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LETTER FROM THE EDITOR

ISSUE 16, SUMMER 2016

In this issue of Public Diplomacy Magazine, we focus on crisis diplomacy. The global community currently faces many different types of crises. Crises arise in all parts of the world including humanitarian, environmental, governance issues, and beyond. In this issue, we attempt new, diverse approaches to handling crisis situations.

By focusing on three main actors who encounter conflict -- non-governmental organizations, government entities, and cultural actors -- we see varying approaches to mitigating and solving conflicts. Beginning with a look at the OCHA and the Carter Center, we examine how proactive preparation and discussion might minimize negative impacts of crisis situations.

Government organizations then focus on different aspects of crisis diplomacy. As seen with Fernando, Chao, and Hessler-Radelet governments and governmental organizations take a more reactive approach to crises. These pieces demonstrate the important role governments play in creating, assuaging, and solving crises.

Lastly, we see how non-traditional actors harness culture and art to address crises. By using a common language of art, film, music, and food these actors bring awareness to various issues. While employing a different approach these actors expand the arsenal of addressing crises. Throughout this issue we notice a common thread regarding the importance of communication.

It is the goal of this issue to continue to highlight and bring awareness to new tools, approaches, and solutions in public diplomacy. We would like to thank the USC Center on Public Diplomacy, the USC Dornsife School of International Relations, and the USC Master of Public Diplomacy program for their continued support and shared interest in our mission. We would also like to express our deepest gratitude to all of the authors for their contributions; it is with their assistance that we are able to help further the study of and interest in public diplomacy.

Sarah Valeria Salceda
Editor-in-Chief
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HOW CAN HUMANITARIANS AND PEACEBUILDERS ENGAGE MORE EFFECTIVELY IN CRISIS SITUATIONS?

A CASE STUDY OF THE UNITED NATIONS OFFICE FOR THE COORDINATION OF HUMANITARIAN AFFAIRS’ CONFLICT PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM AND EFFORTS TO BETTER COOPERATE WITH LOCAL PARTNERS

CONFLICT ANALYSIS FOR CONFLICT PREPAREDNESS:
AN OCHA CASE STUDY

MASAYO KONDO ROSSIER
INTRODUCTION

This piece highlights the need to understand the operational context of humanitarian work, so that humanitarian action will be “conflict-sensitive.” By analyzing the conflict in different aspects, humanitarian response will be more effective and improve its linkage with peacebuilding and development. It presents the work of the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) to this end. It also serves as a primer on key terms and concepts in the academic study of conflict preparedness and response and risk management.

While preparedness for disasters caused by natural hazards (floods, cyclones, landslides, earthquakes, droughts, etc.) is commonly performed through non-political entry points, the humanitarian community nonetheless needs to be prepared for crises and conflicts. It can learn good practices for responding to conflicts from the work of the peacebuilding and development community. OCHA is engaged in promoting better conflict analysis skills among staff and partners, with a view toward articulating responses to humanitarian crises that are conflict-sensitive, building community resilience, and contributing to peacebuilding processes from a humanitarian perspective. In May 2016, the World Humanitarian Summit committed to work differently, by strengthening alignment across the humanitarian-development nexus.

There is a critical gap between the analysis and implementation and disconnect between conflict analysis and concrete operational steps. Ideas obtained from conflict analysis need to be translated into actionable approaches in the field.

WHAT IS PREPAREDNESS?

Preparedness efforts entail both short-term and long-term perspectives. When crises are imminent, contingency planning is carried out among responders and stakeholders in preparation for any type of crisis. Long before crises unfold, risks should be analyzed and efforts to build resilience made. In addition, responders need to be equipped with the skills to conduct conflict analysis as part of preparedness for conflict.

Preparedness assesses the operational context, stakeholders’ interests and underlying economic and socio-political dynamics, in which humanitarian response takes place. For disasters caused by natural hazards, preparedness is defined as follows: The knowledge and capacities developed by governments, professional response and recovery organizations, communities and individuals to effectively anticipate, respond to, and recover from, the impacts of likely, imminent or current hazard events or conditions.

Preparedness is carried out within the context of crisis risk management in order to build the capacities to manage different emergencies and achieve orderly transitions from response to sustained recovery. It is based on sound risk analysis and good linkages with early warning systems, contingency planning, stockpiling, arrangements for coordination and evacuation, public information, and training and field exercises. These must be supported by institutional, legal, and budgetary capacities, as it takes time and effort to build and develop effective response capacity. In reality, however, most responders prefer to react and respond to crises, instead of enhancing their response capacity through emergency preparedness. But without emergency preparedness, there is no effective response.

For the past several years, the international humanitarian and development communities have been vigorously promoting efforts to build resilience, community resilience, in particular. This resilience agenda helps to improve links between humanitarian and development action and, rather than reacting to imminent crises, it fosters stronger integration of risk management. As shown in Table 1, different risks require different...
approaches to risk reduction, risk transfer, emergency preparedness, and responding to and recovering from crises. This serves as a form of public diplomacy, as these non-state actors must engage with local populations to effectively analyse potential conflicts and solutions.

**CONFLICT ANALYSIS FOR PEACEBUILDERS & HUMANITARIANS**

Conflict analysis has already been well developed and applied in peace-building actions, in contrast to some efforts in humanitarian action. Peace-builders have a longer-term perspective in conducting conflict analysis. According to the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office:

*Conflict analysis can be defined as an assessment of the context, causes, consequences, actors, and dynamics of conflict as well as the sources and actors supporting peace and resilience. Conflict analysis can be undertaken for various reasons: as a tool for quick context assessment of the conflict situation, as a first step towards program development, as preparation for working with parties to a conflict, as a conflict resolution/transformation tool, or as a tool for mainstreaming conflict sensitivity and peacebuilding into broader strategies or activities, including humanitarian action.*

Conflict analysis needs to support conflict-sensitive programming. Conflict sensitivity is “the ability of an organization to 1) understand the context it operates in, 2) understand the interaction between its intervention and that context and 3) act upon this understanding in order to minimize negative impacts and maximize positive impacts on conflict.” Despite the constraints in time during the emergency response phase, humanitarians also need to be conflict-sensitive to “do no harm.” The challenge is how to conduct a “good enough” conflict analysis that can devise conflict-sensitive humanitarian action.

In analyzing so-called fragile states, indicators of conflict risks may include: mounting democratic pressure; massive movements of refugees and IDPs (internally displaced persons); chronic or sustained human flight and brain drain; uneven

---

**Table 1: Risk management options across key policy areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk reduction (preventing hazard/shock, reducing exposure and vulnerability)</th>
<th>Transfer or share risks</th>
<th>Being better prepared</th>
<th>Responding and recovering effectively</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate change risk</td>
<td>Greenhouse gas emissions reduction, poverty reduction</td>
<td>(Re)insurance, community savings and other forms of risk pooling</td>
<td>Monitor salinisation, coral bleaching, seasonal forecasts</td>
<td>Support environmental migration and livelihood transitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster risk</td>
<td>Land use planning, poverty reduction, strong building codes with enforcement</td>
<td>(Re)insurance, community savings and other forms of risk pooling</td>
<td>Early warning, evacuation, first aid training</td>
<td>Cash transfers, rapid shelter provision, risk assessments in reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict risk</td>
<td>Conflict analysis informing policy and programming decisions, consensus building approaches, electoral reform in some contexts</td>
<td>Building wider allegiances and coalitions for peace</td>
<td>Early warning, conflict analysis, training in mediation, development of negotiation strategies, proactive peacekeeping</td>
<td>Peacekeeping, transitional justice/peace building, new governance and decision-making processes, economic opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and financial shocks</td>
<td>Transformative and promotive social protection, land reform, migration, build foreign reserves</td>
<td>Redistributive tax measures, with investment in welfare/benefit for more exposed individuals</td>
<td>Early warning, economic trend analysis, coordination between government departments, macro-economic shock facilities</td>
<td>Cash and other asset transfers, increases in aid, supported investment flows</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ODI. Resilience: A Risk Management Approach
economic development along group lines; poverty, sharp and/or severe economic decline; criminalization and/or de-legitimization of the state; progressive deterioration of public services; suspension of the rule of law and widespread violation of human rights; security apparatus operates as a “state within a state;” and the rise of factionalized elites and external intervention. Humanitarian response needs to take into account not only short-term manifestation of crises but also structural and underlying causes of conflicts.

DESPITE THE CONSTRAINTS IN TIME DURING THE EMERGENCY RESPONSE PHASE, HUMANITARIANS ALSO NEED TO BE CONFLICT-SENSITIVE TO “DO NO HARM.” THE CHALLENGE IS HOW TO CONDUCT A “GOOD ENOUGH” CONFLICT ANALYSIS THAT CAN DEVISE CONFLICT-SENSITIVE HUMANITARIAN ACTION.

ACTION LEARNING INITIATIVE FOR CONFLICT ANALYSIS

OCHA, in collaboration with the UN System Staff College and the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, is currently piloting a project called the “Action Learning Initiative: Conflict Analysis for Humanitarian Action and Peacebuilding” for its staff and partners. It consists of three phases: 1) An on-line course on conflict analysis tools, 2) Face-to-face workshops, and 3) Individual project implementation. The Initiative focuses on strengthening staff knowledge and applied skills in conflict analysis, and on translating conflict analysis into conflict-sensitive humanitarian planning and delivery, thereby promoting the linkage between humanitarian action and peacebuilding. Participants apply acquired conflict analysis skills in their current work to ensure action-oriented learning in each specific context. They are supported in the implementation of their projects through advice and mentorship. This initiative also promotes networking and exchange of good practices and lessons learned.

Conflict analysis tools include: Stages of conflict, Timelines, Conflict mapping, The ABC (Attitude, Behavior, Context) Triangle, The Onion, The Conflict Tree, Force-Field Analysis, Pillars, The Pyramid, etc.

The “Action Learning Initiative” is one way to promote the conceptual and operational linkages between humanitarian action and peacebuilding through effective conflict analysis. It will be more beneficial if humanitarians and peace-builders can be trained together, allowing them to share different perspectives and eventually to plan actions jointly.

WORLD HUMANITARIAN SUMMIT—DIALOGUE BETWEEN HUMANITARIANS & PEACE-BUILDERS

The UN Secretary-General’s initiative for first-ever World Humanitarian Summit in May 2016 focused on five core responsibilities spelled out in his Agenda for Humanity. In preparation for the Summit, Geneva-based humanitarians and peace-builders exchanged views in July 2015. In promoting conflict-sensitive humanitarian responses, conflict analysis is essential. At a minimum, conflict analysis ensures that humanitarian responses will “do no harm,” and good conflict analysis allows responders to capitalize on the peacebuilding opportunities naturally present in the humanitarian response phase. Challenges for good conflict analysis are due to organizational barriers, lack of information-sharing at the field level, and limited staffing capacity and high turnover of humanitarians. There is a critical gap between analysis and implementation, and there is a disconnect between conflict analysis and concrete operational steps. Ideas obtained from conflict analysis need to be translated into actionable approaches in the field. At the World Humanitarian Summit, stakeholders made a commitment in The Peace Promise to conduct context, risk or conflict analysis regularly to ensure common and shared understandings of
the contexts to inform the work (Commitment 2). Furthermore, the early recovery phase can become the connecting element between the humanitarian and peacebuilding phases.

