



WPF REPORTS

number 41

The Foundation Report

2004-2005

THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

The World Peace Foundation was created in 1910 by the imagination and fortune of Edwin Ginn, the Boston publisher, to encourage international peace and cooperation. The Foundation seeks to advance the cause of world peace through study, analysis, and the advocacy of wise action. As an operating, not a grant-giving foundation, it provides financial support only for projects which it has initiated itself.

Edwin Ginn shared the hope of many of his contemporaries that permanent peace could be achieved. That dream was denied by the outbreak of World War I, but the Foundation has continued ever since to attempt to overcome obstacles to international peace and cooperation, drawing for its funding on the endowment bequeathed by the founder. In its early years, the Foundation focused its attention on building the peacekeeping capacity of the League of Nations, and then on the development of world order through the United Nations. The Foundation established and nurtured the premier scholarly journal in its field, *International Organization*.

Since 1993, the Foundation has examined the causes and cures of intrastate conflict. The peace of the world in these decades has been disturbed primarily by outbreaks of vicious ethnic, religious, linguistic, and intercommunal antagonism within divided countries. The episodes of brutal ethnic cleansing that convulsed Rwanda, Bosnia, and Kosovo are but the best known and most devastating of a rash of such attempts to oust rivals across the globe. Few places are immune from some variant of this internecine warfare, whether the immediate battles are over religion, language, appearance, or color differences. Thus, the Foundation is active in and studies the problems of Afghanistan, Nigeria, and the Sudan, and has worked in and studied the prospects for democracy in Burma and Haiti. It has sponsored research on the role of non-governmental organizations in preventing conflict in ethnically divided societies. It has engaged in feasibility studies regarding the reduction of conflict in Africa by the creation of African crisis response forces. It has analyzed the use of preventive diplomacy in resolving ethnic and other intercommunal conflicts. Its work on truth commissions demonstrates how that method of post-conflict justice-seeking can help prevent future internal conflicts. The Foundation has examined how the United Nations should manage its peace building responsibilities.

Intercommunal conflict often becomes civil war and, in some cases, leads to failed states. The Foundation has actively researched the causes of state failure, and how best to reinvigorate and manage the resuscitation of wounded states.

Contributing to widespread killings in intercommunal conflicts, civil wars, and imploding states is the easy availability of small arms and other light weapons. For this reason, the Foundation engaged in a long-term examination of the small arms problem, and how its licit and illicit trade should be addressed. The Foundation has also analyzed the connection between conflict diamonds and civil war.

Part of the task of the Foundation is to resolve conflicts as well as to study them. The Foundation's work in Congo, Cyprus, Burma, Sri Lanka, Haiti, the Sudan, Zimbabwe, and all of Africa has resolution of conflict as its goal. The Foundation has sponsored a detailed study of negotiating the end of deadly conflict within and between states. It is also engaged in an analysis of the successes and failures of African leadership.

THE FOUNDATION

REPORT

2004–2005

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION
Cambridge, Massachusetts
2006

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Philip Khoury, *Chairman*
J. Brian Atwood
Peter D. Bell
Lincoln P. Bloomfield
Barbara Bodine
Catherine E. C. Henn
Thomas M. O'Reilly
Kenneth A. Oye
James M. Shannon
John Shattuck
Anne-Marie Slaughter
Frederick G. P. Thorne
Paul Van Slambrouck
Richard H. Ullman
Robert I. Rotberg, *President*

Copyright © 2006

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

79 John F. Kennedy St.
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
Tel: 617-496-9812
Fax: 617-491-8588
E-mail: world_peace@harvard.edu
www.worldpeacefoundation.org

All rights reserved

Contents

I.	Seeking Peace in a Time of Terror and Turmoil	1
II.	Promoting Peace within a Troubled and Terrorized World	4
	Terrorism in Yemen and the Horn of Africa	4
	State Building in Afghanistan	5
	Measuring Governance	6
	Rogue States	7
	Preventing Nation-State Failure	7
	African Leadership	8
	Nigeria	9
	The Palestine/Israel Conflict	9
	The Program on Intrastate Conflict	10
	Fellowships	10
III.	The World Peace Foundation and the Quest for Peace	11
	The Formative Years	11
	The 1930s	13
	World War II and After	13
	The 1980s and Early 1990s	14
	1990s to 2003	15
	The Foundation and Its Partners	31
	The Endowment	31
	The Board of Trustees	31
	The Office and Staff	32
	The Foundation's Web Site	32
IV.	Books of the World Peace Foundation (since 1963)	33
V.	Reports of the World Peace Foundation	36
VI.	Trustees of the World Peace Foundation	39

I. Seeking Peace in a Time of Terror and Turmoil

If anything is to be accomplished in this world, someone must do something. Someone must put his hand to the work, or furnish the funds for other hands...Moral influence is good, but if that is our sole reliance, this cause [of peace] will not be advanced. Until...moral influence is quickened into action, little will be accomplished.

Edwin Ginn's words 100 years ago are still apt. Addressing the thirteenth International Peace Congress, the founder of what was to become the World Peace Foundation worried out loud about the increasing rush toward war in Europe, about the (unnecessary) dreadnoughts that Germany and Britain were building, about the dangers of American imperialism and American attacks on Filipino resisters, and about how to build an enduring movement for peace in the United States. Ginn, as early as 1897 and throughout the early years of the twentieth century, was a tireless advocate (along with Andrew Carnegie and many others, even President Taft) of the compulsory arbitration of disputes between nations, of a league of nations, of a world court, and of a world police force to enforce the decisions of a world court. As a hard-headed businessman, he viewed war as enormously wasteful of human and material resources. War was an impermissible drag on governmental budgets better devoted to education, health, and welfare.

This Foundation has failed, so far, to create the more peaceful world that Ginn envisaged and worked so hard to achieve. Instead, the peace of the world is more shattered than ever by the rise of terror on a scale and with a ferocity and a reach never previously known, by Washington's hegemonic preemptive response to terror and to the monstrosity of Iraq under Saddam Hussein, and by the continuation of civil wars across the failed and failing states of the developing world. Ginn would be dismayed and discouraged.

Four years ago, in our biennial Report, we wrote that the forces of terror were everywhere and anywhere, always taking advantage of the civil liberties and political and economic largesse of nations that follow democratic procedures and espouse progressive values. We did not anticipate the rapid conquests of Afghanistan and Iraq, and the troubled and greatly flawed rebuilding experiences in both countries. We did not then know how superbly staged wars could be succeeded so thoroughly by ineptly and inadequately arranged peace efforts, and how the process of reconstruction in Iraq would so dramatically fail to win the hearts and minds of so many of those who had been freed from Saddam Hussein's baleful yoke. Nor could we have predicted that vanquishing the Taliban would not lead ineluctably to the extirpation of al Qaeda and the capture of Osama bin Laden. Amid an atmosphere of unremitting terror, the maintenance of world peace thus continues to be no less complex than in former eras.

At the end of 2005, Liberia elected Africa's first woman president, and there were some modest hopes that Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf, a Kennedy School

of Government graduate, would be able to rebuild her war ravaged state. Sierra Leone, next door, was a recovering failed state, too, but Côte d'Ivoire, Liberia's other neighbor, remained embroiled in a civil war between north and south, with no immediate end in sight.

The Sudan remained enmeshed in combat as well, with Government-backed marauders attacking refugee camps and rebels in Darfur and battling Beja rebels in the country's northeastern region. But at least the new north-south agreement was holding, and the two decade old conflagration between the Arab-dominated government in the north and African Christian soldiers in the south had ended. Peace had broken out and been sustained for several months. Reintegration of north and south, and development were underway.

The Congolese wars had also entered a quiet phase, even if skirmishes continued in the country's northeast and the Kinshasa government had hardly begun projecting national power beyond Kinshasa. Burundi was still divided by war, too.

Outside of Africa, the new intrastate battlegrounds were Haiti, about which the Foundation has written in the past, Nepal, Russia, and southern Thailand.

The Foundation was also concerned with the world's worst and most repressive nation-states. As well as its older project on good governance, the Foundation in 2004 and 2005 began to define repression and thence to devise ways to measure it in a manner that would faithfully reflect the odious efforts of regimes such as those in Belarus, Burma, Equatorial Guinea, North Korea, Syria, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, and Zimbabwe.

The failed and repressive states of the world all were potential vectors of terror, and a handful of rogue states—nation-states both highly repressive and highly aggressive—were still sponsoring terror and terrorists as 2005 closed. In order to address many of these issues in one theatre of action in the world, the Foundation sponsored a productive meeting in 2004 which developed into a late 2005 book: *Battling Terrorism in the Horn of Africa* (Brookings, 2005), with a chapter on Yemen and other chapters on the relevant African countries of the region.

Peacefully preventing or reducing conflict in and beyond these kinds of troubled states has been an object of the Foundation for more than a decade. So has the Foundation been concerned with the elimination of the underlying causes of state failure and collapse, intrastate antagonism, and ethnic and religious disharmonies of the kinds that so often engender bloodshed. The Foundation consequently continues its enduring attention to conflict prevention and conflict resolution, both in general and with regard to particular civil wars and civil hostilities. The Foundation also seeks to create conditions and policy frameworks conducive to intercommunal understanding, to peacemaking and peace building globally, and to direct study and action in theaters of violence.

For all of these reasons, the phenomenon of state failure, and the place of state weakness and state failure in providing hospitable terrain for terror and terrorists, are of critical concern to the Foundation. During 2003 and 2004, the results of our large project on the nature of state failure appeared in two books: *State Failure and State Weakness in a Time of Terror* (Brookings, 2003) and *When States Fail: Causes and Consequences* (Princeton,

2004), and in articles in *Foreign Affairs* and the *Washington Quarterly*. Those publications explain why nation-states fail, and set out a continuum of state efficacy from strength through collapse, with endangered states possibly progressing from weak through failing to failed, with collapse as the end position reached now by Somalia and formerly by Liberia, Sierra Leone, Lebanon, and Tajikistan. Together with our separate but complementary work on UN Peace Operations and Peacekeeping, our books and articles also suggest how best to prevent failure and to reconstruct those high risk states that ultimately do not sustain themselves.

Closely related to and contributing to the weakness and failure of states is poor national governance. In 2002, and continuing through two meetings in 2003, and with additional writing and a meeting in early 2004, the Foundation focused its attention on how best to measure qualities of governance in the developing world and, equally, on how to improve the poor levels of governance that afflict so much of the developing world. The goal of this governance project is a) to create an intellectually acceptable framework for the study of governance in the developing world and, b) to propose a governance ranking method that will do for governance what Transparency International's rating system has done for corruption: to take governance out of the closet and to improve the manner in which most citizens of the developing world are governed.

The vicious wars of the twenty-first century, and internal violence in conflicted nations such as Afghanistan, Burundi, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Iraq, and the Sudan, among others, are greatly fueled by the availability of small arms and light weapons—the lethal implements of choice in most outbreaks of intra-state carnage. An awareness of the role of small arms in the destructive conflicts of Africa, the Middle East, and Asia led us to investigate the resource bases that fuel civil conflict, especially diamonds and timber.

The Foundation previously examined how to employ methods of preventive diplomacy and early warning to forestall conflict. It worked directly with the military establishments of Africa to develop and evaluate early action crisis response capabilities. It has analyzed how best to negotiate the conclusion of deadly intrastate conflicts. It continues to be engaged directly, too, with the resolution of long-standing intrastate belligerencies through dialogue and mediation, not least in Cyprus.

Another enduring and closely related concern in this century and the last has been transitional justice and post-conflict administration. The Foundation's research and publication on the truth commission endeavor, its close attention to specific cases of failure and trauma, and its work with and about the UN are mutually reinforcing and interlocking. Since 1993, in various ways with which Ginn would have resonated, the Foundation has sought to understand the root causes and the underlying complexities of the world's internal wars, and to reduce their number, severity, and duration.

Ginn, the visionary Boston publisher who became a firm champion of peace at the end of the nineteenth century, more than a decade before he established the Foundation in 1910, believed that lasting peace was achievable through rational means, especially by educating Americans about the

wastefulness of war, and by undertaking systematic research on the causes (and folly) of conflict between and within nations. Ginn and similarly minded persons of his era were ahead of their time, and still are. His and their practical idealism, and the search for solutions to the vexing problems that cause antagonism and violent hostilities within and between nation-states, still motivate the energies and resources of the Foundation.

