, age 18 and older, in the West Bank and Gaza.

A majority of those polled endorse bombings against Israeli civilians within undisputed parts of Israel; more than three-fourths endorse attacks on Israeli soldiers and settlers. At the same time, the poll indicated that Palestinian approval of PA chairman Yasir Arafat is lower now than during Israeli-Palestinian negotiations. Among those polled, 93 percent believe there is corruption within PA institutions, 91 percent support fundamental reforms, 89 percent favor a democratic system of government, and 83 percent would welcome elections (which the PA has announced would be held in January 2003).

Wallach believed that the larger Arab world should be involved in the Israeli-Palestinian peace process. He noted that two-thirds of those polled support Saudi Arabia’s peace initiative, whose provisions include an Israeli-Palestinian ceasefire, Israel’s return to its 1967 borders, creation of a Palestinian state, and normalization of relations between Israel and Arab nations.

Sower of Seeds

Continued from page 3

innovative use of the Internet to connect “seeds” who remained separated by the hostility that continues to divide Israelis and Palestinians.

The Institute of Peace was fortunate to have had the opportunity to support the growth of John’s vision. A modest grant in 1994, Seeds’ second year of operation, gave John enough backing to bring professional counselors into the program and develop other sources of funding. A second grant enabled him to evaluate the effectiveness of the camping experience. And a fellowship at the Institute in 1997–98 gave him the time to write an appealing book about his creation, The Enemy Has a Face: The Seeds of Peace Experience (U.S. Institute of Peace Press, 2000). This was precisely the use of our resources that Congress had in mind in creating the Institute and funding its work. It demonstrates that the Institute is not a self-contained set of programs but an outreach vehicle with the ability to empower creative efforts at peacemaking by innovative individuals and institutions around the world.

Seeds of Peace is now in its 10th year of operation. The effort has acquired a certain institutional momentum, but John’s leadership was essential to its vision and growth. His untimely passing challenges us to find ways to sustain his work. There could be no better way of memorializing the innovative peacework of John Wallach, a sower of seeds of peace, than to find ways to sustain his creation. The Institute of Peace is committed to working with his wife and collaborator Janet Wallach and the Seeds of Peace family to give ongoing life to this unique approach to freeing young people from the bonds of hatred that trap societies in enduring conflict.

—RICHARD H. SOLOMON

Islam and Democracy
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of Human Rights, human rights remain a point of contention between the West and the Muslim world. Monshipouri argued that the core of the dispute is less a conflict of western versus Muslim values than it is the manifestation of an internal struggle within the Muslim world. This struggle pits Islamic conservatives, Islamic reformists, and Muslim secularists against one another. Monshipouri noted: “Muslim countries have increasingly become the site of an emerging cultural conflict over who controls the process of social change.”

Monshipouri argued that efforts by Muslim women and youth to gain a greater role in civil society and development of public policies will be vital in shaping attitudes toward human rights. Monshipouri also stressed that western policymakers need to treat “Muslim masses as partners in the struggle against human rights abuses,” while also actively assisting reformist voices.
Promoting Democracy in the Muslim World

According to Hicks, the U.S. record on promoting democracy in the Muslim world has been highly inconsistent and largely ineffective. Hicks noted that "the myth of cultural incompatibility between Islam and democracy has been a comfortable backdrop for a U.S. policy of inaction, leaving a legacy of low expectations and Orwellian doublespeak that will take years to overcome."

To overcome these inconsistencies, Hicks outlined several courses of action open to U.S. policymakers:

- Substantially increase the proportion and amount of U.S. foreign assistance spent on promoting democracy in the Muslim world.
- Provide governments and key interest groups in Muslim societies with economic, political, and other types of incentives to engage in democratic reforms.
- Make more effective use of existing multilateral agreements, international treaties, and international organizations to help overcome skepticism of the U.S. government's motives.
- Promote regional accountability mechanisms with existing regional institutions such as the League of Arab States.

Kubba added that assistance should have four foci:

- Helping dysfunctional states increase their ability to provide critical public services.
- Advocating legal and institutional reforms to enhance opportunities for greater political participation.
- Assisting civic education efforts.
- Finding techniques to contain the political abuse of religion.

Former U.S. Institute of Peace Fellow Tahseen Bashir Dies

Tahseen Bashir was both well-spoken and outspoken in support of tolerance in the Middle East.

"Some people think the state is what counts; I believe that over time it's people that count." These words of Tahseen Bashir's seem to sum up his motivations for a lifelong career in diplomacy.

Bashir died of heart failure on June 10 in London.

From his student days he was an independent and principled risk taker. Throughout his career as a student activist, diplomat, presidential spokesman, and international thinker, he remained a strong voice of tolerance. He saw images beyond the events of the moment, a picture of coexistence of Israelis and Arabs.

Even in the difficult job of spokesman for Presidents Nasser and Sadat, Bashir was an independent thinker. He had a sharp wit and could quickly cut to the heart of the matter.

While a 1995–96 senior fellow at the U.S. Institute of Peace, Bashir analyzed the transformation of Egyptian policy from a strategy of confrontation to a strategy of peace. "What matters over time," he said, "is whether you create a constituency that will support peace." While a fellow, he was part of a group of eminent figures exploring ways to improve Arab-Israeli relations that also included Jordanian ambassador Adnan Abu Odeh and Israeli professor Ephraim Kleiman.
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