In conclusion, conflict analysis will support humanitarians in integrating conflict-sensitive approaches and peacebuilding concerns in humanitarian action, before entering into the response phase. Conflict analysis needs to be conducted as part of emergency preparedness.

The views expressed here are those of the author, and do not represent an official position of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Contingency planning—A management process that analyzes specific potential events or emerging situations that might threaten society or the environment and establishes arrangements in advance to enable timely, effective and appropriate responses to such events and situations.

Natural hazards—Natural process or phenomenon that may cause loss of life, injury or other health impacts, property damage, loss of livelihoods and services, social and economic disruption, or environmental damage.

Preparedness—The knowledge and capacities developed by governments, professional response and recovery organizations, communities and individuals to effectively anticipate, respond to, and recover from the impacts of likely, imminent or current hazard events or conditions.

Recovery—The restoration, and improvement where appropriate, of facilities, livelihoods and living conditions of disaster-affected communities, including efforts to reduce disaster risk factors.

Resilience—The ability of a system, community or society exposed to hazards to resist, absorb, accommodate to and recover from the effects of a hazard in a timely and efficient manner, including through the preservation and restoration of its essential basic structures and functions.

Response—The provision of emergency services and public assistance during or immediately after a disaster in order to save lives, reduce health impacts, ensure public safety and meet the basic subsistence needs of the people affected.

Risk management—The systematic approach and practice of managing uncertainty to minimize potential harm and loss.

Risk transfer—The process of formally or informally shifting the financial consequences of particular risks from one party to another whereby a household, community, enterprise or state authority will obtain resources from the other party after a disaster occurs, in exchange for ongoing or compensatory social or financial benefits provided to that other party.
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“There is a need to ‘highlight the ways in which humanitarian organizations and foreign actors represent a significant economic and political stake for local actors, often simultaneously empowering certain groups (warlords, organized political groups) and disempowering others (marginal populations, women, indigenous groups).’ In searching for the linkage, it seems that there is a growing gray area where humanitarian action and peacebuilding overlap and converge.” Kondo Rossier, Masayo. Linking Humanitarian Action and Peacebuilding: A Review of Practices and Expert Opinions. 2011. CCDP Working Paper No.7. p. 19.

World Vision International makes use of a tool, Good Enough Context Analysis for Rapid Response (GECARR), under pilot testing. UN Executive Office of the Secretary-General is currently leading an effort to compile a Conflict Analysis Practice Note.

The Fragile States Index, created by the Fund for Peace and published by Foreign Policy, has put countries into perspective by providing an annual snapshot of the vitality and stability (or lack thereof) and ranking them accordingly for the last 10 years. foreignpolicy.com/fragile-states-2014/


“Early Recovery is defined as recovery that begins early in a humanitarian setting. It is a multi-dimensional process, guided by development principles. It aims to generate self-sustaining nationally owned and resilient processes for post-crisis recovery. Early recovery encompasses the restoration of basic services, livelihoods, shelter, governance, security and the rule of law, environment and social dimensions, including the reintegration of displaced populations. It stabilizes human security and addresses underlying risks that contributed to the crisis.” https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/clusters/early-recovery

By including conflict analysis at the preparatory stage or when planning for a contingency, concerns for the peacebuilding agenda can already be included.” Kondo Rossier. 2011. pp. 25–26.
DIALOGUE AS DIPLOMACY
AN INTERVIEW WITH HRAIR BALIAN, DIRECTOR OF THE CARTER CENTER'S CONFLICT RESOLUTION PROGRAM

Justin Chapman
Hrair Balian is the director of the Carter Center’s Conflict Resolution Program. The Carter Center is a nonprofit organization founded by Jimmy and Rosalynn Carter dedicated to fighting disease, hunger, poverty, conflict, and oppression around the world. In Africa, the Carter Center has led a coalition that reduced incidences of Guinea worm disease from 3.5 million cases in 1986 to just 126 today, putting the disease on the path to eradication.

In addition to improving global health, the Carter Center is also dedicated to enhancing freedom and democracy around the world and to preventing and resolving conflicts between cultures. The Center’s Conflict Resolution Program is currently engaged in Africa and the Middle East.

In an interview last year with Public Diplomacy Magazine’s incoming Managing Editor, Justin Chapman, for the Pasadena Weekly, President Carter said he did not think much progress has been made in terms of resolving the Israeli/Palestinian issue or establishing peace in the Middle East.

“I think it’s in a low ebb right now,” Carter told Chapman. “It’s at the worst state that I have known since I’ve been involved in politics, and that’s been a long time. We have fewer influences in both Israel and among the Palestinians than we ever have before. The Netanyahu government has indicated quite clearly that it has no intention of complying with international law or with the policy of the United States. So, at this point, I don’t see hope for progress in the immediate future. But the Carter Center doesn’t give up. We continue to work over there constantly to try to find some way to reopen the possibility of a peace agreement. But unless we have help from the U.S. government and help from the Israeli government, I don’t think we’re going to make any progress. I don’t see any immediate prospect of that being done.”

Chapman interviewed Mr. Balian about the role the Carter Center plays in helping to resolve some of the world’s most challenging conflicts.

**Tell me about some of the conflicts that the Carter Center is currently working to resolve.**

**Hrair Balian:** We’ve been involved for a very long time in the Israeli/Palestinian conflict. We have a long, long history of involvement there in a number of ways, such as election observation for the various Palestinian Authority parliamentary elections for the past fifteen to twenty years.

Then we moved on to Palestinian/Hamas reconciliation; we’ve been working with Hamas for quite a few years now, trying to bring them as close as possible to the Quartet Principles for them to be accepted by the international community, including the U.S. And we worked there on the grassroots level with youth and various other groups. We’ve had an office there for some time now. We’ve had an office in Jerusalem, another one in Ramallah, and a third one in Gaza. That’s the Palestinian scene.

We’ve also been involved in Africa. We have an interesting group of people from Sudan and South Sudan who have been meeting with...
each other for the past three years. There are two centers in each capital which tried to address a number of the outstanding issues which were not dealt with in the comprehensive peace agreement. That’s what we call the Sudan/South Sudan Dialogue. In Sudan we’re working on a project to see if we can help both the opposition and the government to improve the national dialogue. So far very few opposition people and organizations are participating in the national dialogue. We’re trying to expand that and see how we can help by bringing in examples from other national dialogues that have been productive or also that have failed and bring in lessons from those national dialogues to see if the Sudanese can improve their internal dynamics in the country, including the wars in the country.

We have also been involved for more than twenty years now in Liberia. We started with small conflict resolution work at the high level, moved into election observation missions, and in the last eight years we’ve been working at a very grassroots level out in the forests with chiefs and religious leaders at the very local community level to address local disputes before they become larger inter-religious or inter-ethnic or regional wars, as the previous wars were started in Liberia. We try to reconcile customary laws that these traditional chiefs have been working on in terms of conflict resolution, from the family level to property disputes, with the country’s formal statutory laws so that there are no conflicts or as few conflicts between the two sets of laws as possible. It’s quite an innovative and unique program that has been reviewed by quite a few organizations who have given us very high marks for what we’re doing.

During the Ebola crisis, for example, we used this community mobilization network of chiefs and religious leaders to get the message out to the village and hamlet level in the forest of what is and is not the Ebola virus and how it spreads. They were messages developed by health professionals that our community workers were able to spread, and that has been credited as one of the main reasons why Liberia was able to get rid of the Ebola crisis before the other neighboring countries that were afflicted by it. So that’s been used for health reasons, though eventually at the end of the day it’s a conflict issue as well, potentially.

Another large program we have now is on the conflict in Syria. We have no presence in Syria for obvious reasons, but we do visit Damascus, though not other places. We’re working with leaders from the government side, the pro-regime side, the various armed opposition groups, military leaders, and importantly also civil society: women’s groups, etc., trying to bridge communication gaps between these various groups, trying to change the conversation from when Assad will go to what the transition could look like and why everyone would have a stake in this transitional process and how it could all be done. We’re now intensifying our work on this, to look at governance options and constitutional constructs that can support the governance options.

Let’s start with the transitional period of eighteen months according to UN Resolution 2254; we all know it’s going to take longer than eighteen months.

Which conflict is the most challenging?

Syria. Syria. Syria. It’s enormous. It’s so complex and in such a sensitive area with the potential of spreading over everywhere as we’ve seen with ISIS. The final project we’re working on, in terms of conflict resolution work, is looking at ISIS’ recruitment of foreign fighters, their methodology, and analyzing in a very nuanced way their recruitment propaganda, and coming up with concrete, hopefully more effective countermeasures to their recruitment propaganda.

Tell me about the Carter Center’s new Syria Conflict Map and how it contributes to resolving that conflict?

In Syria we’re developing this methodology of documenting the war in essence from the ground, going through open source social media material and supplementing the available
information with on the ground reporting to us through indirect sources, which we call the Conflict Mapping Project. We’re now in discussions to transform it and see how we can use this enormous database that we’ve collected and the methodology that we’ve developed with very sophisticated software to monitor violations of the ceasefire. It is a tool to help us understand the conflict and point out potential problem areas.

What role does the Carter Center play in resolving conflicts that governments cannot?

One of our principles of any conflict resolution anywhere is that we talk with everyone, whether they’re on a terrorist list or not, it does not matter. We do talk with everyone on whichever side of a given conflict. One of our motives is that we can’t solve a conflict if we don’t talk with everyone. Unfortunately we cannot talk with ISIS and the al Qaeda affiliate in Syria because of their choice, not our choice. If we found a reasonable way in which we can talk to them without risking our lives, we would go and talk to them. But they have no interest. None. That’s fine. But that’s one difference is that we can talk with everyone and governments cannot. Another thing we do is we provide these back channel discussion forums in which governments and intergovernmental organizations can test ideas that they cannot advance in a formal discussion setting. There’s too much risk involved in that for the participants. But in our setting they’re able to because it’s less threatening, less formal.

How does the Carter Center work to prevent conflicts before they begin?

We try to do that, for example in the Palestinian case. When we’re working in Gaza we keep warning everyone that unless some measures are taken to alleviate the misery in Gaza, we’re going to see another war and more and more wars after that. We do engage in preventive work. All the work we do in Liberia is actually preventive work, trying to address small conflicts at the local level before they turn into larger nationwide conflicts.

Are there any conflicts where you feel the Carter Center failed or did not live up to the goals that it wanted to accomplish?