The Foundation focuses on eliminating those political, social, and economic conditions that provide encouragement to war. It continues its preference for rigorous analyses of acute challenges to world order and of seeking to foster improved national and international policy making by drawing informed conclusions and recommendations from careful study. The Foundation specializes in constructively brokering dialogues between opposing communities, no matter how long and bitterly estranged, and in developing useful methods of contributing to effective and sustainable conflict resolution. In these many ways, the Foundation seeks world peace in keeping with the spirit of Ginn's ambitious bequest.

II. Promoting Peace within a Troubled and Terrorized World

Since 1993, the Foundation has focused most of its energies on diagnosing the etiology of intrastate conflict, on developing theory that addresses and practical methods of preventing such conflict, on mediating and resolving individual conflicts within states, and on coping with the consequences of the global emergencies which arise out of or are intrinsic to the contemporary wave of internecine hostilities. From 2004 through 2005, the Foundation engaged in the following activities:

Terrorism in Yemen and the Horn of Africa

Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, and the Sudan—the countries constituting the “Horn of Africa”—together with Yemen, are potential hostages to terrorism. Their largely unsecured territories provide a platform for terrorists, and their internal conflicts and weaknesses create potential breeding grounds for current and future anti-American terrorism. American efforts to combat terrorism in the region demand cohesive strategies across U.S. foreign policy agencies and across the region. The U.S. must employ multipronged social, economic, political, and military strategies to overcome not only the immediate threats but medium- and longer-term risks.

At a World Peace Foundation conference entitled, “Examining the ‘Bastions’ of Terror: Governance and Policy in Yemen and the Horn of Africa” held at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government in November 2004, a group of three dozen experts from the diplomatic, NGO, policy, security, and scholarly communities discussed how best to combat terrorism in the region.

The group's recommendations were clear and remarkably unified about the major strategies for countering terrorism in Yemen and the Horn of Africa. The U.S. must work with its allies to craft a unified and multilateral approach to the underlying as well as the immediate problems of the region. American efforts must be concerted with local authorities and multinational efforts (including NGOs) and development and humanitarian efforts of the international donor community must be coordinated and complementary. These recommendations and the conference discussions were summarized in Deborah West's report, "Combating Terrorism in Yemen and the Horn of Africa," WPF Report 40. *Battling Terrorism in the Horn of Africa*, a book on the same topic, edited by Robert I. Rotberg, was published by Brookings Institution Press in 2005.

State Building in Afghanistan

Effective state building in Afghanistan depends on strengthening security, providing serious new monetary incentives for wheat growing instead of poppy production, decreasing the hold of narco-terrorists, improving regional commercial linkages, enhancing the country's sense of nationhood, and bolstering good governance. Those were the conclusions of a private, free-ranging, off-the-record discussion on Afghanistan's future sponsored by the World Peace Foundation very late in 2005 at the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. Senior Afghans, Europeans, and Americans participated.

WPF Policy Brief 5, "State Building in Afghanistan: New Ideas," offered the conference participants' specific recommendations for bolstering Afghanistan. Its future security and prosperity depend on lessening today's dependence on opium and also on returning the country to its former economic status as a critical part of Central Asia or greater Eurasia, rather than its more recent position on the far periphery of South Asia. A sense of common purpose would help develop Afghanistan economically, but because the country is not completely united, with the central government having only limited visibility and legitimacy beyond Kabul, a sense of common purpose would strengthen the nation as well. Like so many post-conflict countries, to accomplish any of these and other critical objectives Afghanistan needs to be better governed. Afghanistan, said the World Peace Foundation meeting, desperately requires a robust legal framework.

These issues must be resolved locally, and not by outsiders. But the role of foreign security forces and foreign donors will remain vital for at least another decade. Too much of this outside activity is random and not coordinated with other donors and with the central government so as to ensure maximum benefit to Afghans.

State building in Afghanistan is not a sure thing. But if the drug-related and judicial reforms outlined in this Policy Brief, and if Afghan, NATO, and U.S. forces can greatly reduce insecurity, then—and only then—Afghanistan has a chance of emerging stronger rather than weaker in the years to come. A book is being prepared to explore the issues confronting Afghanistan in greater depth.

Measuring Governance

Nation-states fail in part because their governments perform poorly. That is, they provide too few of the required political goods: security, a functioning legal system, the capacity for strong economic performance, education, health, an empowered civil society, and others that signify high quality governance. In order to obtain a consensus on what were those goods, and how they contribute to the delivery of government services—governance—the Foundation convened two meetings at the Kennedy School of Government in 2003 and a third meeting in 2004. Participating were scholars of government, governance, and sovereignty; creators and managers of existing attempts to provide good governance measurement systems; official users of the outputs of such measuring systems; and purveyors of analogous developing world measurement methods.

Emerging from the second of the two meetings, and embodying both the argument for more precise definitions of governance and for new measuring schemes, was Marie Besançon, *Good Governance Rankings: The Art of Measurement*, WPF Report 36 (Cambridge, MA, 2003). That Report also contained a description of the fifty-one existing data sets that contain information relevant to answering the question: “How Best to Measure Governance in the Developing World.”

Robert I. Rotberg and Deborah West’s, *The Good Governance Problem: Doing Something about It*, WPF Report 39 (Cambridge, MA, 2004), detailed the proceedings of the April, 2004 meeting at the Kennedy School and offered both a rationale for and a method of ranking the countries of the world according to the quality of their governance. It suggested the establishment of a new non-governmental organization to oversee the process, and details how that NGO would create the necessary rating system. The discussion of good governance was furthered by Robert Rotberg’s article, “Strengthening Governance: Ranking Countries Would Help,” which appeared in *The Washington Quarterly* in 2004.

Attempting to find an acceptable way by which to measure the amount of good governance in each country, and thus ranking developing world countries from high to low in terms of governance, arguably would encourage the lower-ranked nation-states to improve their methods of governance. Transparency International’s rankings of nation-states according to their perceived levels of corruption has brought the corruption issue out of the closet and contributed to greater attention to the problem of corruption globally. What is needed is a similar spotlight on governance, again with the intent of encouraging countries to improve their methods of delivering political goods to citizens.

Ranking nation-states according to how well they govern is thus a goal of the Foundation’s continuing endeavors on this subject. One part of that work at the initial meeting, and in 2004, focused on the extent to which non-subjective or only partially subjective measures can be created to measure governance. Objective measures will reduce the carping from target governments; measuring devices that rely on perceptions, or subjectivity, are always open to charges of bias.

Rogue States

After the evil empire was dispatched and America's global power ascendance was assured, world order was still disturbed by jumped-up nation-states that breached international norms of behavior, outrageously and always egregiously. From Washington's perspective, these were the nation-states that played by no known rules of world order, pursuing at best idiosyncratic designs. These states disregarded Washington's predominant military might and followed autarkic rather than collegial, consensual, or respectful policy trajectories. First in the Clinton administration and then in the George W. Bush administration, Washington began calling these outlaw, anomic, unsavory, and troublesome places "rogues." Rogue states, in other words, are the primary policy worries of the post-Cold War era; rogues collectively and individually have replaced the Soviet Union as the repositories of evil.

Contemporaneously, and sometimes much earlier, commentators and scholars employed the appellation "rogue" to describe those polities that oppose the dominant powers in the international system, especially the United States, show aggressiveness, operate in a manner that troubles world order, or flout international law. Possessors of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and sponsors of terrorism obviously are rogues because they refrain from obeying international standards. Rogues are "crazy" states. Their actions are unpredictable and hence roguish. Earlier, before the Cold War had ended, "rogue" was used more narrowly and precisely to describe a nasty nation-state that refused to treat its inhabitants decently—in accord with the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The World Peace Foundation held a series of conferences at the Kennedy School with several dozen scholars, diplomats, and NGO practitioners in order to seek fuller, measurable, and more comprehensive definitions of rogue states. The group asked: In the first decade of the twenty-first century, what are the characteristics of those dozen or so nation-states that are truly odious and truly troublesome—those that operate beyond the international normative pale? From a human rights perspective, and presuming value in an orderly world, these are the worst of the worst. They breach a variety of "civilized" norms. They offend regional and global power structures. What distinguishes them from strong states, failed states, weak states, and from the globe's leading powers?

A book, edited by Robert I. Rotberg, *The Worst of the Worst: Rogue and Repressive States in World Order*, has been readied for publication.

Preventing Nation-State Failure

Beginning in 1998, the Foundation sought to develop effective methods to prevent nation-state failure. Its investigation into the nature and causes of failing and failed nation-states proceeded as a collective endeavor, ultimately with thirty authors focusing in their initial and much revised papers (and at three meetings at the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, in 1999, 2000, and 2001) on various explanations for, indicators of, and factors contributing to the failure of states in the modern world; second, on contem-

porary cases of state failure, near failure, and failure and recovery; and, third, on how both to prevent failure and recover from failure.

The final product appeared in the two books and two articles already mentioned. Both, especially the second, differentiated between strong and weak states in the modern world and offered a clear way (especially in the first chapter of the second book) of distinguishing between failing, failed, and collapsed nation-states. The contents of the Princeton book analyzed why states fail and how they may best be resuscitated (and by whom). The Brookings book contained a number of relevant empirical examples of collapse, failure, and weakness. Several of its chapters showed how one time collapsed nation-states were rebuilt, and how the provision of security is the most essential of all post-conflict peace building necessities.

African Leadership

This project is premised on the proposition that political leadership in Africa is weaker than it should be and needs to be. It further asserts that future African leaders can learn from the examples of Asia, Europe, and the Americas about how to strengthen their own ability to guide small and large countries in order to benefit citizens rather than themselves or ruling cliques. It suggests that conflict and civil war (which provide reservoirs for terror) stem from bad leadership and leadership mistakes. It seeks to strengthen the capacity of future African leaders to be responsible, honest, and wise—to avoid future leadership debacles like those presided over by Presidents Moi, Mobutu, Mugabe, Siad Barre, and Idi Amin. Conflict can be reduced in Africa if more broad-minded leaders of integrity are in charge.

The project involves the participation of a set of a dozen or more present and former African heads of state and present and past cabinet ministers in deciding what is to be done about the problems of African leadership and how best, in their minds, to build capacity for better leadership and better governance in Africa.

In 2003, the group met first at the Kennedy School and then in Botswana. It held a third meeting in early 2004 in Mombasa, Kenya, and a fourth meeting in mid-2005 at the Kennedy School of Government.

During its first two meetings, the group decided that it could exert a positive influence if it created a sensible Code of African Leadership. The Code incorporates a set of best practice principles and is intended to provide standards of conduct for elected leaders.

The group believed that it should form itself into a Council of African Leadership to be a resource and advocacy body for best practices. Its members intend to advise leaders or civil society groups that seek its help. They also believe that international organizations will turn to the Council for advice and recommendations, as over the crisis in Zimbabwe or similar examples of dysfunctional leadership.

The group's members were very serious about capacity building. They believed that they could devise a training program for new elected officials that will prepare them to lead effectively and responsibly, and socialize

groups of younger leaders year after year in the arts of good governance, thus bringing about a sustainable amelioration of African ills.

The fourth strand of the leaders' work was the setting of standards for good governance in Africa, in addition to good leadership. There was talk of an experimental ranking system.

The group finalized the Code of African Leadership and announced the African Leadership Council at its meeting in Kenya in March, 2004. It also agreed upon a capacity building program and a curriculum. It discussed the governance and rankings question. Its members are hard-headed, practical, and not politically correct. They are seized of the crisis in African leadership, and they are determined (however idealistically) to show that there exists a set of African leaders (former and present) who care about positive leadership, and who want to reclaim Africa from those who have led it astray. When the group met again in 2005, it decided to invite additional leaders of integrity to join the Council. It also strengthened its plan to begin training seminars for young elected African political leaders in 2006.

Nigeria

Nigeria is the largest country in sub-Saharan Africa and a supplier of 7 percent of U.S. petroleum imports. It is and has been a largely dysfunctional polity, with a steady record of brutal dictatorship throughout large periods of its post-independent existence. Since the restoration of democracy in 1999, and the re-election in 2003 of President Olusegun Obasanjo, Nigeria is poised to achieve its vast potential as the western linchpin of Africa. Can it do so? If so, how?