No, I mean with this Palestinian reconciliation, we’ve been working at it for quite some time and unfortunately we haven’t been able to move it, which does not mean we should not continue to try different ways. There are very few people who address this issue of reconciliation.

What are a couple of the Carter Center’s proudest success stories in resolving conflicts?

Going back to Liberia where the work we’re doing I think has prevented the conflict from resuming or the country sliding back into civil war. We’re not the only reason, obviously, why they haven’t slid back into the war, but we’ve been a contributing factor to that end. Some of the work we’ve done in Nepal, for example, through our election work that we’ve done, trying to calm things down through our reporting process so that all sides have confidence in the outcome of the elections and then the formation of the government and the drafting of the constitution. President Carter has been there so many times in the last eight years that I’ve been with the Center. I think that could be considered a good example of what an organization such as the Carter Center can accomplish in preventing a country from sliding back into conflict.
SRI LANKA & INDIA: BILATERAL NEGOTIATIONS TO AVOID CONFLICT

Sarala Fernando
OVERVIEW

Negotiations are at the heart of diplomacy and the agreements they create are the main instruments by which countries foster bilateral relations and promote friendship among each other. Since Sri Lanka and India are the two oldest state formations in South Asia, bolstered by common racial, religious, and social linkages, all agree that the bilateral relationship between the two neighbors must be maintained at the strongest and most cordial levels.

In the early days after independence, despite the asymmetries of size and resources, difficult bilateral problems inherited from colonial times such as citizenship for the indentured labor from South India, establishing the international maritime boundary, and the status of Kachchitivu island were all settled by negotiations. These agreements, reached by the Foreign Ministry with the input of concerned ministries and backed by consistent support of the political leaders, are hailed even today as protecting Sri Lanka’s national interests and creating a neighborly relationship. The Foreign and Defense ministries came under the prime minister’s control, enabling close, strategic coordination of national interests to be deployed throughout the protracted negotiation process. Prime Minister Sirimavo Bandaranaike, in particular, was interested in foreign affairs and worked closely with her officials in a relationship of mutual confidence – a stand which positioned Sri Lanka well in historic multilateral negotiations like the Law of the Sea.

So why are things so different now? Why is Prime Minister Wickremasinghe berating Foreign Ministry officials and suggesting that foreign affairs should be handled at the political leaders’ level? The common explanation is that once a separate Foreign Ministry was created in 1978 under the new constitution, it became one among the plethora of ministries competing for a voice in the decision-making process. The Foreign Ministry’s prerogative in foreign negotiations, although laid down in government procedure, was contested. In this atmosphere the path opened for vital negotiations, like the India–Sri Lanka Agreement of 1987, to be finalized in secret outside regular official channels. In hindsight, even in India, there are many who question the thrust and manner in which the 1987 Agreement was concluded. Despite the furor over those secret negotiations, the unfortunate trend had been set for foreign negotiations to be conducted without taking into account the legal opinion and institutional memory residing in the Foreign Ministry.

Finding win-win solutions in an inclusive, transparent manner may require protracted negotiations and delay the current political timetable, but only robust agreements can stand the test of time in public opinion and strengthen the bilateral relationship with India.
action to create a Global Affairs Committee comprising party stalwarts to overlook foreign policy has, not surprisingly, brought criticism from perceptive observers of foreign policy making. Academic research, such as the work of Lloyd Rudolph (who along with his wife Susanne has written extensively on Indian affairs) suggests yet another reason why in recent times political leaders are claiming they are better able to negotiate good agreements than at the official level. Lloyd Rudolph defined several phases or modes in diplomacy, such as normal, crisis, and strategic diplomacy. According to this view, diplomacy is “most likely to be stable and informed when it is at the bilateral level and normal when professionals tend to be in charge and deliberative coordination and discussion among colleagues is given a chance. When crises occur, the action tends to move up…to the presidential level…when members of the president’s coterie…seize control…what matters to them are the president’s political agenda and electoral prospects.”

Crisis diplomacy then is the order of the day.

SRI LANKAN FRIENDS OF INDIA CAN HARDLY BE HAPPY WITH THE CURRENT STATUS OF THE BILATERAL RELATIONSHIP. STRAINS HAVE MULTIPLIED DUE TO THE TWO PROPOSED NEW AGREEMENTS WITH INDIA…[THAT HAVE BEEN CALLED] ‘INDIAN IMPERIALISM.’

Yet, Sri Lankan friends of India can hardly be happy with the current status of the bilateral relationship. Strains have multiplied due to the two proposed new agreements with India: the Economic and Technical Cooperation Agreement (ETCA) and the Indian ambulance service, which have run into unending controversy. Several professional organizations have voiced their concern, joined hands using all the tools of social media, and taken to the streets in public demonstrations. These efforts have had such success that banners have been raised at Colombo University calling for protests against “Indian imperialism.” Such is the level of political polarization that the amiable Indian ambassador recently took the unusual step of publicly rebuking political leaders like former President Rajapaksa and former Foreign Minister Pieris for their role in the opposition protests. Prime Minister Wickremasinghe may have won over the Indian leaders with his statement in parliament of his determination to sign the framework agreement despite all the public challenges. However, this has not helped to soften domestic opposition to the agreements in question. Such defiance will only create more suspicion, stiffen public opposition, and muddy the waters of the bilateral relationship.

The need of the day is to cool down the politics and return to normal diplomacy. As the public’s skepticism of politicians is at its highest, this is the time for experts and business leaders to come forward to salvage this agreement. Public diplomacy approaches call for “listening” to others and “building relationships.” Why not try to engage and explain why the new agreements are needed, over and above what is available under the existing Board of Investment regime? Under ETCA, two sectors are to be initially opened by Sri Lanka, namely IT and ship-building. However, it is puzzling that business groups from these sectors have been reluctant to come forward to support the government on ETCA. It is also not yet known which areas India will, in reciprocity, open to Sri Lanka. Given the negative experience of the India–Sri Lanka Free Trade Agreement (ISLFTA), where Sri Lanka’s exports to India continue to be challenged by non-tariff barriers, it is no surprise that the Sri Lankans will be extra cautious with
regard to the new agreements.

A comprehensive information program should have been launched by the government well ahead of the proposed new agreements to clearly explain their benefits to the public. In this day of WikiLeaks and whistle-blowers, it is no longer possible to negotiate such initiatives under a veil of secrecy. Moreover, popular skepticism is rising over free trade arrangements. Thanks to technological advances in rapid communications, the opposition to such agreements is learning to mobilize with speed, as well as network and communicate more effectively with the public than the government.

IN THIS DAY OF WIKILEAKS AND WHISTLE-BLOWERS, IT IS NO LONGER POSSIBLE TO NEGOTIATE SUCH INITIATIVES UNDER A VEIL OF SECRECY.

The government has taken a positive step in commissioning a study on the bilateral economic relationship by a reputed think tank, which needs to be placed in the public domain. The statements issued by the professional organizations and disseminated through their websites contain several useful suggestions, the incorporation of which will strengthen the new agreements in the long term. Sri Lankan experts, officials, and business leaders must coordinate closely in the drafting process so that solid arguments can be presented to the Indian negotiating side to address, for example, the failures of the ISLFTA as experienced by their exporters. This is where the experience and institutional memory of the traditional negotiators like the Foreign Ministry, the Commerce Department, and the Attorney General’s Department will be most useful, if they are given a chance. There is an established practice of preparing positions well ahead and taking full account of all the objections from the business community. However, if they are to negotiate from a position of strength and not weakness, the Sri Lankan delegation must have the support of the political leaders instead of having the ground cut under their feet. Finding win-win solutions in an inclusive, transparent manner may require protracted negotiations and delay the current political timetable, but only robust agreements can stand the test of time in public opinion and strengthen the bilateral relationship with India.

It should be remembered that the negotiations over indentured labor from India took the best part of 40 years and weathered many changes of government on both sides. However, the Sri Lankan government is a coalition with a limited duration of two years, cobbled together to enable the two-thirds majority required to push through sweeping constitutional reforms. Wide-ranging, open, public consultations are now taking place throughout the island with respect to the new constitution, which aims to change the electoral system and reduce the powers of the current executive presidency in favor of a prime minister who is accountable to parliament. This open process is in curious contrast to the reluctance to engage in public consultation on key foreign affairs negotiations like ETCA. Prime Minister Wickremasinghe will go on an official visit to China this week and it is expected that a free trade agreement will be signed that includes reference to services. So the urgency to conclude ETCA may be a political necessity to restore the balance in the island’s relations with the two Asian giants. It is a gamble that could have negative consequences on the government’s popularity at the next election.
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WHAT IS THE ROLE OF THE PEACE CORPS IN CRISIS SITUATIONS?

PEACE CORPS DIPLOMACY

AN INTERVIEW WITH DIRECTOR CARRIE HESSLER-RADELET

Nastasha Everheart, Erica McNamara, Valeria Salceda, Bret Schafer & Lacey Szczepanik
Carrie Hessler-Radelet began her career in international development as a Peace Corps Volunteer in Western Samoa (1981–83), teaching secondary school with her husband, Steve Radelet. She went on to spend more than two decades working in public health, focusing on HIV/AIDS and maternal and child health.

During her time at the Peace Corps, Hessler-Radelet has led historic reforms to modernize and strengthen the agency to meet the challenges and opportunities of the 21st century. She spearheaded sweeping efforts to revitalize the volunteer recruitment, application, and selection process, resulting in record-breaking application numbers in 2015.

Hessler-Radelet has also been instrumental in forging innovative strategic partnerships, such as Let Girls Learn, a powerful whole-of-government collaboration with First Lady Michelle Obama to expand access to education for adolescent girls around the world, and the Global Health Service Partnership, which sends physicians and nurses to teach in developing countries.

During Hessler-Radelet’s tenure, she has championed the health and safety of Volunteers, leading initiatives to dramatically improve volunteer support and risk reduction, and overseeing the implementation of the 2011 Kate Puzey Peace Corps Volunteer Protection Act. She was also actively involved in establishing the President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) and served as a primary author of PEPFAR’s first strategic plan.

While in Los Angeles, the Public Diplomacy Magazine staff had the opportunity to talk with Hessler-Radelet about the important crisis diplomacy work done by the Peace Corps.

**What is the role of the Peace Corps in implementing U.S. Foreign Policy?**

Carrie Hessler-Radelet: The Peace Corps is an independent agency that is not a part of the State Department or USAID but rather a part of the U.S. government’s portfolio of international options. We have a very unique role because we work at the community level. So our role is not like that of the State Department that implements the U.S. Government’s priorities abroad. The Peace Corps comes into a country at the invitation of the host nation and we work on the priorities that they set forward. These priorities also have to align with U.S. Government priorities as well, which they always do.