In order to provide answers to those questions, the Foundation invited Nigerian scholars and practitioners, and American and British scholars and practitioners, to meet in Cambridge, Mass., at the end of 2002. A large number of papers on controversial subjects were presented, especially four presentations that were the basis for a public Kennedy School Forum on women's rights and shari'a law, "After the Riots: Islamic Law and the Future of Nigeria." The discussions on the problems of Nigeria were summarized by Deborah West, *Governing Nigeria: Continuing Issues after the Elections*, WPF Report 35 (Cambridge, MA, 2003). The papers, much revised, became the basis for an edited book, *Crafting the New Nigeria: Strengthening the Nation*, which was published by Lynne Rienner Publishers in 2004.

The Palestine/Israel Conflict

Is there a narrative capable of bridging, reconciling, and embracing the two vigorously competing narratives of Palestinians and Israelis from before 1948, but also incorporating the signal events of 1948, 1967, 1973, and 2001? At the first of two meetings in 2003, scholars and writers from Palestine, Israel, Britain, and the U.S. argued about whether bridging narratives were useful and/or possible, whether the different myths were responses to or antecedents of the current conflict, and about the essential facts and reconstructions of the challenging events in their common and intertwined lives. A report on the heated first meeting of the group is contained in Deb-

orah West, *Myth and Narrative in the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*, WPF Report 34 (Cambridge, MA, 2003). A book, *Israeli-Palestinian Narratives of Conflict: History's Double Helix*, resulting from the discussions held at an authors' meeting in late 2003, will be published in 2006 by Indiana University Press.

The Program on Intrastate Conflict, Conflict Prevention, and Conflict Resolution

The Program was established in the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs of the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, on July 1, 1999, as a result of an association between the Foundation, the Center, and the School. The Program analyzes the causes of ethnic, religious, and other intercommunal conflict, and seeks to identify practical ways to prevent and limit such conflict. It has been intimately involved with the large-scale attempt to identify why some kinds of nation states fail and collapse, and how world order should react to the phenomenon of state failure. The Program has attempted to re-frame state building as a policy option and imperative, examined the relationship between resource flows and civil war, studied the consequences of the global proliferation of small arms, researched peace building and peace enforcement capabilities in Africa, and critiqued the appropriate role of truth commissions in strengthening conflict prevention and conflict resolution. Robert I. Rotberg, President of the Foundation, is also Director of the Program. More information about the Program can be found at: <http://bcsia.ksg.harvard.edu/?program=WPF>.

The Program's email address is: conflict@harvard.edu.

Fellowships

The Program on Intrastate Conflict, in conjunction with the International Security Program, both in the Belfer Center of Science and International Affairs in the Kennedy School of Government, jointly offer each year a limited number of pre- and post-doctoral research fellowships to promising scholars who are writing dissertations or books on questions of conflict, conflict prevention, and conflict resolution of interest to both Programs.

Since 2001–2002, this joint fellowship endeavor has welcomed thirty-two fellows working on such topics as peacebuilding strategies in Bosnia-Herzegovina, group demands as bargaining positions in East Central Europe, normative change and disarmament, how refugee crises lead to the spread of civil war, and the role of norms and principled ideas in international relations theory and practice. The fellows have come from universities in the U.S., Britain, Belgium, Canada, Italy, and Switzerland, and have carried passports from Armenia, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Germany, Greece, Israel, Italy, and the Netherlands. In addition, five of the fellows have been visiting faculty from institutions abroad. After their fellowship years, many have accepted appointments at colleges and universities in the U.S., or in Britain, Canada, Hungary, Israel, Lebanon, and the Netherlands. Several have won major prizes, and are widely published.

III. Promoting Peace within a Troubled and Terrorized World

The World Peace Foundation has an unusual name, ambitious goals, a special style of operation, and an unexpected history. It begins with Edward Ginn, who, like his friend and contemporary Andrew Carnegie, dreamed of world peace and established the Foundation as the vehicle with which to realize his dreams.

The Formative Years

Ginn was born on February 14, 1838 on a rocky hillside farm in North Orland, Maine, in what he called blessed poverty. (A full-length biography of Ginn is being prepared.) He worked as a cook in a logging camp, sailed as a hand on a Grand Banks fishing schooner, and taught school. In 1862, he graduated from Tufts College, despite failing eyesight and near penury. After graduating, he sold schoolbooks successfully, and developed a gift for marketing. Ginn & Co., the firm that he founded in Boston in 1868, became the leading textbook publisher in the United States.

Influenced by Edward Everett Hale, pastor of Boston's South Congregational Church, peace champion, and noted orator, Ginn began attending conferences on international arbitration at Lake Mohonk in 1897, and soon became dedicated to the cause and the possibility of world peace. He gave his first address to the conference in 1901, and became an active member of the American Peace Society, serving as a director from 1901 to 1903 and as vice president from 1903 until his death. These were active years for the American peace movement. Its 1903 petition to the Massachusetts legislature to request that Congress authorize the U.S. President to establish a regular international congress was later taken up by the Interparliamentary Union of 1904, which urged President Theodore K. Roosevelt to call a second Hague Peace Conference. In 1904, Secretary of State John Hay sent out a circular proposing just that, but international events and protocol delayed the Conference until 1907, when Czar Nicolas II formally convened it.

In 1903, Ginn announced that he would issue books and pamphlets on peace. He recruited Edwin D. Mead, with Hale the co-founder of the *New England Magazine*, and a noted reformer in his own right, to edit books and pamphlets on peace, some by Immanuel Kant and Leo Tolstoy. Ginn also published reports on the two Hague conferences, and various treatises on peaceful dispute resolution.

Ginn also began donating funds to support a peace conference and a variety of organizations active in seeking peace rather than war. These efforts at public education for peace were continued throughout the first years of the century. In mid-1910, he founded the International School of Peace in Boston in order to educate "the people of all nations to a full knowledge of the waste and destruction of war and of preparation for war, its evil effects on present social conditions and on the well-being of future generations and to promote international justice and the brotherhood of man...." The School was not

really a teaching establishment. Instead, it employed a planning staff to map out strategies to influence mass opinion in favor of peace.

The School was converted into the World Peace Foundation at the end of 1910, shortly after Carnegie had created the Carnegie Endowment on International Peace. Trustees of the Foundation initially included Dean Sarah L. Arnold of Simmons College, President William Herbert Perry Faunce of Brown University, President A. Lawrence Lowell of Harvard University, and President Joseph Swain of Swarthmore College.

When Ginn, who died in early 1914, bequeathed a third of the income from his estate to support the Foundation, he defined what lasting peace would entail: It would occur when "the nations shall so far cooperate in the settlement of controversies by the substitution of peace methods for those of war as to constitute an International Supreme Court, an International Executive, an International Police Force, or something substantially equivalent thereto...and an International Parliament." Ginn welcomed disarmament, but did not himself believe that nations would willingly lay down their weapons without some substitute like his police force.

For ninety-six years, the Foundation that Ginn created has endeavored to act in accord with the spirit of his original design. During Ginn's lifetime, however, the Foundation initially had an evangelical intent: "It will be the aim of the workers in our Foundation," Ginn wrote in 1911, "to go into the field and impart to various circles their own enthusiasm and sense of responsibility." And so they did, lobbying Washington and sending advocates to schools, colleges, National Grange chapters, local chambers of commerce, and so on. Ginn and his followers opposed the U.S.' intervention in Mexico's revolution and wanted schools to cease glorifying war in their curricula. New textbooks were planned.

The Foundation produced short and long pamphlets in profusion during its earlier years. John W. Foster wrote *War Not Inevitable* (1911) and President William Howard Taft produced *The Dawn of World Peace* in the same year. William C. Gannett wrote *International Good-Will As a Substitute for Armies and Navies* (1912) and Edwin D. Mead authored *Heroes of Peace* in the same year. Later in 1912, Charles F. Dole wrote *The Right and Wrong of the Monroe Doctrine*.

Lecturing, lobbying, and pamphleteering continued to preoccupy a very busy Foundation until the onset of World War I took the steam out of peace-making. For a few years the Foundation reprinted official documents, and sought a new direction. That direction, promoted by President Lowell, led the Foundation to put its resources behind the promotion of a post-war League of Nations capable of policing aggression. The Foundation appropriated funds to support the League to Enforce the Peace, an advocacy group with that goal as its mission.

After the war, in the wake of the failure of the U.S. Senate to ratify the Treaty of Versailles, the Foundation became the exclusive American distributor of the publications of the League of Nations (which the United States had refused to join), the World Court, and the International Labor Organization. It published the *Yearbook of the League of Nations*. The Foundation further

helped to develop an American League of Nations Association, and lobbied unsuccessfully for the ratification of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice. Harvard Professor Manley O. Hudson, a Foundation Trustee, published most of his books, including *The World Court, 1922-1929* (1929), and articles on the Court, under the auspices of the Foundation. Philip Jessup wrote *American Neutrality and International Police* (1928) and *The United States and the World Court* (1929) for the Foundation. The Foundation also sponsored studies of the British Commonwealth of Nations, the Kellogg-Briand Pact, the Paris Peace Pact, China (1927), Nicaragua and the United States (1927), and U.S. investments in Latin America (1929).

The 1930s

During the early 1930s, the Foundation published Kenneth Colegrove, *International Control of Aviation*; Warren Kelchner, *Latin American Relations with the League of Nations*; William Henry Chamberlin, *The Soviet Planned Economic Order*, and Denys Myers, *World Disarmament*. J. B. Condliffe wrote the significant *China Today* (1932). Two Foundation-sponsored books were responsible for shifting American policy toward the Caribbean: *Haiti under American Control*, by Arthur C. Millspaugh, and *The United States and the Caribbean Area*, by Dana Gardner Munro. In addition, the Foundation published sixteen pamphlets on subjects such as Nazism and colonialism.

In 1938, the Foundation initiated the publication of the annual *Documents on American Foreign Relations*; the Council on Foreign Relations assumed responsibility for *Documents* in 1952.

Most of all, during the 1930s, the Foundation eschewed pacifism, fought isolationism, and favored military preparedness for the United States. In 1939, the Trustees sought to halt the flow of munitions to Japan "so long as the invasion of China continues."

World War II and After

Leland Goodrich, a leading scholar of international organization, directed the Foundation from 1942 to 1946. He focused the Foundation on the rebuilding of the post-war world, recruiting a committee of leading university scholars to produce reports on such trenchant issues as the "Post-War Treatment of Japan," and "Post-War Relations with the Soviet Union." Goodrich, along with several subsequent trustees of the Foundation, was a member of the secretariat of the San Francisco conference which created the United Nations. In 1946, the Foundation published the first definitive work on the UN—*Charter of the United Nations: Commentary and Documents*. A year later, it established *International Organization* (IO), ever since the leading scholarly journal in this area. Many special issues of IO, including one on transnational relations (edited by Joseph S. Nye and Robert Keohane) in 1971, and another on Canada and the United States (edited by Nye and Alfred O. Hero) in 1974, followed the changing interests of the Foundation. (In the early 1990s, with IO well-established, the Foundation wished the editors of IO well, and gave the journal its independence.)

In the wake of World War II, the Foundation supported analytical surveys of Soviet Russia and the Far East, and a study of the effects of air bombing. It prepared short booklets on the United States' relations with Argentina, Australia, Canada, Eastern Europe, and the Netherlands. It investigated collective security and economic policy. *Negotiating with the Russians* (1951), analyzed the difficulties that had been and would be experienced during the Cold War.

Throughout the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, the Foundation focused on key issues of international concern, as well as on problems of multilateral peace-making. The Foundation sponsored the writing of a noteworthy early treatment of Africa by Rupert Emerson and Norman Padelford and a central examination of the Arab-Israeli dispute, oil, and petrodollars by Jacob C. Hurewitz (1976). Lawrence Finkelstein edited *The United States and International Organization: The Changing Setting* (1969). The Foundation also actively explored Franco-American relations, building upon the book, *Diversity of Worlds* (1957), that Raymond Aron and August Heckscher had organized and edited for the Foundation. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the Foundation sponsored several meetings at which leading French and American leaders discussed the foreign policy issues which threatened to divide their nations.

From 1954 to 1983, the Foundation's activities were directed indefatigably by Alfred O. Hero. Born and raised near New Orleans (he was reluctantly to leave the Foundation to manage a family plantation in southern Louisiana), Hero encouraged the Foundation's focus on relations with France, but was particularly responsible for an extensive program of Canadian studies (and Canada-U.S. and Quebec-U.S. relations) in cooperation with the Canadian Institute of International Affairs and the Centre Québécois des Relations Internationales.

The 1980s and early 1990s

During this decade, the Foundation sought to influence the debate on how the West should respond to apartheid in South Africa, co-sponsored several dialogues across the racial and political divides in South Africa, analyzed whether and how Namibia should and could achieve independence and what the consequences of that independence would be, examined how change for the better could be accelerated in Mozambique and Angola, scrutinized Soviet interests in southern Africa and asked how big power and regional power conflict could be reduced throughout the region, and proposed a set of guidelines for United States policy toward all of Africa during the 1990s. Six books on related aspects of African politics, economics, security, health, and peace-keeping emerged from these activities, as did a wealth of informal contacts, a variety of newspaper opinion pieces, and—finally—policy changes which in some cases took years to come to fruition.

Richard J. Bloomfield, the executive director of the Foundation from 1983 to 1992, and during his previous U.S. ambassadorial career an influential participant in the making of U.S. policy toward Latin America, organized a pathbreaking review of the status of Puerto Rico, subtitled *The Search for a National Policy* (1985). Jorge Dominguez, Robert Pastor, and R. Delisle

Worrell edited *Democracy in the Caribbean* (1993), another important book with the same regional focus. Richard J. Bloomfield and Gregory F. Treverton edited *Alternative to Intervention: A New U.S.-Latin American Security Relationship* (1990), as a part of the Foundation's concern for issues affecting United States and Latin American policy. Dominguez and Marc Lindenberg edited *Democratic Transitions in Central America* (1997). It featured the analyses, reflections, and recollections of persons who directly shaped the political processes that transformed Central America in the 1970s and 1980s from military to democratic rule.

During the same period, the Foundation also sponsored Rosemarie Rogers, *Guests Come to Stay: The Effects of European Labor Migration on Sending and Receiving Countries* (1985), and Thomas G. Weiss, *Collective Security in a Changing World* (1993). In that last edited book, Ernst B. Haas and other authors attempted to forecast the shape of the new world order. Two years before, Weiss and Meryl Kessler, *Third World Security in the Post-Cold War Era*, had concentrated on a particularly vexing set of actual and potential conflicts, and on how to strengthen the capacity of the United Nations to handle them. John Holmes edited *Maelstrom: The United States, Southern Europe, and the Challenges of the Mediterranean* (1995), which focused on problems and options for U.S. policy in and around the Mediterranean basin. He and his Maghrebi and southern European collaborators examined the future of the region as insiders worried about the medium- and long-term implications of Muslim fundamentalism, weakening economies, trans-border migrations, and much more.

Holmes, former senior associate of the Foundation and, earlier, a U.S. Foreign Service officer in Europe, also argued in *The U.S. and Europe after the Cold War: A New Alliance?* (1997) that the end of the Cold War removed the original compelling reason for a strong trans-Atlantic relationship, but still left the United States and the nations of Western Europe in need of each other. Holmes asserted that a new U.S.-European relationship would have to be founded on a basis other than the presence on European soil of substantial numbers of U.S. soldiers. That relationship would, moreover, have to take account of the increasing integration of Europe and would have to be more equal than in the past.

1990s through 2003

The Media and Humanitarian Crises

The Foundation's project on the role of the media in improving policy responses during complex humanitarian emergencies led to a wide-ranging meeting in late 1994. The conferees concluded that close cooperation between international relief agencies and the media was essential to prevent and contain the many humanitarian emergencies that threatened to overwhelm the world's logistical and emotional capacity to assist and to care in the post-Cold War period.

The project's participants agreed that future Bosnias, Rwandas, and Somalias could be avoided if there were more and better-targeted information-sharing between the media and relief agencies.

Although public opinion too often reflected the latest capsule summaries of distant conflicts as they were portrayed on television, that same public opinion, well-informed or not, influenced decision-making in Washington and other capitals.

In an oversimplified sense, television images of starving Somali forced the U.S. to send humanitarian assistance and military personnel to reimpose order, and equally dramatic images of Somali attacks on American soldiers compelled Washington to withdraw. The challenge was to harness that dramatic power for understanding complexity and presenting nuances, not to decry it.

The media, if their efforts could be focused and sustained by collaboration with humanitarians, could decisively alter both public attitudes and the actions of policy makers. It should thus be possible to augment the strength of the international humanitarian safety net protecting the suffering, the project concluded.

Those and other results of the meeting were discussed in *The Media, Humanitarian Crises, and Policy-Making*, WPF Report 7 (1995). Revised chapters, including one by Andrew G. Natsios, later USAID administrator, arising out of the conclave and its far-ranging dialogue were published in Robert I. Rotberg and Thomas G. Weiss (eds.) *From Massacres to Genocide: The Media, Public Policy, and Humanitarian Crises* (Washington, DC, Brookings Institution Press, 1996). The Thomas G. Watson Institute of International Studies at Brown University co-sponsored this project.

NGOs, Early Warning, and Preventive Diplomacy

In early 1995, about forty-five leaders of non-governmental organizations, academics, journalists, and other practitioners convened at Harvard University to examine how local and international NGOs working in troubled states could effectively sound the bells of early warning and thus contribute to preventive diplomacy in areas like Sri Lanka, Rwanda, and the Sudan. Emily MacFarquar, Martha A. Chen, and Robert I. Rotberg, *Non-Governmental Organizations, Early Warning, and Preventive Diplomacy*, WPF Report 9 (Cambridge, MA, 1995), summarized the discussions of the meeting. Subsequently, with several chapters deriving from papers presented at the meeting and a number written afresh, appeared Robert I. Rotberg (ed.), *Vigilance and Vengeance: NGOs Preventing Ethnic Conflict in Divided Societies* (Washington, DC, Brookings Institution Press, 1996).

The book's conclusion assessed the role of NGOs in early warning and early action, reporting that early warning was neither as easy nor as obvious as it sounded. Nor was preventive diplomacy straightforward. Preventive action, preferably early, was essential, but such action was more easily described than achieved. The role of NGOs in raising the tocsin of alarm in situations of incipient intrastate conflict, especially in ethnically divided societies, was generally problematic, contextually specific and determined, and fraught with unanticipated obstacles and tactical traps.

The Reconstruction of Haiti

President Jean-Bertrand Aristide, restored to office in 1994 by the intervention of the United States, was in 1996 about to leave the presidency. Given the belated arrival of democracy in Haiti in 1991, and its intrinsic weakness in a country dominated by dictators for 190 years, the Foundation joined the Haitian Studies Association of the United States and the University of Puerto Rico in organizing a project to suggest how Haiti's democratic, economic, and social future could be enhanced and Aristide's initial successes sustained. The project also asked how larger powers (especially the United States) could contribute to the fruitful development of Haiti.

In order to discuss those and other questions, a large meeting was held in 1996 in western Puerto Rico. It was attended by many Haitian government officials, Haitian-American scholars and advocates, diplomats from Washington, Puerto Rican academics and writers, and mainland U.S. scholars and journalists.

The results of the Haiti meeting were summarized in Jennifer McCoy, *Haiti: Prospects for Political and Economic Reconstruction* (WPF Reports 10 & 11, the second being a translation into French, with a Kreyol summary). Robert I. Rotberg (ed.), *Haiti: Renewed: Political and Economic Futures* (Washington, DC, Brookings Institution Press, 1997), included chapters emanating from the conference, and newer studies. The Foundation's contemporaneous work on Haiti also appeared in Rotberg, *Haiti's Turmoil: Politics and Policy under Aristide and Clinton*, WPF Report 32 (Cambridge, MA, 2003).

Funds for Peacekeeping: Reforming the United Nations System

With the goal, among others, of funding ever more numerous United Nations' peace support operations, in 1996 the Foundation sponsored (along with the Thomas S. Watson Institute of International Studies at Brown University) a study of the United Nations system, and how it could be pruned of obsolete and ineffective organizations in order to save relatively significant sums of money. Leon Gordenker wrote that study, which was reviewed at meetings at Brown University and the United Nations, and released to the press in late 1996 at the United Nations as WPF Report 12, *The UN Tangle: Policy Formation, Reform, and Reorganization* (Cambridge, MA, 1996).

Gordenker's study suggested that the United Nations could cut its regular budgetary costs by half (and devote those funds to peacekeeping) if it pruned its system of obsolescent, inefficient, redundant, wasteful, and corrupt branches. The Report provides many illustrative examples of intergovernmental treaty organizations (like the International Labor Organization), interorganizational entities (like the Global Environmental Facility), and many more that soak up funds, sometimes solely in order to keep an outdated bureaucratic bloat in business.

Gordenker acknowledged the very great difficulty of reforming the UN, particularly since the UN system had grown programmatically and functionally since 1946, but without apparent design. There was a formlessness which "even the sloppiest spider would reject," he wrote. Nevertheless, relieving the UN of nodes which duplicate the work of other sections, or overlap in jurisdiction, would be start. So would the elimination of those bodies which are widely judged to be inefficient, ineffective, or produce work of poor quality.

Removing the Military Yoke in Burma

Burma had little experience with democracy before nationalists led by General Aung San wrested the country back from Britain in 1948. In 1962, a military junta gained power and established one of the world's more brutal, isolated, and autarkic regimes. Student-led riots in 1988 led to a free election in 1990. The forces of democracy, led by Aung San's daughter Aung San Suu Kyi, won 82 percent of the seats in the legislative assembly, but the junta clung determinedly to power, and did so into 2006.

The Foundation's project on Burma had two goals: to examine how that country might be assisted to assure its democratic future and economic growth and prosperity, and to suggest how Western and Asian powers ought to regard and then to deal with Burma's future. The United States and the European Union have condemned Burma's junta, and instituted sanctions. But without the cooperation of the leaders of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, Japan, and China, sanctions (and embargos) will remain cosmetic. What should and could be done?

The Foundation-sponsored Burma meeting took place in late 1996, at Harvard University, sponsored by the Foundation and the Harvard Institute for International Development. It provided an opportunity to craft policy responses capable of advancing the cause of democracy and economic development in that troubled and complex Southeast Asian state. The context of such policy responses was hardly auspicious. Burma's 45 million people were desperately poor, with an estimated average annual per capita GDP of about \$200 (although the illicit drugs trade and currency disparities might boost that amount). They were oppressed by the military dictatorship which continued to harass Daw Aung San Suu Kyi and arrest her supporters well into 2006.

The participants in the Burma meeting were tentative in their conclusions. But they were surprisingly hopeful about the likelihood of a non-confrontational transition from military to democratic rule. Yet that transition, however accomplished, would still leave enormous problems. The National League for Democracy and Suu Kyi would have to manage (perhaps in a Chilean manner) the retreating military. They would inherit a Burma which has suffered more than three decades of disinvestment, not least in the human resources domain. The country's educational and health deficits are very large. So are its infrastructural needs. There was a vast illegal drugs trade, with its great potential for corruption and exploitation.

Associated with that trade are ethnic-based insurgencies. About 35–40 percent of Burmese are non-Burmans, and many ethnic antagonisms smolder despite recent accommodations with the government. A transition to democratic rule in Burma, most participants agreed, was in 1996 thus not an end in and of itself, but a means to the achievement of a better future for all Burmese. David I. Steinberg wrote *Burma: Prospects for Political and Economic Reconstruction*, WPF Report 15 (Cambridge, MA, 1997). The Foundation subsequently published a book: Robert I. Rotberg (ed.), *Burma: Prospects for a Democratic Future* (Washington, DC, Brookings Institution Press, 1998).

Sri Lanka

Sri Lanka, the serendipitous isle off India's southeast coast, is still savaged by civil war. Although Sri Lanka was largely peaceful during British colonial times, after independence, in 1948, the majority Sinhala intensified patterns of state-sanctioned discrimination against the minority Tamils. Since the fanatical Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam began battling the government in 1984, more than 65,000 Tamils have died, and thousands more have been internally displaced.