We have recently made a greater effort to align our work with the other agencies that do development work. The Peace Corps is very much a part of the U.S. Government’s development initiatives: PEPFAR (the President’s malaria and HIV/AIDS initiative), the global education framework, and Feed the Future (the nation’s food security initiative), all of which the Peace Corps is a part of. We make sure that these initiatives are properly implemented at the community level. That they are sustainable, owned by the community; that they are monitored and evaluated, that there is an understanding of
how to continually get inputs and supplies for these initiatives, and that they are sustained over time. Peace Corps volunteers are the last mile. We are very proud to be a part of these initiatives and we make a big difference.

For example, one of our main focuses in Africa is malaria. It is the leading killer in children and causes years of loss of work at the community level. So, malaria prevention through education is very important. The President’s initiative allowed for distribution of bed nets at the community level. Our volunteers also found that infected people were not actively seeking care. They would accept malaria as a way of life and would not see a doctor and would suffer through malaria bouts. This allowed for continued transmission of malaria, because if a mosquito bites an infected person it then becomes a carrier of the disease.

One of our volunteers said: “We need to be much more proactive about case detection and treatment.” He was a health volunteer from Eastern Senegal and close friends with another community health worker, his neighbor, whose daughter had died of cerebral malaria. She was supposed to be under her bed net but because she was not always under the net she was bitten at either dusk or dawn. The two workers decided to find a solution to proactively detect and treat cases to prevent malaria transmission, particularly to children. Once a week they would go out to every house in the community and would test people if they said they had a symptom of malaria. If they were positive, they were either treated on the spot or, for more serious cases, the volunteer would accompany them to the hospital.

The team’s success intrigued the head of the U.S. Center for Disease Control (CDC). The CDC decided to test the intervention approach with a case control study. One village received proactive intervention and community outreach while another received the same level of services that was previously being offered.

At the end of one rainy season they found that there was a 90% decrease in malaria incidents in the village that received the extra services. This was incredibly promising. But because it was so time intensive, the CDC was not sure the program could be sustained on a larger level or throughout the geographic region. The Peace Corps believed it could be done. So more communities were involved, the original team members from the Eastern Senegal community health team trained health workers from 15 villages, which increased the size to about 100,000 people. The National Malaria Control Program in Senegal provided all the supplies through their normal supply chain and the next rainy season, the results were the same.

This approach was tested over a 6 month period in a geographic region with 1.45 million people using thousands of community health workers trained by 17 Peace Corps volunteers and hundreds of community health workers that were trained by the regional cohorts with an 88% decrease in malaria incidents. The results of this large-scale trial were published in the Journal of Tropical Medicine and International Health. This is just an example
of how we can work at the community level to get buy in for program ideas that can really save lives.

Our volunteers have such credibility because they speak the language, they understand the culture and they are very well integrated into their community. This gives them the credibility to be able to work and to try new things with community support to save lives.

**OUR VOLUNTEERS HAVE SUCH CREDIBILITY BECAUSE THEY SPEAK THE LANGUAGE, THEY UNDERSTAND THE CULTURE AND THEY ARE VERY WELL INTEGRATED INTO THEIR COMMUNITY. THIS GIVES THEM THE CREDIBILITY TO BE ABLE TO WORK AND TO TRY NEW THINGS WITH COMMUNITY SUPPORT TO SAVE LIVES.**

Is the Peace Corps involved in the Syrian refugee crisis?

The Peace Corps is not involved, per se, because we do not have volunteers in Syria. The bottom line factor for volunteer placement is our ability to safely support them. Right now, Syria is not a safe place. The places where we work are not front-line refugee counties. We are not in Greece, we are not in Turkey (though we have been in the past) but we are not at the front line of the refugee crisis because we really work in the development space not the humanitarian relief space. We do have volunteers in some of the countries that are receiving refugees, especially in Eastern Europe such as Macedonia, Kosovo, Moldova, and Albania. There are Peace Corps volunteers there; in some cases Peace Corps volunteers are working with refugee populations in those countries, if they are asked to do so by the host government.

Though there is a huge Syrian refugee population, there are also refugees from other countries. There is a lot of migration regardless, so the Peace Corps tries to create the conditions of peace and prosperity at the community levels so that the people can find jobs and receive education so that they might find peace and prosperity at the community level so they won’t feel compelled to migrate under difficult conditions to another country.

We actively work with young people – 80% of our beneficiaries are young people – to make sure they are able to find gainful employment and education, and a future in their community so they do not feel compelled to migrate.

**THE PEACE CORPS TRIES TO CREATE THE CONDITIONS OF PEACE AND PROSPERITY AT THE COMMUNITY LEVELS SO THAT THE PEOPLE CAN FIND JOBS AND RECEIVE EDUCATION SO THAT THEY MIGHT FIND PEACE AND PROSPERITY AT THE COMMUNITY LEVEL SO THEY WON’T FEEL COMPULSED TO MIGRATE UNDER DIFFICULT CONDITIONS TO ANOTHER COUNTRY.**

Related: there are many Central American refugees in our own county. The Peace Corps works in the places these children are coming from. It is heart breaking to hear testimony from family members who say that they feel that their child’s best shot for survival is handing them over to, essentially, a human trafficker to take them illegally across a national boundary. Because
violence in some of these communities has gotten so high, it seems the only option.

In Central America, we are doing a lot of work to build safe communities. We are also returning volunteers. After people complete their Peace Corps service, many volunteers are drawn to humanitarian relief work so they return to their host countries. We have partnerships with various NGOs, AmeriCorps, and the U.S. Citizen Immigration Service where we take volunteers who have served in Central America and speak Spanish and the local languages, particularly for El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras, because they understand the conditions of the communities from which they are leaving and are able to provide more effective assistance to those refugees.

What lessons did the Peace Corps learn from the Ebola epidemic that may be applied to the current Zika epidemic? What role can the Peace Corps play in educating communities?

Peace Corps volunteers are very good at education because they are at the community level. We did evacuate from Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Guinea during the period of intense Ebola activity. Before that occurred, volunteers were doing a lot of community education and basic work regarding hygiene and hand washing. We have now returned to all of those countries, except for Sierra Leone. We also did a lot of education in Ghana, Togo, Burkina Faso, Mali, and Senegal, which surround the Ebola affected countries.

There was a lot of fear. I am most proud of the staff in the affected countries because when we evacuated, we still had a team of host county nationals and other Americans in those places. When the CDC came in to manage the U.S. response, they did not have a base of operation for those countries and we turned our entire operation over to them. They used our vehicles, our spaces, but most importantly they used our staff. My staffers – who were dealing with their own fears, concerns, and illness within their families – went with the CDC to the hotspots of Ebola to help them in their community outreach.

THE PEACE CORPS ... [HAS] LANGUAGE AND CROSS-CULTURAL FACILITATORS WHO SPEAK ALL OF THE INDIGENOUS LANGUAGES... WENT WITH THE CDC TEAM TO BE COMMUNITY EDUCATORS, TRAINERS, AND CULTURAL AMBASSADORS.

There were several incidents in Guinea in which communities reacted poorly and actually killed health workers because they didn’t understand what was happening. The Peace Corps is very well known in all of those countries, we have long histories there, and we have language and cross-cultural facilitators who speak all of the indigenous languages. They went with the CDC team to be community educators, trainers, and cultural ambassadors. We estimate that in Guinea alone, we were responsible for training 300,000 community educators.

THE VOLUNTEERS ARE OUR EYES AND EARS ON THE GROUND. IN DEVELOPMENT IT IS ESSENTIAL BECAUSE IF YOU DON’T HAVE COMMUNITY BUY IN OR THE BARRIERS ON THE GROUND THE PROGRAMS WILL NOT BE SUCCESSFUL.
In terms of Zika, we have sent out an emailed fact sheet to countries in Central and South America. The volunteers are educating the community. It is the kind of thing that all of the volunteers can do: agriculture, health care, any of them can talk about Zika. We have not had to evacuate because it has not had the same health impact.

**How does the Peace Corps coordinate with other U.S. entities, specifically the military in crisis situations?**

The Peace Corps does not have much interaction with the military. However, we have worked with them on a few occasions. For example, the naval Mercy Ship, that gives medical and dental services internationally when docked. While in Fiji it was in port, the Peace Corps helped to promote the message that Mercy Ship was available but also helped to target the distribution of medical supplies. Volunteers who know the communities and understand the needs of the communities were able to direct them to ensure that supplies were reaching the places most in need.

The volunteers are our eyes and ears on the ground. In development, it is essential because if you don’t have community buy in, the programs will not be successful.

A historian who is documenting U.S. engagement in Afghanistan first told me a story that was later confirmed by others. She interviewed General Karl Eikenberry who was the ambassador, 4 star general. There was a battle in which 15 marines lost their lives trying to reclaim a particular territory. Ambassador Eikenberry went to this village to talk to the chief and reestablish relationship and ensure him of continued U.S. support and to commemorate the loss of life. When he arrived the chief ran out and said “The Americans are here! The Americans are here! Is Rick here? Is Rick with you?” this was being translated. And he asked if there was a Rick with them but no one knew who he was. The translator asked, who is Rick? And the chief responded: “Peace Corps!”

**RICK WHO WAS THERE 25 YEARS BEFORE WAS STILL BELOVED...IT SHOWS THE POWER OF THE PEACE CORPS AND THE POWER OF PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS.**

Turns out Rick was a volunteer who had worked there 25 years before. He had built an irrigation system that was still used and had sustained the village during the conflict with the Taliban. The chief spoke about Rick and how much the loved him and wanted him to return. When they knew the Americans were coming back they hoped Rick was there.

General Eikenberry went back to Kabul thinking of the 15 marines who had given their lives to save the village whose names would never be known, but Rick who was there 25 years before was still beloved. He has since become an incredible advocate for the Peace Corps because it shows the power of the Peace Corps and the power of personal relationships.
OVERVIEW

For nearly 75 years, the Voice of America (VOA) – the United States government’s largest civilian international broadcaster – has operated in crisis environments around the world. VOA was created during World War II to broadcast factual news via shortwave radio to countries under Axis control, and quickly became a trusted source of news about the United States and the world. Today, VOA has expanded beyond its shortwave radio roots to television, Internet, FM radio, and mobile devices in 44 languages to reach a worldwide audience of nearly 190 million people each week, many of them in crisis environments. VOA’s recent involvement in two crisis environments in Africa demonstrates some of the varied and important roles it plays in public diplomacy, as well as the agility with which its journalists and content creators must operate. Through its coverage of Africa’s Ebola epidemic of 2014–2015 and during political turmoil in Burundi in 2015–2016, VOA served U.S. national interests and its Congressionally-mandated mission. This essay details our responses.

EBOLA CRISIS

Voice of America’s response to the 2014–2015 Ebola epidemic is a prime example of the role that targeted media messaging combined with factual information can play in crisis environments. VOA is the only U.S. government broadcaster serving sub-Saharan Africa, and it reaches a weekly audience of 51 million people. African and U.S. officials worried that a prolonged outbreak of the disease could lead to widespread death and related complications such as food shortages and economic instability that could trigger conflict in areas still emerging from decades of civil war.

Because VOA is regarded in the region as a source of objective, unbiased, and comprehensive news and information, we had an advantage in our participation in the battle against Ebola: audiences were already receptive to news from VOA and accustomed to depending on VOA for information they recognized as factual and helpful. We also had resources on the ground, with reporters and broadcast facilities already serving the affected regions.

In Guinea, Liberia, and Sierra Leone, where the epidemic was most felt, radio is the primary means for communication. VOA’s network of FM, shortwave, and medium wave (AM) radio stations operated by VOA’s parent agency, the Broadcasting Board of Governors (BBG), plus independently owned radio stations to which VOA regularly supplies news and information programs, gave us broad coverage in the affected areas.

VOA broadcasts in the languages spoken in the region – not only the dominant languages in the region, English and French, but also indigenous languages spoken in the affected countries, including Hausa and Bambara. This gave us the ability to provide content in languages people were accustomed to hearing. That those resources were already in place helped VOA quickly and effectively get out the word about U.S. and international activities to combat the disease.

The primary audiences for our Ebola outreach were heads of households and community leaders, who could share information and influence their local communities, and those who struggled with
the fear, stigma, and ravages of the virus. Our approach included news stories, public service announcements, and partnerships focused on the disease and how to combat it, explaining America’s support and assistance for those suffering from Ebola.

VOA’s English and French to Africa Services increased Ebola-related programming and created special radio networks for the region with special, daily 10-minute Ebola updates and frequent public service announcements. VOA also used existing web and mobile phone–based assets including WhatsApp and mobile, desktop, and social media platforms used in the region to inform about the disease and bring headlines and updates to people in the affected areas. A special web section with stories and health advice about the epidemic featured facts about the disease delivered by government and health officials including President Barack Obama and Sierra Leone’s first lady. To reach as many people as possible, the site was designed to work well on simple feature phones popular in West Africa.

VOA produced scores of public service announcements about the disease, voiced by artists, singers, athletes, and other well–known personalities in the region. VOA Hausa’s Ebola awareness campaign, “Kana so ka kare kanka daga kamuwa da cutar Ebola?” (Do you want to protect yourself from an Ebola infection?), educated listeners on ways to prevent contracting or spreading the disease and encouraged them to pass along the information to friends and family.

VOA also partnered with Africa United, a consortium made up of the CDC Foundation, international health organizations, and corporations to produce and distribute PSAs and educational multi–media materials to the countries hardest hit.

THE PRIMARY AUDIENCES FOR OUR EBOLA OUTREACH WERE HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS AND COMMUNITY LEADERS, WHO COULD SHARE INFORMATION AND INFLUENCE THEIR LOCAL COMMUNITIES, AND THOSE WHO STRUGGLED WITH THE FEAR, STIGMA, AND RAVAGES OF THE VIRUS.

VOA also entered into a groundbreaking partnership with its main international broadcasting competitor – the BBC World Service – to pool resources and content about the Ebola outbreak, so as many people as possible could receive factual information about the disease. VOA and BBC shared TV, radio, and digital content related to the outbreak, including public service announcements that each had developed, and collaborated on coverage. VOA also worked with the U.S. State Department to bring additional soft power resources to bear. A VOA special project, funded in part by the State Department and produced by VOA’s Central News division for VOA language services and BBG’s networks around the world, used first–person accounts from Sierra Leone, Guinea, and Liberia to expose the anxiety, social upheaval, and distress caused by Ebola and offer hope. The series also explained CDC and U.S. military humanitarian aid efforts and other measures to halt the spread of the virus.

VOA also served as a gathering place for leaders to confront other seldom talked–about issues connected with the epidemic. A special 90–minute Straight Talk Africa television show, airing in English
throughout Africa, featured a doctor who helped discover Ebola, an Ebola survivor, and Sierra Leone’s ambassador to the United States. A live studio audience and viewer participation via social media led to a wide-ranging discussion on the stigma associated with the disease. Other programs to the region allowed audiences to talk directly with doctors and government officials about the disease and international response.

Host Shaka Ssali (left) with officials and Ebola survivors on Straight Talk Africa

Content provided by VOA continues to resonate. An Ebola microsite [ebola.voanews.com] set up by VOA during the crisis still draws traffic – more than 1.5 million visits – stresses the danger of misinformation and provides clear answers to frequently asked questions about the disease.

BURUNDI CRISIS

VOA media assets on the ground in Burundi provided valuable soft power response to violence that erupted in 2015 after President Pierre Nkurunziza announced he would seek a third term. In the protests and attempted coup that followed, the government closed all private radio stations and many were set afire. VOA’s FM radio stations serving Burundi’s capital of Bujumbura, however, were not disrupted. VOA became the only locally-available source of reliable news and information.

In response to the turmoil, VOA’s Central Africa language service was able to expand its programming for the area, increasing programming from seven hours per week to more than 20 hours. VOA extended newscasts and added broadcasts in the Kirundi language, spoken by more than half of the country’s residents, including a radio talk show that allowed citizens to ask questions and discuss issues they could not express on Burundi government media. VOA also expanded shortwave broadcasts to communities outside the reach of our FM signals, and created a social media audio program in Kirundi, Amajwi Y’Urwaruka (Voices of Youth), to reach young people impacted by the crisis.

As refugees fleeing Burundi quickly became an international concern, VOA sent reporters to neighboring Rwanda, Tanzania, and the Democratic Republic of Congo to provide daily coverage of the refugees via FM, short wave radio, television, and digital media. As conditions deteriorated, President Obama spoke to the people of Burundi in a message from the White House that was first broadcast on VOA’s Bujumbura FM stations in English, with simultaneous translations by VOA in Kirundi, French, and Swahili. Within a few hours, video of the President’s remarks received more than 175,000 online views, a significant number in a small country where Internet penetration is low.

VOICE OF AMERICA USED ITS ASSETS ALREADY IN PLACE AND ITS EXISTING, TRUSTED RELATIONSHIP WITH LOCAL AUDIENCES TO FUNCTION AS A “FIRST RESPONDER” AND TO SERVE AS AN EFFECTIVE TOOL OF U.S. PUBLIC DIPLOMACY.

With VOA’s increase in Burundi content, the Nkurunziza government criticized our call-in shows and threatened to shut down our radio stations. Three of our reporters were threatened and forced to flee the country. As the U.S. government...
broadcaster, VOA was helped by other U.S. government entities, including the State Department, which worked with BBG to resist the pressure against VOA’s radio stations.

VOA extended newscasts and added broadcasts in the Kirundi language, spoken by more than half [... including a radio talk show that allowed citizens to ask questions and discuss issues they could not express on Burundi government media.

The expanded coverage, built upon VOA’s assets already in place, has been vital for the region. VOA’s social media presence has grown on Facebook, Twitter, SoundCloud, SMS, and WhatsApp, and the VOA Central Africa Service website reached nearly four million page views in 2015, up nearly 400 percent prior to the crisis.

VOA Correspondent Gabe Joselow in Bujumbura

CONCLUSION

The epidemic of Ebola has subsided. Diplomats now play a larger role in trying to resolve issues in Burundi. In both cases, the Voice of America used its assets already in place and its existing, trusted relationship with local audiences to function as a “first responder” and to serve as an effective tool of U.S. public diplomacy. In these and other crisis environments, VOA uses news and information, public service announcements and educational programming, and programs that allow people in the target regions to express themselves freely in languages they speak at home to function as an example of the role free and honest media can play in civil society.

Kelu Chao is Associate Director for Language Programming of the Voice of America, overseeing the production and distribution of television, radio, Internet, and mobile content in 44 languages. She served as acting VOA Director from June 2015 to April 2016. A native of Taiwan, Chao earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in Journalism from National Chengchi University and Master of Arts degrees in Speech Communication and Instructional Media from Kent State University.
IN AN INCREASINGLY VIOLENT WORLD, WHAT TOOLS ARE THE MOST EFFECTIVE AT ACHIEVING PEACE AT HOME AND ABROAD?

UTILIZING ARTS-BASED PEACE EDUCATION TO EMPOWER CONFLICT RESOLUTION DIALOGUES

TEACHING PEACE
AN INTERVIEW WITH HAWAH KASAT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF ONE COMMON UNITY

Justin Chapman
HawaH Kasat is the executive director of One Common Unity, a non-profit organization he founded in 2000 that utilizes arts-based peace education, summer youth initiatives, and films, festivals, and concerts to inspire personal growth and nurture sustainable, caring communities.

At the heart of the organization’s mission is nonviolent conflict resolution. According to its mission statement, One Common Unity “teaches people how to create media, arts, and music that reflect the stories of those working diligently to create communities which honor and respect one another and understand our inherent equality and interdependence. OCU believes violence is a learned behavior, and therefore, if someone can be taught violence, they can also be taught compassion, cooperation, and the skills necessary to create healthy and mutually beneficial relationships.” The organization has worked with over 14,500 youth and families from around the country.

The Washington Post wrote in 2010 that One Common Unity “started as a violent toy trade-in initiative [and] has grown to include workshops throughout DC schools, featuring music, literature, and filmmaking as a means to promote peaceful communities.”

A graduate of AmeriCorps, HawaH has traveled to thirty five countries in the past fifteen years to facilitate interactive workshops, foster dialogues, perform poetry, teach yoga, and speak with those interested in creating a caring, sustainable, and equitable world. Public Diplomacy Magazine incoming managing editor, Justin Chapman, spoke with HawaH about the impact One Common Unity is having in Washington, DC, across the country, and overseas.

How did One Common Unity come to be?

One Common Unity came into existence through the vision and motivation of a group of artists and educators living in Washington, DC. At the time we were confronting epidemic levels of gun violence in DC, which for a long time was known as the murder capital of the U.S. There were a string of school shootings that took the lives of a number of high school students, all within the short span of a few months. We saw a lot of high school students lose their lives and we wanted to come together to create an alternative vision, an alternative to the violence through art, through music, and through poetry to really change the culture and change the conversation around what we can do to make the world a better place. Our first event was the Alternatives to Violence rally and festival back in the year 2000.

What are some of the ongoing programs that One Common Unity provides?

The Fly By Light Youth Ambassador Program is an innovative youth program that is really working at the intersection of art and emotional literacy, social justice, and nature immersion. It is an after school program that happens in five public high schools in the D.C. metropolitan area.
schools in DC and it emphasizes leadership, compassionate communication, effective conflict resolution, and self-love as pathways to personal growth, health, and wellness. The program culminates with an overnight retreat we do in the summertime with all the youth from the program. They go into a national park for about six days and five nights. We have a really deep, intensive experience with our curriculum. We are also doing teacher training and a lot of work right now in developing more curriculum in more media specifically. We are really trying to capture youth voices and share young people’s opinions on important current events and topics that are happening in the world. Making films and having young people perform and make music has also been really vital to our work. We have a performance troupe which is filled with some of our most talented performing artists and youth, and that performance troupe goes all around to conferences, festivals, events, and they do a lot of performing. One Common Unity’s work is mostly done in DC and a few other spots around the country where we host film screenings. We’ve been doing a lot of teacher training programs for various schools in different parts of the country. We partner with other organizations and help supplement their programming with our programming.