The Foundation and the Centre for Ethnic Studies in Sri Lanka jointly sponsored a large, well-attended meeting in late 1997 at Harvard University to seek answers to the problems besetting the island, and to try to propose possible solutions. The political culture, the bases for ethnic and religious conflict, the economy, and the military situation of the country were all examined and discussed at length. Attempts to negotiate sustainable solutions were also analyzed, but with little hope of any immediate breakthrough. *Sri Lanka's Civil War and Prospects for Post-Conflict Resolution* by Lisa M. Kois, Dana Francis, and Robert I. Rotberg, was published as WPF Report 18 (Cambridge, MA, 1998). A book, edited by Rotberg, *Creating Peace in Sri Lanka: Civil War and Reconciliation* (Washington, DC) was published in late 1999.

Creating Peace in Sri Lanka contains a series of interrelated chapters by Sri Lankan, British, and American authorities on the war and its aftermath. They discuss how to end the war and how the island nation can heal its physical and psychic wounds. The book suggests that third-party mediating intervention is essential, and that any resulting peace can only be sustained by intensive attention to serious political devolution and societal reconstruction. The book is about peace, how to achieve it and keep it, even in societies as fractured as Sri Lanka. It is also a tough-minded book, not one written by Pollyannas: the myriad problems of Sri Lanka are viewed through uncompromising lenses of realism.

In 2002, the vicious conflict continued unabated. Indeed, contributing author Neelan Tiruchelvam, a Tamil moderate, was killed in July 1999 by a suicide bomber before he could add several paragraphs to his chapter entitled, "Devolution and the Elusive Quest for Peace." Tiruchelvam's untimely death underscored the urgency for *Creating Peace in Sri Lanka*.

The book concluded that, however it is arrived at, Sri Lanka needs a peace that recognizes and appreciates Tamil culture and traditions. Ethnic fairness and justice must be the moral basis for whatever new social contract can be constructed out of the wasteland of war. Fairness and justice can provide the normative framework for a new egalitarian system in which all ethnic groups are treated equally and equally valued. In 2004, a Norwegian brokered mediation seemed about to produce that result. By the end of 2005, however, with post-tsunami government changes in Sri Lanka, the Norwegian mediation process was largely in tatters.

Negotiating and Mediating the End of Deadly Conflict

How do UN officials and others charged with bringing about halts to hostilities accomplish their objectives? Given the plethora of intrastate conflicts in the modern age, what are the lessons for ending future conflicts that can be learned from successful and partially successful efforts in the recent past? In 1997, the Foundation invited a series of leading practitioners—persons who had negotiated or mediated the cessation of one or more civil wars—to explain what they had done and how they had operated, and what lessons they drew from their own crisis experiences. They shared their lessons with academic experts (most of whom had also negotiated internationally) of the theory of negotiation and mediation.

The mediators and their academic colleagues suggested that although every negotiation or mediation is unique, there were universal lessons that could be drawn. Listen to both sides. Understand people’s fears and concerns. Create opportunities for the parties to know each other away from the negotiating table.

Other lessons suggested by the conference participants included:

- International forces and external events can propel combatants in an internal conflict toward resolution.
- The threat of forceful intervention assists negotiators.
- So long as either side in a conflict believes that it can win militarily, it is difficult to reach a negotiated settlement.
- It is important to involve all parties, even extremists, in talks.
- Manipulated and coerced agreements are bound to fail.
- Most negotiations take a long time, and mediators have to be prepared to stay for the duration.
- Although conflicts are often seen as clear-cut battles between two opposing sides, there is often as much dissension among the members of each side as there is between the two sides.

The transcript of the interactive discussion that resulted—one of the rare occasions when practitioners and professors actually talked together—was edited by Dana Francis and published as WPF Report 19 (Cambridge, MA, 1998). Its explanatory title is: *Mediating Deadly Conflict: Lessons from Afghanistan, Burundi, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Haiti, Israel/ Palestine, Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Sri Lanka*. Contributors included: Eileen F. Babbitt, Lincoln P. Bloomfield, Herman J. Cohen, Diego Cordovez, Roger Fisher, Donna Hicks, James O.C. Jonah, Herbert C. Kelman, Brian S. Mandell, Robert A. Pastor, Robert I. Rotberg, Lawrence Susskind, Peter J. de Vos, William Weisberg, and Howard E. Wolpe.

Truth Commissions and Transitional and Restorative Justice

The Foundation’s *Truth v. Justice: The Morality of Truth Commissions* (Princeton, 2000), edited by Robert I. Rotberg and Dennis Thompson, marked the completion of the second phase of its project on transitional justice and conflict prevention. Earlier, the Foundation had co-sponsored (with the Harvard Law School’s Program on Human Right’s and the Kennedy School’s Program on Eth-

ics in the Professions) *Truth Commissions: A Comparative Assessment* (Cambridge, MA, 1997), edited by Henry Steiner—a transcript of a seminal meeting on the efficacy and utility of the truth commission method.

Creating a truth commission can assist nation-states to make a transition from post-conflict trauma to fundamental good governance. By providing a dispassionate and comparatively stable means to bind the wounds of recent or deep-seated injury, the truth commission method enables a country otherwise focused on retribution and condemnation to move forward under a conditional framework of restorative or transitional justice.

Since the publication of the Foundation's book, articles reflecting its approach have appeared in newspapers and magazines in Mexico City and Sao Paulo. Truth commissions or historical clarification commissions are underway or being considered in Cambodia, Cyprus, East Timor, Kosovo, Mexico, Sierra Leone, the Sudan, Zimbabwe and elsewhere. The Foundation sponsored or participated in meetings at the Kennedy School, Harvard University, and in the U.S. on the subject of transitional justice. The general issue remains of substantial and continuing concern to the Foundation.

Diamonds in Peace and War: Reforms and Results

Rough diamonds are a rebel's best friend—and a potential fuel for and cause of civil war. Although 95 percent of the world's \$7 billion a year trade in rough diamonds—gemstones and industrial abrasives—stems from countries at peace with themselves, notably Botswana, Canada, Namibia, and South Africa, the other 5 percent was inextricably intertwined with war. Angola, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and Sierra Leone were the producers of contested diamonds. In those bitterly divided territories, where anti-government insurgencies flourished from 1975 (Angola), 1991 (Sierra Leone), and 1996 (the DRC), control over alluvial diamond sources has provided steady funding for arms purchases, corruption, civil conflict, mayhem, and atrocities.

In early 2000, spurred to action by these realities and by the outcry of a coalition of non-governmental organizations, De Beers Ltd., which produces 50 percent of the world's diamonds and controls 65 percent of the world's trade in diamonds, and the main exporting and importing countries, began meeting together with NGO leaders to craft a protocol that came to be known as the Kimberly Process. As Ingrid Tamm's report of this project makes evident, *Diamonds in Peace and War: Severing the Conflict-Diamond Connection*, WPF Report 30 (Cambridge, MA, 2002), the Process eventually produced an agreed upon method of making the trade in conflict diamonds more costly and cumbersome than the trade in peaceful diamonds. Proper diamonds are supposed to travel from mine or alluvial field to sorting house to cutting and polishing center and on to jewelry manufacturers and jewelers only with passport-like documentation. Conflict diamonds are beyond the pale; they will have no authorized documentation.

A meeting of diamond producers and importers, NGO leaders, U.S. officials, Congressional legislative staff (responsible for the Diamond Trade and Protection Act that passed the House late in 2001 and was intended to lend

strong support to the Kimberley Process), academics, and journalists was convened in October 2001 at the Kennedy School to bring all of the concerned parties together in a neutral atmosphere, review the Kimberley Process proceedings and prospective U.S. legislation, and assist in differentiating conflict from peaceful diamonds. Sponsored by the Foundation, the Carr Center for Human Rights Policy, and the Project on Justice in Times of Transition (the last two part of the Kennedy School), the meeting gave added legitimacy and urgency to an ongoing concern. It also followed and linked directly to the Foundation's continuing project on the trade in small arms and its direct influence on civil conflict around the globe.

The Scourge of Small Arms

Small arms and light weapons—assault rifles, machine guns, grenade launchers, shoulder-fired rockets, and other weapons capable of being carried by individual soldiers—are the instruments of combat most commonly employed in the terrible small wars of the post Cold War era. Ethnic and internal conflicts depend on a relentless tide of small arms and their easy availability in an international environment that tolerates violence, waves of human suffering, and deaths too numerous to count.

Fatalities caused by intrastate conflict, overwhelmingly those of innocent civilians, number more than 15 million since the early 1990s. Eighty percent are women and children. Another 10 million are internally displaced as a result of these same wars and the lethality of small arms.

Small arms are portable, easily manufactured and readily procured, and increasingly affordable. They are manufactured both in the developed and the developing world, sold legitimately to armies and police forces, and oft abandoned or declared surplus. Ammunition is relatively inexpensive.

The global trade in these weapons and ammunition may be worth more than \$7 billion a year. Diffusion from manufacturing sources through government-to-government transfers and sales, from private suppliers to governments or private merchants abroad, from governments covertly to distant insurgents, through theft from official arsenals, and by black market trafficking and gun running, is steady and easy. Exact numbers of small arms manufactured are not known. The flow of legal transfers is poorly documented. So, obviously, is the illegal trade. It flourishes, but how many arms move, and to whom, are closely guarded secrets.

In collaboration with the Fund for Peace, the Foundation convened three meetings in 1999 and another in late 2000, all in Washington, DC, to examine how feasible it was to reduce the flow of small arms to zones of combat, and by what means. A list of recommendations, and the research and other considerations from which those recommendations emerged, are analyzed in Michael Klare and Robert I. Rotberg, *The Scourge of Small Arms*, WPF Report 23 (Cambridge, MA, 1999). The Foundation's work later fed into and paralleled discussions at the United Nations in 2001 on a treaty to regulate the proliferation of small arms. It also provided an additional basis for the Foundation's approach to conflict diamonds.

War and Peace in Southern Africa

In 1994, with the establishment of a free and independent South Africa, the entire southern African region emerged at last from the cauldron of apartheid. But the consequent unparalleled opportunities for growth and regeneration brought with them critical challenges and unexpected stresses and strains. The Foundation had attempted in the 1970s and 1980s to bring black and white South Africans together for meaningful dialogue. It had sponsored several projects, and published a number of relevant studies (see the complete list at the end of this Report). Examining the tensions of the post-apartheid order, in South Africa as well as its surrounding region, seemed necessary. The Foundation did so together with its long-time partner, the South African Institute of International Affairs, and a new partner, the South African Institute for Security Studies.

War and Peace in Southern Africa focused on the interrelationships among and the roles of the following factors in the peaceful development of southern Africa: regional trade, migration, crime, drugs trafficking, policing methods, demobilization of armies, and regional peacekeeping—thus encapsulating in one meeting many of the themes of Foundation activities. A large conference was held in Johannesburg in 1996. Participants came both from Washington and Pretoria, and from Lilongwe (Malawi), Lusaka (Zambia), and elsewhere in southern Africa. In addition to senior government and international officials, academics and practitioners from both sides of the Atlantic Ocean contributed to the written and oral product of the conference. The American participants included a former big city police commissioner, a former deputy attorney general, and an assistant secretary of state. The southern Africans included military, police, and drug enforcement officials, diplomats, journalists, businessmen, and journalists. WPF Report 13, by Greg Mills, was entitled *War and Peace in Southern Africa: Crime, Drugs, Armies, and Trade* (Cambridge, MA, 1996). A book of the same title, edited by Robert I. Rotberg and Greg Mills, was published in Washington, DC, by the Brookings Institution Press in 1998.

Peace Enforcement in Africa

Modern Africa is engulfed in war. Nearly all of those wars are within states, where rivalries that play themselves out ethnically have been the curse of Africa since independence in the 1960s. How to prevent such intra-state conflict was the concern of this project. Specifically, it focused on conflict prevention through intervention and peace enforcement by African commanded sub-regional crisis response forces. Africans can respond appropriately to their own crises and need not rely on outside inter-positioning between combatants. Africans can, the project concludes, take charge of reducing their own intrastate warfare.

Since future Congos and Rwandas are unlikely to be rare, and since Burundi is a continuing calamity, an overriding issue for both Africa and the West has been how to restore and keep the peace. The motives for doing so are obvious: to save lives and boost the possibility of economic development; and to achieve a greater than present prosperity for Africans and Africa. The

absence of civil war would encourage national and continental opportunities for growth. Human and economic potentials would be unlocked after years, if not decades (in some cases), of destruction.

Africa's problems are primarily of the pre-cessfire kind. How to persuade or compel warring parties to lay down their arms and resolve conflicts peacefully is the overriding question. Thus, if a rapid reaction force of African soldiers could be created to create the peace, and to minimize the spread of hostilities, fewer lives would be lost and fewer internecine antagonisms would transform themselves into all-out civil wars. At least that is the hypothesis that motivated the World Peace Foundation to explore how an African-controlled force could be used to prevent conflict and strengthen the pursuit of peace on the continent.

The purpose of convening three successive meetings of African ministers of defense and chiefs of staff, together with officers, diplomats, and scholars from Europe and America, was to solve both the technical problems and answer the relevant political questions. The first meeting, at Harvard University, evaluated existing Western initiatives, found them wanting in terms of conflict prevention and serious peace enforcement, and emphasized the need for African ownership of conflict prevention in Africa and any forcible kinds of intervention for peace. Jeffrey Herbst's report of that meeting, *Securing Peace in Africa: An Analysis of Peacekeeping & Peace Enforcement Potential*, WPF Report 17 (Cambridge, MA, 1998) underscored the difficulties. He suggested that traditional peacekeeping was irrelevant to Africa. Instead, peace enforcement of the kind anticipated by Chapter 7 of the UN Charter was needed to deter bloodshed in a country that was "at war with itself." Ending hostilities—not reinforcing an existing peace—was and would be the object in Africa.

The second meeting in this series took place at the invitation of and with the co-sponsorship of the Ministry of Defense of Malawi. Along the shores of Lake Malawi, ministers of defense, chiefs of staff, and former military leaders from Senegal, Ghana, Uganda, Kenya, and virtually all the members of SADC, bar South Africa and Congo, decided that crisis response forces, organized sub-regionally, were a good idea. Unlike Herbst, they believed that they could assume primary responsibility for preventing their own internal wars. Properly trained and equipped African fire brigades, funded and assisted by the West, could greatly improve Africa's ability to reduce intrastate conflict and civilian deaths. Military and diplomatic officials from Britain, Denmark, France, Canada, and the United States, at the meeting in Malawi, welcomed these decisions and promised to back the creation and support the operations of sub-regional crisis response forces. Those warm words went beyond existing and continuing cooperation with African armies. Dana Francis' report of the Malawi meeting, *Peacekeeping or Peace Enforcement? Conflict Intervention in Africa*, WPF Report 21 (Cambridge, MA, 1998) summarized its accomplishments and emphasized the large extent to which answering the key political questions had been gently avoided.

The third conference was held in the middle of a national park in western Tanzania, in 1999. Nearly seventy participants represented the countries of the Malawi conclave, plus Namibia, Nigeria, and Norway (which had also

been represented at the initial session at Harvard). This time, although assumptions about what could be accomplished militarily through crisis response forces remained positive, doubts about the ability of African political leaders to resolve the critical political issues were articulated even more forcefully and candidly than at the previous meeting. Robert I. Rotberg and Ericka A. Albaugh, *Preventing Conflict in Africa: Possibilities of Peace Enforcement*, WPF Report 24 (Cambridge, MA, 1999), presented those arguments in full. A book, *Peacekeeping and Peace Enforcement in Africa: Methods of Conflict Prevention*, with chapters by Happyton Bonyongwe, Christopher Clapham, Herbst, Steven Metz, Rotberg, and others was published in late 2000.

Resolving Civil War in the Sudan

The Sudan is Africa's largest country by area. It has been convulsed by internal war since 1983, with episodes of civil conflict even earlier, and has a long history of enmity between the Arabized and ruling north and the indigenous and traditionally oppressed African south. Yoked together by Anglo-Egyptian reconquest in 1898 and from national independence in 1954, neither half of the Sudan has ever been happy with the other. The north has always been relatively much more developed, the largely neglected south remaining poorer, less well-educated, and insufficiently provided with social services.

At the beginning of 2002, the war between south and north entered a comparatively quiet phase. The official Sudanese government purged its most Islamist elements and pledged support for the U.S. campaign against terrorism. The government also began to welcome and cooperate with U.S.-initiated peace brokering initiatives. A cease-fire, leading to a peaceful rearrangement of the Sudan, seemed much more likely than at any time since 1983. Ultimately, we wrote in 2002, a sustainable peace in the Sudan would depend upon a fair distribution of proceeds from the petroleum being pumped from a district that the north had in recent years carved out of the south. Early in January 2004, after two years of negotiations between northern and southern Sudanese leaders along the shores of Lake Naivasha in Kenya, both sides agreed to divide present and future oil revenues. Earlier they had resolved a number of other issues. A year later, also at Lake Naivasha, final peace accords were signed.

Although the main civil war between North and South is largely ended, starting in 2003, genocidal hostilities broke out in Darfur, the Sudan's westernmost province. Two Darfurian rebel groups have clashed with the government of the Sudan; in retaliation, the government has battled the rebels directly and also armed and funded a local antirebel militia called the *janjaweed*, who have conducted a ferocious bout of scorched-earth ethnic cleansing. About 180,000 people have died and 2 million have been displaced since the conflict began. The Foundation plans to convene a meeting in March, 2006, to address the crisis in Darfur and build on its earlier work on the North-South conflict.

The Foundation convened two meetings in Washington, DC in 2000 to discuss conflict resolution in the Sudan with U.S. and European officials, diplomats and former diplomats with experience in the Sudan, academic and journalistic specialists, and NGO and church representatives. Rachel Gisselquist produced *Sudan: Policy Options Amid Civil War*, WPF Report 26 (Cambridge, MA, 2000), to which Deborah Weinberg added a postscript. Both reports sum up spirited debate and disagreement.

Peace and War in Failing Zimbabwe

The Foundation and the South African Institute of International Affairs convened a large and well-attended meeting in late 2001 in Johannesburg to bring together Zimbabweans from opposed political parties and South African policymakers, businessmen, academics, and journalists. Also participating in the meeting were locally accredited diplomats from a range of nations and three leading American analysts of Zimbabwe's turmoil. As a developing polity that had slipped considerably in all economic rankings (from comfortable to dire), as an illiberal democracy that had lapsed into despotism at the hands of an aging tyrant, and as a once strong African state that was imploding by the day, Zimbabwe provided a laboratory case of man-made failure. It desperately required conflict resolution. It also exemplified the weakness of African leadership, an emerging theme of Foundation activity.

As the report of the meeting by Moeletsi Mbeki, Greg Mills, and Fred Phaswana, *Zimbabwe Before and After the Elections: a Concerned Assessment*, WPF Report 28 (Johannesburg, 2001) makes clear, Zimbabwe's ruling party and the challenging opposition party perceived political and economic realities very differently. Although President Thabo Mbeki of South Africa subsequently spoke out against the errors of President Robert Mugabe's procedures and his damaging violations of the rule of law in Zimbabwe, at the meeting itself two influential South African cabinet ministers were defensive and hesitant. Corporate leaders, the Americans, and all but ruling party Zimbabweans predictably deplored Zimbabwe's self-inflicted wounds, but also expressed alarm at what allowing Zimbabwe to descend into anti-democratic behavior and economic free fall meant and would mean for the sustainable development of good governance and economic prosperity in southern Africa and all of sub-Saharan Africa. Already the rand had plunged against the U.S. dollar (and was to depreciate further into early 2006), foreign investment into southern Africa had largely ceased, and Zimbabweans (and Zambians) were facing serious food shortages thanks entirely to mismanagement and corruption in Zimbabwe. The Foundation was poised, along with many other concerned outside organizations, to assist Zimbabwe's transition back to democratic rule and sensible economic planning.

Despite all of the Foundation's myriad efforts, however, as this Report went to press in early 2006, Mbeki still dithered, Mugabe was still in power, and Zimbabweans were increasingly hungry, poor, unemployed, beleaguered, and bereft. Inflation had soared over 500 percent per annum and the World Food Program reported that fully half of all Zimbabweans were hungry.

Puerto Rico

In 1983, the Foundation focused on how the U.S. could best rule its largest dependency. In 1985 it issued a widely noted book, *Puerto Rico: The Search for a National Policy* (Boulder, 1985) which dealt with the options available to Puerto Ricans and the U.S. government. In 2000, those same options were still on the table: the existing commonwealth associated status, statehood, or independence. The Clinton administration and the Republican-dominated Congress were unsure about the future of Puerto Rico, a possible issue in the then upcoming presidential elections. A referendum in Puerto Rico (1998) and the outcome of elections in the commonwealth had demonstrated the lack of popular support for independence, but had otherwise given comfort both to those who advocated statehood and those who favored an enhanced version of the current associated status.

The Puerto Ricans who joined U.S. officials and former officials and American academics in Washington in 2000 to discuss once again how Puerto Rico should be governed comprised politicians, businessmen, lawyers, and economists from all tendencies and persuasions. Several had participated in the 1983 meeting and a few had even been close to the decisions made when Puerto Rico originally opted for association as a commonwealth in 1952.

Rachel Gisselquist's report of the meeting, *The Challenge of Puerto Rico: Resolving Status Issues*, WPF Report 27 (Cambridge, MA, 2000), includes an edited summary of the positions advanced by the participants. The meeting began with a discussion of the controversial topic of Vieques, which, as one participant noted, was a microcosm of the problem of Puerto Rico because it embraced the question of what Puerto Ricans themselves wanted for their territory. The meeting also examined historical facts and fictions about national identity, U.S. legislation and status, current political realities in both Puerto Rico and the U.S., and economic options.

Due to the complexity of the ties between Puerto Rico and the U.S., the participants debated at length how to address the issue of Puerto Rico's status—past, present, and future. Although Puerto Rico is considered a "commonwealth," the term does not denote a specific, distinct political status. Some Puerto Ricans argued that changing the relationship to a "free association" would improve U.S.-Puerto Rican relations, but some participants noted that both terms were equally ambiguous and although the latter might be preferred, it would not in fact resolve the status issue. Regardless of terminology, the three options needing to be addressed were separation, association, and integration.

The group ultimately agreed that a consensus on resolving the Puerto Rican issue might prove possible. However, there was much work to be done on both sides in shaping a resolution of the issue that would reasonably satisfy both Puerto Rico and the U.S.

World Faiths Development Dialogue

At the behest of the Aga Khan Foundation, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the World Bank, the Foundation organized a research program and a set of meetings in 2001 to explore the premise that faith networks could assist

international lending agencies and bilateral donors effectively to address questions of peace, development, and poverty alleviation in the world's poorest countries.

The research program produced papers on twelve countries (from Albania to Uganda) which explored the project's governing premise. The Foundation then convened a series of meetings at the Kennedy School of world experts respectively on African religions, Buddhism, Orthodox Christianity, Hinduism, and Islam. Each meeting investigated the different approaches of each faith to peace making, economic development, and poverty alleviation. Each meeting also attempted to ascertain how the methods of organization and governance of each faith would or would not mesh with the approach of the Dialogue, and with the proposed Center for Faiths Development.

The underlying conclusion of the meetings was that the faiths were largely decentralized and non-hierarchical in their governance, that the Dialogue and the putative Center would only with difficulty find nodes of complementarity within each faith structure, and that each faith had its own schisms and internal disagreements with which to contend. As peace and development cooperators and/or contributors, the various faiths were not expected to be strong or effective.

UN Peacekeeping

How should the United Nations reform its overall approach to peacekeeping, peace enforcement, peace maintenance, and peace building—even state-building? In two meetings at the Kennedy School (May 2001) and the UN (November 2001, co-sponsored by the International Crisis Group and the Permanent Mission of Jamaica), three current UN Under-Secretary Generals, two former UN Under-Secretary Generals, several UN Assistant Secretary Generals, several members of the Panel on UN Peace Operations (the Brahimi Commission), other senior UN officials, an array of Permanent Representatives to the UN from the G7 and other leading nations, practitioners, academics, and journalists evaluated the reforms recommended by the Brahimi Commission and discussed the extent to which those reforms should and could be implemented.