**What work has One Common Unity done internationally in terms of crises and conflict resolution?**

ShantiSalaam was an outreach pilot international program we did in December 2006 and January 2007. We tried to do what we were doing in DC, and replicate that overseas in a war torn area of the world. So ShantiSalaam really became an opportunity to bring together people from different religious backgrounds, particularly Muslims and Hindus, living in neighboring communities in the nations of India and Pakistan, and in Kashmir. We used arts, cultural events, concerts, and workshops in community dialogue to really create an important conversation around healing and reconciliation through the arts. We traveled to fourteen cities over the course of about two months and reached thousands of people through radio, print, and television.
about the need for dialogue and coming together across religious, racial, economic, and national borders. There was about five or six core educators and artists who were on the tour and doing the workshops and the trainings and organizing the concerts, and then there were thousands of people who were reached through the events and programs. Generally speaking, while it’s not in our mission statement, we do peace and conflict resolution work, which is inclusive within social/emotional learning and literacy. Peace and conflict resolution is a very important aspect of that work, and so it’s always at the forefront. Non-violence is at the forefront of our objectives, promoting a more non-violent, peaceful world and that means learning how to resolve conflict non-violently. It’s really important. So most of our programs do tie peace and conflict resolution into them for all of those reasons, because they overlap.

**What new projects is One Common Unity working on?**

We’re definitely looking to take a deeper dive with our youth program. We want to do more retreats every year, and more specialized retreats like a retreat that would happen for youth who identify as LGBTQ, another retreat that may specialize with youth that are overcoming specific domestic violence in their homes. We definitely want to add more and do more retreats. We find them to be a very important time to connect with our youth and have them be really inspired by our work. And then we’re looking to expand into more schools in DC. We have a Yoga and Mindfulness program that was piloted about two years ago and it’s still going strong in a middle school and we want to increase the number of middle
schools to have that Mindfulness program that we have. Over the coming years we want to look at doing some national training and certification programs that would give people around the country the opportunity to work with youth and become fluent and versed and skilled in our pedagogy and our curriculum and our message of youth education. We definitely want to build out a training program for youth workers that want that opportunity. Maybe one day we’ll get out to a few other cities with the actual Fly By Light program itself. We just partnered with a distribution company called the Video Project, and they’re helping us design a national campaign around our film *Fly By Light*, which we’ll be taking around the country. [Film description: “A group of teenagers board a bus for West Virginia, leaving the streets of Washington, DC, to participate in an ambitious peace education program. For the first time in their lives Mark, Asha, Martha, and Corey play in mountain streams, sing under the stars, and confront the entrenched abuse, violence, and neglect cycles of their past. But as they return to DC, each young person faces an unforgiving series of hurdles and roadblocks that challenge their efforts to build a better life. Through breathtaking visuals from street corners to mountaintops, *Fly By Light* is an intimate exploration of the chaotic, confusing, and emotional journey to rewrite a young person’s future.”]

**What kind of impact is One Common Unity making in the community?**

I don’t think I would still be doing this work if I didn’t see it touching lives of young people. We work really deep with the people that we work with, so I definitely see a lot of huge changes take place. I see young people whose lives get put on a whole new trajectory because of our work.

*Learn more about One Common Unity at onecommonunity.org.*
HOW DO POSTERS HELP TO COMMUNICATE UNSEEN STRUGGLES, UNKNOWN HISTORIES, AND BOTH INTERNATIONAL AND DOMESTIC CRISIS?

A LOOK AT THE WORK AND INFLUENCE OF THE CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF POLITICAL GRAPHICS

THE POWER OF THE POSTER

Carol A. Wells
The Center for the Study of Political Graphics (CSPG) is an independent political arts organization with more than 85,000 posters, one of the largest collections in the world. CSPG has become an international and inspirational resource to engage people in today’s struggles for peace and justice. CSPG is a collective accomplishment. It is the creation of countless activists who challenged the powerful to make the world a better place. It is the creation of numerous artists who used their talents in the service of humanity. It is the creation of many people who collected posters that they valued for their messages and aesthetics. Through its achievements and continual research, CSPG engages a form of crisis diplomacy. By disseminating the works and histories of international struggles, CSPG is the legacy of the heroes, the countless women and men, often unknown, who lived and gave their lives so that others could achieve fulfillment. CSPG is their legacy and accomplishment.

CSPG grew from activist roots. The very first exhibition in 1981—years before the idea for CSPG developed—used the power of posters to oppose the disinformation and depredations of the Reagan administration against the Sandinista Revolution in Nicaragua.¹

CSPG IS A COLLECTIVE ACCOMPLISHMENT. IT IS THE CREATION OF COUNTLESS ACTIVISTS WHO CHALLENGED THE POWERFUL TO MAKE THE WORLD A BETTER PLACE.

These posters showed how the Sandinistas promoted literacy, healthcare and women’s rights, and empowered people to work for a better future. This exhibition was co-produced by Professor David Kunzle, his UCLA art history class, and myself. Thirty-five years later, CSPG continues to collaborate with students.

This first exhibition grew into one

Nicaragua Must Survive

Justice Now! Reparations Now!
of CSPG’s unique programs—traveling educational exhibitions that are shown in both traditional gallery spaces and grassroots community centers. The Nicaraguan exhibition circulated throughout the U.S. and Canada by word of mouth for nearly a decade. This was before the Internet and Facebook, and the phone tree was the social networking tool of the time. The posters were new and had an urgent message. At the time, there was no thought of preservation and documentation for future scholarship. In traveling with this exhibition, I collected out-of-date posters, rescuing many from the trash. Each poster commemorated a struggle for peace with justice. But they were not taken seriously as art or as historical documentation. This realization led to the idea for CSPG.

A SINGLE POSTER ON A WALL YELLS ITS MESSAGE. DOZENS OF THEM TOGETHER ARE THE VISUAL EQUIVALENT OF BREAKING THE SOUND BARRIER.

CSPG posters often have a profound effect on viewers. If a single poster can affect someone—and a single poster changed my life—imagine what a room full of posters can do. A single poster on a wall yells its message. Dozens of them together are the visual equivalent of breaking the sound barrier.

A few examples of the impact these posters can have include:

• Until seeing a CSPG exhibition, Japanese exchange students at UCLA did not know that Japanese-Americans had been put in concentration camps.²

• Our very first Getty intern, in 1993, arrived here from Viet Nam when she was five. She was raised by her mother, who was virulently anti-Communist. On her first day working at CSPG, she discovered a 1971 Chilean poster supporting the Vietnamese struggle for liberation.³ Until that moment, she had no idea that there was an international solidarity movement supporting Vietnamese independence. Our posters radically changed her understanding of the world. In return, she taught me that to spell Viet Nam as a single word continued the colonial spelling, that Vietnamese is monosyllabic, and that breaking it into two words reflects their sovereignty.
I met a teenage Salvadoran refugee who, although born and raised in El Salvador until escaping the civil war in the late 1980s, had never heard of Farabundo Martí, the Salvadoran revolutionary from the 1930s. She learned about him from a CSPG poster.

A Guatemalan graduate student came to CSPG to research women in Central America. She had never heard of Rogelia Cruz Martínez, Miss Guatemala of 1958. In 1967, Rogelia was kidnapped, tortured and murdered because she was associated with the Guatemalan Labor Party. Our poster had Rogelia’s picture with the Miss Guatemala banner across her chest, next to a massacred family, but it did not identify her. We learned her name from Norma Chinchilla, Professor of Sociology and Women’s Studies and Latin American studies. This was before Google, when primary research like this depended upon oral history and interviews. Now Rogelia Cruz Martínez’s story is connected with the poster and will not be forgotten.

A high school teacher in Watts used CSPG posters found on our website to teach his 10th grade world history class. They were reading one to two years below grade level because they fell through the many cracks in our educational system. The posters helped him teach about heroes and world leaders who looked like his students—such as Harriet Tubman, Nelson Mandela, Rigoberta Menchú, and Salvador Allende. Role models who are the opposite of how people of color are too often represented in the mass media—as maids or prostitutes, drug dealers or terrorists.

HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS FROM EAST LOS ANGELES VISITED CSPG’S IMMIGRATION EXHIBITION AND WERE IMPRESSED WITH YOLANDA LOPEZ’S ICONIC “WHO’S THE ILLEGAL ALIEN, PILGRIM?” WHEN THEY REMARKED HOW THE POSTER WAS SO CURRENT, I POINTED OUT THE DATE TO THEM.
THE ART WAS DONE IN 1978—BEFORE THEY WERE BORN—SHOWING THAT THE STRUGGLE IS ONGOING.

• In 1994, when proposition 187—which threatened to prohibit the undocumented from access to health care, schools, and other social services—was on California’s ballot, high school students from East Los Angeles visited CSPG’s immigration exhibition. They were impressed with Yolanda Lopez’s iconic Who’s the Illegal Alien, Pilgrim? poster. When they remarked how the poster was so current, I pointed out the date to them. The art was done in 1978, and the poster in 1981—before they were born—showing that the struggle was ongoing.

• Another iconic poster commemorates the My Lai Massacre, when U.S. army troops killed more than 500 unarmed Vietnamese civilians, mainly women and children, in 1967. Kept secret from the U.S. public for more than a year, the photo and poster of the massacre changed U.S. public opinion from supporting to opposing the war. A few years ago, graduate students in design were totally blown away by the poster—not because of the horror of the image, but because they thought the dead babies were digitally inserted into the photo. They asked, “those babies look real, how did they get them in there?” It profoundly frightens me that we now live in a post-Forrest Gump world, where digital manipulation can create images that are so realistic that people can no longer believe their own eyes.

CSPG’s exhibitions address these distortions of historical realities by showing a topic from the perspectives of different times and places.
CSPG’S EXHIBITIONS ADDRESS THESE DISTORTIONS OF HISTORICAL REALITIES BY SHOWING A TOPIC FROM THE PERSPECTIVES OF DIFFERENT TIMES AND PLACES. PERHAPS THE LARGEST CONTRIBUTION CSPG HAS MADE IN REGARDS TO COMMUNICATING CRISIS SITUATIONS IS OUR RECURRENT ANTI-WAR EXHIBITIONS.

Perhaps the largest contribution CSPG has made with regard to communicating crisis situations is our recurrent anti-war exhibitions. These are the most painful because they call our government to account. In 1991, CSPG produced the *Price of Intervention from Korea to the Persian Gulf*. It was the most visited exhibition we had ever had up to that time. It also received the most press, from CNN to the Korea Times. The Los Angeles Times even sent two reporters. It also received a bomb threat. Many viewers said that before seeing this exhibition, they were intimidated by the government and corporate media hype and felt isolated in their opposition to the pending Gulf War. After seeing *The Price of Intervention*, they realized that they were not alone, and that they were in fact part of a growing international anti-war movement. Viewers were both educated and empowered.

**THERE IS A WORLDWIDE POSTER RENAISSANCE GOING ON RIGHT NOW, DUE TO INCREASING RESISTANCE TO OPPRESSION, INCREASING DESPERATION IN THE WORLD, AND THE EASE OF DIGITAL COMMUNICATIONS.**

The exhibition documented the dozens of U.S. military interventions since WWII. This was December 1990. George H.W. Bush said he would start bombing Iraq unless Saddam Hussein withdrew from Kuwait on January 21, 1991—our exhibition opened January 22nd. We had no posters about the coming war in the Gulf, so we worked with a local high school Humanitas class to produce some.

Students were asked to take a position supporting or opposing the war. I taught the students the basics of designing political posters – keep it simple, few colors, and bold text. Thirty of their posters opposed the war and three supported the war. Many were amazing: One depicted two vultures sitting on a branch, one saying to the other “My favorite meal is after a war.” Another said, “War is like suicide—it kills part of yourself.” They ranged from the funny to the profound and we decided...
to use them all. The student work was the only part of the show to be censored—by the principal of their high school. All the publicity the exhibition was receiving made the principal nervous. We wanted to travel the student posters with the rest of the exhibition, to Torrance and then to Italy, but the principal insisted that we get permission from the students’ parents. The principal’s permission request letter contained a threat, and the parents were told that if their child’s work opposed what the U.S. government was doing, it could have a negative impact on their immigration status. The parents were understandably afraid, and we were denied further use of the student work.

All of this speaks to the power of the art we collect and exhibit. If information is power, then CSPG is a powerful resource for the world. There is a worldwide poster renaissance going on right now, due to increasing resistance to oppression, increasing desperation in the world, and the ease of digital communications. But paper posters are still being printed and carried in demonstrations and posted on walls everywhere in the world. Whether they are about human rights abuses in the Middle East, lead in Flint, Michigan’s water supply7, or the shooting in Ferguson, Missouri, artists are often the first responders. Their posters ensure that Trayvon Martin, Michael Brown, and all the others for whom justice was denied will not be forgotten.

Although the specific issues may have changed—dissent continues, and posters document this resistance. CSPG is honoring the activists and artists by preserving their art for current and future generations.

FOTNOTES
1 CSPG 03858
2 CSPG 3084
3 CSPG 27953
4 CSPG 6629
5 CSPG 31865
6 CSPG 3545
7 CSPG 45694

Carol Wells
Founder, Center for the Study of Political Graphics

Carol Wells earned her B.A. in History and M.A. in Art History at UCLA. She taught the history of art and architecture for thirteen years at California State University, Fullerton. Wells has published numerous articles and catalogue essays on political poster art and has produced over 100 political poster exhibitions since 1981.
A RESTAURANT IN PITTSBURGH INTRODUCES ITS CUSTOMERS TO THE CUISINES, CULTURES, AND VIEWPOINTS OF COUNTRIES THAT ARE IN CONFLICT WITH THE UNITED STATES

GASTRO-DIPLOMACY AS A MECHANISM FOR CULTURAL ENGAGEMENT

CONFLICT KITCHEN
AN INTERVIEW WITH DAWN WELESKI AND JON RUBIN

Bret Schafer
Conflict Kitchen is a restaurant that serves cuisine from countries with which the United States is in conflict. Each Conflict Kitchen iteration is augmented by events, performances, publications, and discussions that seek to expand the engagement the public has with the culture, politics, and issues at stake within the focus region. The restaurant rotates identities in relation to current geopolitical events.

Public Diplomacy Magazine’s incoming Editor-in-Chief, Bret Schafer, discussed the gastro-diplomacy venture with the founders, Jon Rubin and Dawn Weleski.

**What is Conflict Kitchen?**

Jon: That has become a more complicated question to answer as the project is now in its sixth year. I think at the tip of the iceberg, we are a restaurant that serves food from countries with which the United States is in conflict. That is the entry point to the project for a lot of the public. We also do programming, outreach, and education initiatives both onsite and offsite that seek to further the knowledge the public has of the people and cultures of the countries we are focusing on. So what started off with food as the primary mechanism to introduce people to people and ideas they might be unfamiliar with has now significantly expanded.

At its core, the goal of the project is to broaden the conversation that we are having in our city, specifically about people who are living in countries that for one reason or another we [the United States] are in conflict with. The benefit of that is simple: a more informed populace makes more informed decisions. Oftentimes, we in the United States tend to conflate the viewpoints of people living in these countries with their governments’ policies. Do all North Koreans share the same philosophy as their government? Do all Americans share the same philosophy as their government? That is often the starting point we will use.

**How did you two team up?**

Dawn: I was a student at Carnegie Mellon University studying art, and Jon came and basically framed what I was doing as a full-genre of art: using public space, using relationships as the medium of the work, things like that. Then, after I graduated from Carnegie Mellon, he brought me on to basically work as his restaurant manager, and then as assistant director of the Waffle Shop, which was a working waffle restaurant that also produced a live talk-show with its customers. It is actually a project that Jon and his students came up with in one of his classes. We realized, when I came on, that the restaurant itself was actually quite a sustainable revenue stream for the art project; and you do not hear of many art projects sustaining themselves. It is usually, “Oh, you need to become a non-profit,” or you are dependent on arts funding in some way and you spend all your time scrambling for that. So at some point we thought, “Look, any person who walks through our door is a participant of the art project, and
an audience member for the art project.” This blurs the lines between the two and makes the customer a financial supporter of the work itself. So, it is sort of voting with your dollars, in a way. That was basically the Waffle Shop, and that went on for four-and-a-half years. In the time we were open we had about 10,000 people on-stage.

So how did that [experience] lead you to this project in gastro-diplomacy?

Dawn: At that time in my practice I was doing some work in Berlin, and I had done some work in Ghana prior to that. I was starting to think more globally as a Pittsburgher. I always wanted to leave to do projects in other countries because I wanted to engage in political discourse as an American in other countries. At some point I just said, “Why am I always trying to leave the place I was born and raised to engage in discussion? Why not try to create a space for myself here?”

Jon: For me, personally, I have been working in publicly-engaged art projects for over 25 years. I am always interested in creating artworks that start from a shared public language because the works exist in the public. It is important to me that the people who are participating, using, or witnessing the works have some of the same contextual understanding that I have. The idea of running a restaurant as the base of an artwork that the public can engage in made really great sense, and specifically in thinking about how food can tell very specific cultural stories. Everyone needs to eat three times a day and if you are intersecting with that need, you are meeting people at a cultural place of understanding. So the mechanism of using a restaurant as a strategy for public artwork is not very different from many of the other things I have done. The subject of this work really came out of discussions Dawn and I were having about what we felt was missing and perhaps needed in our city and our country. And that was a broader discourse around the cultures and viewpoints of people who are often vilified in the American media.

Dawn: And thinking as business people, we thought about what Pittsburgh does not have: Iranian food, Afghan food, Venezuelan food, Cuban food. We need to tap into that market and offer something that is not offered. We realized that we were naming cuisines from countries with which the U.S. government is in conflict with. So that satisfied the two prongs of our artistic practices [politics and food], and also our burgeoning interest in how art can operate within an entrepreneurial model.

Besides serving the cuisine of nations in conflict, what are some of the ways you raise awareness of the broader issues?

Jon: The overall design of the restaurant is the first introduction people have to the nation we are focusing on. We are anomalous in the visual field. You will see our sign is in Farsi currently because we are focusing on Iran, and I think that is the first level of introduction to the public that this is not the usual way of a restaurant in Pittsburgh because there has never been a Persian or Iranian restaurant in the city.
The food – literally just choosing an item from the menu – becomes the starting point of a conversation. Then our staff can fill that space, and they can tell a whole series of stories based on the cuisine and its background. That moment of curiosity or confusion becomes a pretty fertile space for a very natural and organic conversation about Iran and its cuisine.

Then when you buy the food, it comes with a handout that we produce with every version, which has interviews we have done with members of the public of Iran and some of the diaspora that plays out some viewpoints that they have on a whole variety of topics from women’s rights to the government, their thoughts on Israel, culture and film, etc. These interviews are really just entry points that often complicate what you thought was a pretty simple story. We also publish interviews of kids from the country we are focusing on, which is a great portal into culture and, frankly, into politics through the perception of a child. It is very disarming because no one feels like they are necessarily having ideology thrown at them when it is a kid’s perspective.

What are some of the other programs you have designed at the kitchen?

Jon: Right now, we have a sign that just says, “Take a virtual tour of Iran.” We commissioned two Iranian artists to shoot a virtual reality tour moving from the south of Iran to the north of Iran. So people are putting on virtual reality goggles as they wait for their food, and it is this very beautiful tour that takes you to public and private spaces.

Today, we are expecting to have 300-400 people come into the restaurant. There is a lot of space and time where you are waiting in line to order or waiting in line for your food. So we also have a little video screen that shows a video produced by an Iranian guy who went to visit his father in Iran and shot his father moving through these public spaces. It is a really beautiful, poetic piece.

Usually, what we have on a loop are Instagrams: every two weeks, we have a different guest Instagrammer in the country we are focusing on who is documenting
his or her daily life and uploading it to our Instagram account. Some people are focusing on food; others are focusing on political things; and others are focusing on the banal elements or poetic elements of their daily lives.

We also always do a performance art piece called “The Foreigner.” It is a performance work where you can have lunch with someone in Iran through the body of someone here in Pittsburgh. There is a local from Pittsburgh – we work with actors who have a great capacity for empathy – and they wear headphones and they are live connected to someone in Iran. The customer has a little microphone and they sit with this person and they ask questions of what seems like a very familiar and local person. Meanwhile that local person is functioning as a live, human avatar for the person in Iran, so the questions being asked are heard directly by the person in Iran and the person in Iran answers, in English, and the avatar, the local person, repeats the answers to the customer.

This is a nice metaphor for the larger project. We function as a local vessel for foreign voices. We recognize that we are not in Iran, we are not even Iranian. But we are still trying to close this empathy gap that exists because we have a great capacity for differentiation and the othering of people we cannot see or experience. The idea is to collapse distance in that performance.

It’s all exciting. And it is oftentimes not known at first – you know, when people come to our website or see Conflict Kitchen, they’re like, “Oh, it is a restaurant that serves Iranian food.”

Right. This really seems to be a full-sensory experience.