At its second meeting, with Afghanistan (and the examples of East Timor, Cambodia, Mozambique, and Namibia) very much in mind, the participants examined how well (and how poorly) the UN was (and was not) prepared to assume serious peace creation and post-conflict reconstruction responsibilities. Given the financial weaknesses of the UN generally, and the UN's peace operations capabilities more specifically, UN officials impressed the second meeting with how improvised and limited the response of the UN could be to civil wars as devastating as Afghanistan's. Despite the partial implementation of the Brahimi Report's recommendations—especially the strengthening of the UN's Department of Peacekeeping Operations—the UN was more fully prepared to broker peace through good offices (as Lakhdar Brahimi in fact did in Bonn with victorious assembled Afghan notables and warlords) than to make or keep peace in a troubled zone. Moreover, stretched as the UN continued to be from Sierra Leone and the Democratic

Republic of the Congo through Kosovo to East Timor, it was poorly placed even to assume peacekeeping obligations in Kabul or to organize the entire rebuilding operation that became essential in post-conflict Afghanistan.

Without a rapid reaction force of its own, or even national battalions ready to be dispatched to a UN-commanded operation, the UN bureaucracy remains severely handicapped by its need to secure a mandate from the Security Council on a basis that might or might not be timely, and by the necessity for the UN then to beg both for financial support and for willing contributors of officers and troops to any peacekeeping or peace enforcement operation. As the failures in Rwanda and, initially, in Sierra Leone, suggest and the Brahimi Report underlined, the UN's capacity to act is seriously weakened by these and many other structural deficiencies.

Few subjects are as compelling and as frustrating as reforming UN peace operations. The peace of the world clearly demands a UN with greater capacity to make and sustain peace within and across countries. How to provide that capacity practically and effectively continues to be the concern of the Foundation. Rachel Gisselquist's report, *To Rid the Scourge of War: UN Peacekeeping Operations and Today's Crises*, WPF Report 31 (Cambridge, MA, 2002) discusses these issues (and the content of both meetings) at length.

Reuniting the Island of Cyprus

The Republic of Cyprus became independent from Britain in 1960, but intrastate conflict between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots soon became widespread, leading to a UN peacekeeping mission (United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus [UNFICYP]), from 1964). From mid-1974, after a coup d'état in the Greek-speaking south and the landing of troops from Turkey in the Turkish-speaking north, the island became partitioned de facto. Approximately 18 percent of the island's total population and about 37 percent of the land of the island was thereafter situated north of the UN-monitored line that bisected the island, the remainder in the south. Over the years that separation became more complete, especially after various UN-brokered settlement attempts failed. Meanwhile, as the separation intensified, the economy of the south prospered and the economy of the north, tied as it was Turkish mainland inflation, suffered significantly. By 2003, the south to north economic disparity per capita was about 6 to 1.

In 1998, the Foundation turned its attentions to the problem of a Cyprus divided. The Foundation sought to determine if a resolution of this seemingly intractable conflict were possible and, if so, how. After a conference held at the University of New Hampshire in 1998 and the publication of *Cyprus 2000: Divided or Federal?* (Cambridge, MA, 1998), a report and edited transcript by Robert I. Rotberg and Ericka A. Albaugh, and after consultations at the UN, in Cyprus, and in Washington and London, the Foundation was encouraged to initiate an exercise in Track II diplomacy.

In 1999, 2000, and 2001, the Foundation's Cyprus Study Group—as it came to be called—formally met six times, and held several informal partial meetings. Several members of the Group were involved in a Foundation- and

Kokkalis Program-sponsored additional meeting on the Cyprus problem at Ditchley Park in Britain. Three spoke on a panel in Jerusalem. All of the fourteen Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot members of the Group began their participation as private citizens, albeit with an intimate awareness of the political landscape. Diana Chigas, then of the Conflict Management Group, and Louise Diamond, then of the Institute for Multi-track Diplomacy, joined the Foundation's president in facilitating the formal and informal meetings.

As the Cyprus Study Group was holding its sixth meeting in 2001, so the leaders of Greek-speaking Cyprus and Turkish-speaking Cyprus were commencing their own face-to-face negotiations with greater bonhomie and expressions of positive amity than had occurred for many years. Those negotiations continued well into 2003, and were focused upon the same kinds of critical issues that were discussed by the Cyprus Study Group during its own several meetings. When UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan presented his final, elaborately detailed "Basis for a Comprehensive Settlement of the Cyprus Problem," in February 2003, it embodied the sense of many of the solutions to the outstanding problems of Cyprus' reunification that had been discussed by the Study Group. Some terminology was similar, and the overall approach of the Secretary-General was consonant with the conclusions of the Study Group. But saying so much is not intended to imply more than that the UN negotiating team, and the two Cypriot negotiating principals, were well aware of the fruits of the work of the Study Group. Common approaches to well recognized problems surprised no one, especially since, by 2002-2003, many of the advances which the Study Group had made were common knowledge and in the domain of public opinion.

President Rauf Denktash of the unrecognized Turkish Republic of North Cyprus refused to agree to the Annan Plan. At the same time, plans were made for the Republic of Cyprus' accession to the European Union, and its entrance into the Union in May 2004. Because of Denktash's rejection of the Annan Plan and the prospective running out of the reunification clock in 2004, the Foundation, assisted by the Kokkalis Program, organized a meeting in September 2003 where Greek and Turkish Cypriots, Greek and Turkish officials, and the principal negotiators from the United Nations, the EU, the U.S., and Britain gathered at the Kennedy School to discuss what could be done to improve the island's future prospects. The results of that meeting are summarized in Robert I. Rotberg, *Cyprus After Annan: Next Steps Toward a Solution*, WPF Report 37 (Cambridge, MA, 2003).

The Foundation and Its Partners

In recent years the Foundation and its associated Program on Intrastate Conflict have jointly sponsored projects and activities with the Carr Center for Human Rights Policy, the Center for Business and Government, the Kokkalis Program on Southeastern and East Central Europe, the International Security Program of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, the Project on Justice in Times of Transition, and the Joan Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics, and Public Policy, all in the Kennedy School of Government, and with the International Crisis Group.

Additional financial support for the work of the Foundation during the 2004–2005 period came from Thomas Barry, the National Intelligence Council, the Open Society Institute, USAID, and the USAID Office of Transition Initiatives, and, at the Kennedy School, Carr Center for Human Rights, the Center for International Development, the Center for Public Leadership, the International Security Program, the Kokkalis Program on Southeastern and East Central Europe, and the Project on Justice in Times of Transition.

The Foundation, its trustees, its officers, and the participants in all of the projects during these recent years are grateful for the generous backing and significant collegial support of its collaborators and the foundations and agencies which helped this Foundation to mount the many initiatives reported here and in earlier such biennial reports. We very much value the intellectual and financial assistance that has been received. We are further pleased to share so many interests and projects with programs and their leaders within the Kennedy School and Harvard University.

The Endowment

Edwin Ginn created both the World Peace Foundation and the Ginn Trust. Returns on the corpus of the Ginn Trust provide nearly two-thirds of the annual income of the Foundation. On December 31, 2005, the Ginn Trust was worth more than \$9 million. The remainder of the Foundation's annual income derives from an endowment of \$8 million, which the Foundation itself invests in order to support its programs. The Foundation also receives program and project support from U.S. and foreign foundations and institutions. It gratefully accepts bequests and other gifts to support the study and further advance of world peace. The financial affairs of the Foundation are audited annually.

Board of Trustees

Philip Khoury, Kenan Sahin Dean of the School of Humanities, Arts, and Sciences at MIT, became Chair in 2004, succeeding Richard H. Ullman, David K. E. Bruce Professor of International Affairs, Emeritus, at the Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University, who chaired the Foundation's Board of Trustees since 1995.

Trustees elected to the board since 1995 include Barbara Bodine, director of the Governance Initiative in the Middle East at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government and former career diplomat and ambassador to Yemen, Catherine Henn, until 2001 Vice-President of Corporate and Legal Affairs for the

Boston Globe; Professor Kenneth Oye, former Director of MIT's Center for International Studies; Thomas O'Reilly, Chief Financial Officer, Sager Electronics; Dean Anne-Marie Slaughter, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University; Dean J. Brian Atwood, Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota, and former Administrator of the Agency for International Development; James M. Shannon, President of the Firemen's Protective Association and former Attorney General of Massachusetts, former Member of the House of Representatives from Massachusetts, and an earlier member of the Board of Trustees of the Foundation; John Shattuck, CEO of the John F. Kennedy Library Foundation, Boston, former U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Labor, and Human Rights and former Ambassador to the Czech Republic; and Paul Van Slambrouck, until 2005 editor of the *Christian Science Monitor*. (For a full list of the distinguished Trustees of the Foundation, from 1910, see the final pages of this report.)

The Office and Staff

Since 1999, the World Peace Foundation has been housed at 124 Mt. Auburn St., Cambridge, MA. In 2001, Elisa Pepe became Program Manager, joining Deborah West, Program Coordinator.

The Foundation's Web Site

Information about the World Peace Foundation can be located at www.worldpeacefoundation.org.

Books of the World Peace Foundation (1963–2005)*

Battling Terrorism in the Horn of Africa. Robert I. Rotberg (ed.), (Washington, DC, The Brookings Institution Press, 2005).

Crafting the New Nigeria: Confronting the Challenges. Robert I. Rotberg (ed.), (Boulder, Lynne Rienner Press, 2004).

When States Fail: Causes and Consequences. Robert I. Rotberg (ed.), (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2004).

State Failure and State Weakness in a Time of Terror. Robert I. Rotberg (ed.), (Washington, DC, The Brookings Institution Press, 2003).

Ending Autocracy, Enabling Democracy: The Tribulations of Southern Africa 1960–2000. Robert I. Rotberg (Washington, DC, The Brookings Institution Press, 2002).

Peacekeeping and Peace Enforcement in Africa: Methods of Conflict Prevention. Robert I. Rotberg, Ericka Albaugh, Happyton Bonyongwe, Christopher Clapham, Jeffrey Herbst, Steven Metz (Washington, DC, The Brookings Institution Press, 2000).

Truth v. Justice: The Morality of Truth Commissions. Robert I. Rotberg and Dennis Thompson (eds.), (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2000).

Creating Peace in Sri Lanka: Civil War and Reconciliation. Robert I. Rotberg (ed.), (Washington, DC, The Brookings Institution Press, 1999).

Burma: Prospects for a Democratic Future. Robert I. Rotberg (ed.), (Washington DC, The Brookings Institution Press, 1998).

War and Peace in Southern Africa: Crime, Drugs, Armies, and Trade. Robert I. Rotberg and Greg Mills (eds.), (Washington DC, The Brookings Institution Press, 1998).

Cascade of Arms: Managing Conventional Arms Proliferation. Andrew Pierre (ed.), (Washington DC, The Brookings Institution Press, 1997).

The United States and Europe After the Cold War: A New Alliance. John W. Holmes (Columbia, University of South Carolina Press, 1997).

Haiti Renewed: Political and Economic Futures. Robert I. Rotberg (ed.), (Washington DC, The Brookings Institution Press, 1997).

Democratic Transitions in Central America. Jorge I. Domínguez (ed.), (Gainesville, University Press of Florida, 1997).

* For a list of all World Peace Foundation publications, see WPF Report 25: *Foundation Report 1999–2000* (Cambridge, MA, World Peace Foundation, 2000), 31–40.

Vigilance and Vengeance: NGOs Preventing Ethnic Conflict in Divided Societies. Robert I. Rotberg (ed.), (Washington DC, The Brookings Institution Press, 1996).

From Massacres to Genocide: The Media, Public Policy, and Humanitarian Crises. Robert I. Rotberg and Thomas G. Weiss (eds.), (Washington DC, The Brookings Institution Press, 1996).

Maelstrom: The United States, Southern Europe, and the Challenges of the Mediterranean. John W. Holmes (ed.), (Washington DC, The Brookings Institution Press, 1995).

Os Estados Unidos da America e a Europa do Sud. John W. Holmes (ed.), (Lisboa, FundaquoLuso-Americana, 1995).

Transiciones Democráticas en Centro América. Jorge I. Domínguez and Marc Lindenberg (eds.), (San José, Costa Rica, CINDE, 1994).

Democracy in the Caribbean: Political, Economic, and Social Perspectives. Jorge I. Domínguez, Robert A. Pastor, and R. DeLisle Worrel (eds.), (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993).

Collective Security in a Changing World. Thomas G. Weiss (ed.), (Boulder, Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1993).

Third World Security in the Post-Cold War Era. Thomas G. Weiss (ed.), (Boulder, Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1993).

Alternative to Intervention: A New US-Latin American Security Relationship. Richard J. Bloomfield and Gregory F. Treverton (eds.), (Boulder, Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1990).

Regional Conflict and U.S. Policy: Angola and Mozambique. Richard J. Bloomfield (ed.), (Boulder, Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1990).

Africa in the 1990s and Beyond: U.S. Policy Opportunities and Choices. Robert I. Rotberg (ed.), (Algonac, MI, Reference Publications, 1988).

Guests Come to Stay: The Effects of European Labor Migration on Sending and Receiving Countries. Rosemarie J. Rogers (ed.), (Boulder, Westview Press, 1985).

Puerto Rico: The Search for a National Policy. Richard J. Bloomfield (ed.), (Boulder, Westview Press, 1985).

Portugal, Os Estados Africanos de Lingua Oficial Portuguesa E Os Estados Unidos Da America. Joaquim Aguiar (Lisbon, Fundaçao Calouste Gulbenkian and Boston, WPF, 1985).

South Africa and its Neighbors. Robert I. Rotberg, Henry Bienen, Robert Legvold, and Gavin Maasdorp (Lexington, Lexington Books, 1985).

Namibia: Political and Economic Prospects. Robert I. Rotberg (ed.), (Lexington, Lexington Books, 1983).

The American People and South Africa. Alfred O. Hero and John Barratt (eds.), (Lexington, Lexington Books, 1981).

Conflict and Compromise in South Africa. Robert I. Rotberg and John Barratt (eds.), (Lexington, Lexington Books, 1980).

Oil, the Arab-Israeli Dispute and the Industrial World: Horizons of Crisis. J.C. Hurewitz (ed.), (Boulder, Westview Press, 1976).

Canada and the United States: Transnational and Transgovernmental Relations. Annette Baker Fox, Alfred O. Hero, and Joseph S. Nye (eds.), (New York, Columbia University Press, 1976).

The United States and International Organization: The Changing Setting. Lawrence Finkelstein (ed.), (Cambridge, MIT Press, 1969).

The United Nations in the Balance. Norman Padelford and Rupert Emerson (eds.), (New York, Frederick A. Praeger, 1965).

Africa and World Order. Norman Padelford and Rupert Emerson (eds.), (Boston, WPF, 1962; New York, Frederick A. Praeger, 1963).

Reports of the World Peace Foundation

41. *The Foundation Report 2004–2005*, Robert I. Rotberg (2005)
40. *Combating Terrorism in Yemen and the Horn of Africa*, Deborah L. West (2005)
39. *The Good Governance Problem: Doing Something about It*, Robert I. Rotberg and Deborah L. West (2004)
38. *The Foundation Report 2002–2003*, Robert I. Rotberg (2004)
37. *Cyprus after Annan: Next Steps Toward a Solution*, Robert I. Rotberg (2003)
36. *Good Governance Rankings: The Art of Measurement*, Marie Besançon (2003)
35. *Governing Nigeria: Continuing Issues after the Elections*, Deborah L. West (2003)
34. *Myth and Narrative in the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*, Deborah L. West (2003)
33. *Africa's Discontent: Coping with Human and Natural Disasters*, Robert I. Rotberg (2003)
32. *Haiti's Turmoil: Politics and Policy Under Aristide and Clinton*, Robert I. Rotberg (2003)
31. *To Rid the Scourge of War: UN Peacekeeping Operations and Today's Crises*, Rachel M. Gisselquist (2002)
30. *Diamonds In Peace and War: Severing the Conflict-Diamond Connection*, Ingrid J. Tamm (2002)
29. *The Foundation Report 2000–2001*, Robert I. Rotberg (2002)
28. *Zimbabwe Before and After the Elections: a Concerned Assessment*, Moeletsi Mbeki, Greg Mills, and Fred Phaswana (Johannesburg, 2001)
27. *The Challenge of Puerto Rico: Resolving Status Issues*, Rachel M. Gisselquist (2000)
- Sudan: Policy Options Amid Civil War: Postscript*, Deborah L. Weinberg West (2000)
26. *Sudan: Policy Options Amid Civil War*, Rachel M. Gisselquist (2000)
25. *The Foundation Report 1999–2000*, Robert I. Rotberg (2000)
24. *Preventing Conflict in Africa: Possibilities of Peace Enforcement*, Robert I. Rotberg and Ericka A. Albaugh (1999)
23. *The Scourge of Small Arms*, Michael Klare and Robert I. Rotberg (1999)
22. *The Foundation Report 1997–1998*, Robert I. Rotberg (1999)

21. *Peacekeeping or Peace Enforcement? Conflict Intervention in Africa*, Dana Francis (1998)
20. *Cyprus 2000: Divided or Federal?*, Robert I. Rotberg and Ericka A. Albaugh (1998)
19. *Mediating Deadly Conflict: Lessons from Afghanistan, Burundi, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Haiti, Israel/Palestine, Liberia, Sierra Leone, & Sri Lanka*, Dana Francis (ed.), (1998)
18. *Sri Lanka's Civil War and Prospects for Post-Conflict Resolution*, Lisa M. Kois, Dana Francis, and Robert I. Rotberg (1998)
17. *Securing Peace in Africa: An Analysis of Peacekeeping and Peace Enforcement Potential*, Jeffrey Herbst (1998)
16. *Truth Commissions: A Comparative Assessment*, Henry J. Steiner (ed.), (1997)
15. *Burma: Prospects for Political and Economic Reconstruction*, David I. Steinberg (1997)
14. *The Foundation Report, 1995–1996*, Robert I. Rotberg (1997)
13. *War and Peace in Southern Africa: Crime, Drugs, Armies, and Trade*, Greg Mills (1996)
12. *The UN Tangle: Policy Formation, Reform, and Reorganization*, Leon Gordenker (1996)
11. *Haiti: Perspectives d'une Reprise Politique et Économique*, Jennifer L. McCoy (trans. Carrol F. Coates), (1995)
10. *Haiti: Prospects for Political and Economic Reconstruction*, Jennifer L. McCoy (1995)
9. *Non-Governmental Organizations, Early Warning, and Preventive Diplomacy*, Emily MacFarquhar, Robert I. Rotberg, and Martha A. Chen (1995)
8. *The Foundation Report 1993–1994*, Robert I. Rotberg (1995)
7. *The Media, Humanitarian Crises, and Policy-Making*, Robert I. Rotberg and Thomas G. Weiss (1995)
6. *Democratic Transitions in Central America and Panama*, Marc Lindenberg (1993)
5. *Collective Security in a Changing World*, Thomas G. Weiss and Laura S.H. Holgate (1992)
4. *The Caribbean Prepares for the Twenty-First Century*, Jorge I. Domínguez, Richard Fletcher, and Robert Pastor (1991).
3. *The United States and Latin American Democracy: Lessons from History*, Abraham Lowenthal (1991)

2. *Third World Security in the Post-Cold War Era*, Thomas G. Weiss and Meryl A. Kessler (1991)
1. *Combating Cocaine in Supplying Countries: Challenges and Strategies*, Gregory F. Treverton (1989)

Trustees of the World Peace Foundation

Sarah L. Arnold	1910–1928
George W. Anderson	1910–1938
Edward Cummings	1910–1916
Richard Dana	1910–1912
Samuel L. Dutton	1910–1919
W. H. P. Faunce	1910–1930
Edwin Ginn	1910–1914
A. Lawrence Lowell	1910–1942
Samuel W. McCall	1910–1928
Edwin D. Mead	1910–1911
George A. Plimpton (second term)	1910–1918 1920–1936
Joseph Swain	1910–1927
Samuel B. Capen	1911–1914
Albert Pillsbury	1911–1925
George H. Blakeslee	1914–1954
Samuel J. Elder	1915–1917
Bliss Perry	1918–1929
Stephen Pierce Duggan	1920–1947
John H. Clarke	1923–1931
Manley O. Hudson	1923–1960
Dwight W. Morrow	1923–1925
Willis J. Abbot	1927–1934
Frank Aydelotte	1927–1956
Jeremiah Smith, Jr.	1927–1931
Isaiah Bowman	1930–1933
Roland W. Boyden	1930–1931
Leonard W. Cronkhite	1930–1958
Harry A. Garfield	1930–1942
Alanson B. Houghton	1930–1932
Newton D. Baker	1932–1938
Chester H. Rowell	1932–1939
Raymond D. Fosdick	1933–1935
James G. McDonald	1933–1935
Harvey H. Bundy	1934–1963
James Phinney Baxter, 3d	1937–1968
Christian A. Herter	1937–1966
Bruce C. Hopper	1937–1969
James Grafton Rogers	1937–1953
Charles Seymour	1939–1945
Henry M. Wriston	1939–1952
John H. Williams	1940–1942
Percy W. Bidwell	1942–1963
John S. Dickey	1942–1952
William K. Jackson	1942–1947
Jacob J. Kaplan	1942–1960
Kenneth C. M. Sills	1942–1954
Payson S. Wild	1942–1950
Alger Hiss	1948–1950

Joseph E. Johnson	1949–1981
Arnold Wolfers	1950–1961
James Terry Duce	1951–1960
Donald McKay	1953–1959
Henry Parkman	1953–1958
Tracy S. Voorhees	1953–1960
Erwin D. Canham	1955–1977
Jerome Preston	1955–1973
Lincoln Gordon	1956–1961
Max F. Millikan	1956–1969
Leland M. Goodrich	1957–1974
Robert R. Bowie	1958–1977
Milton Katz	1958–1995
Dean A. Clark	1960–1962
Jerome B. Wiesner	1960–1967
Caroll L. Wilson	1960–1982
George P. Gardner, Jr.	1960–1969
Calvin H. Plimpton	1961–1978
Paul C. Reardon	1961–1972
Arthur E. Whittemore	1961–1969
Kingman Brewster, Jr.	1962–1966
John H. Morison	1962–1989
Eli Goldston	1965–1974
Edmund A. Gullion	1965–1985
Franklin A. Lindsay	1965–1972
Frank M. Coffin	1967–1972
Louis W. Cabot	1969–1971
Hartford N. Gunn, Jr.	1969–1970
John R. Herbert	1969–1985
George C. Lodge	1969–1991
Suzanne Berger	1972–1982
Michael W. Christian	1972–1987
Joseph S. Nye, Jr.	1972–1977
(second term)	1981–1987
Rosemarie S. Rogers	1972–1998
Stephen Stamas	1972–1982
Robert A. Charpie	1974–1982
Richard N. Cooper	1974–1977
Richard H. Ullman	1974–
John C. Sawhill	1975–1979
Lincoln P. Bloomfield	1977–
Abram J. Chayes	1977–2000
T. Jefferson Coolidge, Jr.	1977–1985
Raymond Vernon	1977–1994
John H. Bush	1979–1982
Theodore L. Eliot, Jr.	1979–1985
Robert I. Rotberg	1980–
Adele S. Simmons	1980–1986
Richard A. Wiley	1982–1994
Earl W. Foell	1985–1999
James M. Shannon	1985–1987
(second term)	1999–
Peter D. Bell	1987–

Donald F. McHenry	1987–1994
Frederick G. P. Thorne	1987–
Brian Urquhart	1987–1989
Judith K. Keenan	1988–2002
Catherine E.C. Henn	1995–
Stephanie Bell-Rose	1996–2001
Kenneth A. Oye	1996–
Thomas O'Reilly	1998–
Anne-Marie Slaughter	1998–
J. Brian Atwood	1999–
Philip S. Khoury	1999–
John Shattuck	2001–
Paul Van Slambrouck	2001–
Barbara Bodine	2005–