Jon: Yeah. It is a full-on experience. We have done an online “Iranian Cooking Lesson,” it is a live Google hang-out cooking lesson with an executive Chef in Iran. She cooks with participants from all over the world – from Berlin, from Detroit, from Australia – and everyone gets the same ingredient list and shows up to the cooking lesson with their Skype on in their kitchen. Everyone cooks the same Persian dish with the chef leading them through the process. It’s live-streamed so anyone could watch, and now it’s archived on YouTube.

We actually did the first one two years ago with a chef from North Korea who had defected, and she led an international group through a cooking lesson. So it takes advantage of what we have developed, which is very a large online international audience for the project who knows about it but maybe does not have a chance to participate.

In every instance we are always trying to tweak or reinvent the strategies that might already be out there. Lots of people do global education. Lots of people do cooking. Lots of people run a restaurant. I think as artists we are always thinking, “How can we reinvent these forms so that they are relevant and seductive for our public?”

What are the benefits and challenges of doing this project in a town like Pittsburgh rather than a city like New York?

Dawn: Pittsburgh is a city of 270,000. It is basically a very small city surrounded by a lot of woods, and that is the mentality of a typical Pittsburgher. [Pittsburgh] is very much about welcoming people. For me, I think the thing that works about Pittsburgh – why Conflict Kitchen can work in Pittsburgh – is because this is not happening there, this discussion, this more formalized and more upfront discussion, about the diversity of Pittsburgh and challenging it and saying, “Hey, there actually is diversity in Pittsburgh, look at the people who we are collaborating with.”

So it is turning that idea on its head – that Pittsburgh is not diverse – and saying, “Well, what does diversity mean?” Is it quantifiable? Well, not necessarily, so how
do we qualify diversity in an American city? Because Pittsburgh is so small, we are able to do that.

But I think one of the problems with working in Pittsburgh – and this is why I am interested in continuing [Conflict Kitchen] in Pittsburgh – is that, with the rural population, and even within the suburban population, there is a totally different mentality, and we do not do a great job of reaching certain segments of the community.

**What are ways that you can get outside that bubble [of downtown Pittsburgh], and get to the people who may not show up on their own to the Kitchen?**

Dawn: Well, we are collaborating with people in Pittsburgh who have decided to come to – or have had to come to – the United States for whatever reason. We are utilizing the resources and the people who have come to us. So I think the idea is that now, as Conflict Kitchen, we need to reach out to the people who are not coming to our brick-and-mortar. Does that mean that it is through a food truck or our educational outreach program where we are going into schools?

Those are some of the things that we are beginning to do; however, it is still problematic. The students who are engaging with us, their teachers have approved Conflict Kitchen and want to see us come. They might already have an international studies curriculum, or they are willing to talk about Iran. We have worked with different schools that as soon as we did our Palestinian iteration, they were like, “Oh, we cannot do the programming now, but when you go back to Cuba come back and talk to us about Cuba.” So it is very convenient for you to talk about certain countries and not others.

That is the thing, everyone is ready to engage at the level at which they are comfortable; we just try to make sure it is one or two small steps into the uncomfortable. We cannot ask people to go to places that their minds cannot even imagine. The idea, again, is to engender curiosity through making people feel a little uncomfortable, but then satisfy some level of comfort with the food. So I think that it is the balancing act. But I think that is the difficulty with Conflict Kitchen right now, and the only thing that I can think of is to engage with people more directly in our own backyard.

**Generally speaking, what has been the reaction of the local community, as well as the local government, to this project?**

Jon: The local community has been amazing. We have just had such great support, and it is really borne out in the fact that 95% of our annual income comes just from the sale of food. So our customers essentially support the project. We did a survey recently – we had about 800 people respond just by putting it out on social media – about why people come. Just as many people say they come for the mission of the project as they do for the food. We thought it is probably mostly people coming for the food, and then we get some who come for the idea behind the project, but people get what we do. Pittsburgh is a small city; it is somewhere between a city and a big town. We are part of the civic conversation for a lot of people.

Right at the New Year we did an event with the local Islamic Center here, and it was basically a Muslim solidarity potluck as a response to all the negative rhetoric about Muslims in America.

**Was this right after the San Bernardino shooting?**

Jon: It was probably two months after San Bernardino when Trump was mouthing off. Because of all the Palestinian, Iranian, Afghan versions that we have done of our
restaurant, we have been in touch with a lot of members of the Muslim community and worked with the Islamic Center. This was supposed to bring people to the Islamic center who had never been there before. We had over 250 people show up. We asked folks to raise their hands if they had never been to the Islamic center before, and 85% had never been to the Islamic center. These are probably people who are at least somewhat sympathetic to the plight of Muslims in America, but nonetheless still have never been to our local Islamic center. It was a great opportunity to bring together different communities that we have worked with all this time over a cause that is obviously really important.

Has there ever been a time when your choice of a country or cuisine has created any sort of backlash within the community?

Jon: Well, definitely our Palestinian version created a significant backlash from a small segment of the Jewish population in the city. We have a very strong historical and current Jewish community here in Pittsburgh. There are some more conservative elements within that community that really did not want to hear or have a Palestinian perspective in the public discourse. And they took extraordinary measures to try to silence what we were doing.

That brings up a bigger question: How do you raise awareness of a country in conflict with the United States without seeming biased or being accused of being un-American?

Jon: Well, we have definitely been accused of being un-American. Although, we do have a history and culture of self-critique, thankfully, in our country. Here’s the thing: for five years we had focused on North Korea, Cuba, Iran, and never received any sort of backlash. We were never called un-American or called one-sided; we were never called propagandists until we focused on Palestine.

When we focused on Palestine we hit the third-rail of political discourse in America. All of a sudden, we were now one-sided and, according to Fox News, we were anti-Israeli propaganda sponsored by Secretary of State John Kerry because we once received a grant from his wife’s foundation, The Heinz Endowments. The spin that was thrown onto what we were doing – while we essentially did the same thing we had done with every other version of our restaurant – was indicative of what is always just under the surface in American life about the conversation between Israel and Palestine. When people present just a Palestinian perspective, they are all of a sudden anti-American, anti-Israeli, or even anti-Semitic, which I took incredible umbrage at because I am Jewish myself. I am very sensitive to anti-Semitism, and it was a term that was used against us to essentially silence what we were doing.

There is a great difference between a Palestinian being critical of Israeli policy and anti-Semitism. A lot of language and semantics get conflated and weaponized in that debate. It was also something that made it explicit to our public and customers what was just underneath the surface of this conversation. There are a lot of people who do not want a Palestinian perspective to have a place with an Israeli perspective. That was interesting, and I think in the end, going through it, our public realized that coming to the restaurant was a fairly political act and supporting us was supporting our larger focus – not just the focus on Palestinians, but the focus on Iranians, and North Koreans. And that, in the end, has proven to be productive.

Have you felt any of that negativity lingering now that you have moved to a different
country? Is there still a segment of the community now that is opposed to your mission?

Jon: Yeah, there is some of it that has lingered. We lost some of the schools we were lined up to work with. Some of the supporters we had collaborated with pulled out from working with us. Some of the funders pulled out, including the Heinz Endowments, which publicly disowned us because of our focus on Palestine. So there was significant fallout. That said, a couple of those partners have come back to us, and the general public has always been supportive of us. Frankly, never more so than when we focused on Palestine. We were never busier. It sort of drove people to us. The general public is just fundamentally curious about what Palestinian food is like, and what Palestinians think, and meeting Palestinian members within our own community. They are curious about that. They might have some ignorance about Palestine and a Palestinian perspective, but most of the public is quite open and interested.

When you are approaching a new country, is there a conversation about how you want to influence the dialogue? Or, are you specifically trying to be apolitical and removed, and just open up those avenues to encourage conversations between different groups?

Dawn: People are not dumb. If an American is asking you about Iranian culture, that is inherently political. People have preconceived notions about what we are going to think when we ask a question. So what we try to do is start off with – not necessarily ask people’s opinions, but to get them to tell stories about their lives to make it as individual as possible. What it means for me to be American and you to be American are two entirely different things. So how do we talk about Iranian food? We would not ask someone, “What do you think is the best Iranian dish?” We would ask, “What did you eat for breakfast yesterday morning?” So then it is about that human being, not about their nationality. Then, within the interview – maybe fifteen minutes in – we try to get to a space where we can present some typical American questions, or questions Americans would typically ask. You provide them an opportunity to answer a question an average American would ask, if they actually had the courage to do it. We try to provide a space for questions along all lines of the gradient.
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REDEFINING CRISIS DIPLOMACY

Yesenia Vargas
As diplomacy is becoming increasingly practiced under crisis conditions, Constantinou finds it necessary to define crisis diplomacy as more than simply crisis management, but also as making and sustaining crises. Though this might seem contradictory, Constantinou reminds us that different actors stand to gain and lose from changes to the status quo. Thus, it cannot be said that all actors will work to preserve a system in crisis. Within crisis diplomacy itself, there are two trends that correspond to the crisis management versus crisis-making binary: the former features the institutionalization of crisis management mechanisms into governance, and the latter features purposeful attacks on systems to create radical rather than gradual change.

Crisis management works toward a centralized authority for crisis response rather than entrusting it to individual units, which often exacerbates the problem due to self-interest and clashing perspectives. The move towards centralized crisis response is a positive one, assuming that all stakeholders favor a return to the status quo. Constantinou cites natural disaster relief as one such instance – regardless of aid politics, all actors agree to work toward a return to normalcy. But crises do not always happen; more often than not they are created through human action, direct and indirect. Actors may, for instance, create and then highlight crises as a means of gaining recognition, as was the case with many anti-colonial struggles. And yet within crisis-making, crisis management may still take place, as opponents and defenders of a system find common ground and agree that a total or sudden failure of the system would be disastrous.

Gandhi’s anti-colonial movement, for instance, forewent creating a security crisis through war, and instead created crises of conscience and governmental legitimacy through nonviolent resistance to British rule.

Correspondingly, the role of leadership in crisis diplomacy cannot be analyzed apart from the system that it supports or challenges – leaders across different cases may be praised for creating or diffusing crises, or even striking a balance between the two, as was the case with Nelson Mandela’s career.
Additionally, the shift toward network diplomacy means that mobilization efforts and network connectivity matter more than individual leadership. These groups, ranging from Al Qaeda to the Occupy Movement, are asymmetrical both in their crisis-making and resolution, since splinter groups can easily form to sustain or create new crises. Ultimately, it is not only the diversity of crisis diplomacy mechanisms, but also the field’s changing conditions that should matter to contemporary scholars and to the multitude of actors that seek to preserve or disrupt systems.

Though Constantinou raises necessary points in defining the assortment of ways and means within crisis diplomacy, one of the article’s more interesting points is his claim that crisis managers are increasingly challenged by the growth of global networks, which make definitive negotiations difficult. Despite this, he asserts that managers are not likely to disappear any time soon. Crisis management’s pursuit of centralization and the corresponding decentralization within crisis-making groups may strike a dissonant chord, but it is one of many within the body of crisis diplomacy.

FOOTNOTE: