



**The Pearson Global Forum**  
**Part I. The Breakdown of Social Order**  
**Causes of Conflict Panel featuring:**  
**Rick Barton, former U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for Conflict and Stabilization Operations,**  
**Grant T. Harris, CEO, Harris Africa Partners, LLC.,**  
**John McArthur, Senior Fellow, Global Economy and Development, The Brookings Institution,**  
**Paul B. Stares,**  
**General John W. Vessey Senior Fellow for Conflict Prevention,**  
**Moderated by Liz Schrayner, President and CEO of U.S. Global Leadership Coalition**

RAHMUTLLAH HAMRAZ: Hello, my name is Rahmatullah Hamaraz. I am from Afghanistan. I'm also a student in international development and policy at the Harris School of Public Policy. I am also a recipient of the Obama Foundation scholarship, a unique and highly-competitive scholarship opportunity for rising leaders from around the world. Before joining the Harris School of Public Policy I worked as senior monitoring evaluation officer with the ministry of finance for the peace and the reconciliation of Afghanistan. The peace and reconciliation of Afghanistan aims to reintegrate individuals from previously warring combatant groups into society through a series of dialog and development activities.

My role in the peace and reconciliation of Afghanistan was to interface with local communities to conduct inter-group dialog in order to identify the underlying causes of inter-group hostilities within the country which threatened the lives of noncombatants. My work was to assist younger, less-educated and lower income combatants in an effort to convince them that there are alternatives to war and return to civilian life.

My work with this program gave me greater insights into the causes of armed conflicts within the country, which are civil, multi-generational poverty, and a lack of employment and income-generating opportunities. Having this knowledge I developed a social venture project to facilitate peace-building, poverty elevation, and women's economic empowerment. I am going to implement the first piece of this project after completing my studies at the Harris.

Being at the Harris School of Public Policy, one of my goals here is to learn more about peace-building and conflict resolution. The Pearson Global Forum is the right platform where we can learn more about peace-building and conflict resolution. Here we can make contacts with eminent scholars of this field and people from around the world. Here we can get the knowledge to know the causes of armed conflicts on a global level, and we can share our own experiences with each other. Thank you very much.



LIZ SCHRAYER: Thank you, Rahmatullah. We have to get this right for you and with you, so how wonderful. Good morning, everybody. I'm Liz Schrayer. I'm president/CEO of the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition. Congratulations to the Pearson Institute and University of Chicago for what I know is going to be a fabulous day. We have a stellar panel to kick off our first conversation about the causes of conflict, which is a great way to start this conversation. I'm going to introduce our panelists in a moment. Their bios are in your pamphlet, so I'm not going to go into great depth, but just one comment that I think will set the stage for our conversation. A few weeks ago, like many of you, I was at the marking of 9/11, the 17 years of 9/11 at the U.S. Institute of Peace with Nancy Lindborg. It was a moment that was giving an award to the co-chairs of the 9/11 Commission.

Governor Kean, one of the co-chairs, said there were three goals, and two of them we got right, and one we didn't. One was, obviously, to go after those that perpetrated the terrorist attack, and we did that pretty well in Afghanistan. The second was to make sure that we did what we needed to to get our intelligence better coordinated so we wouldn't be attacked. The third we didn't do well enough still 17 years later, and I'm reading from the report, "To stop the next 9/11 attack U.S. needs a new strategy to mitigate the conditions that enable extremism groups to take root, spread and thrive. In other words, to prevent the growth of terrorism." Causes of conflict are not about terrorism, but clearly that is a lot of what we're going to talk about today.

Lucky for us, we have the panel of the gentlemen to my left, your right. Ambassador Rick Barton, now at the Woodrow Wilson School. His last role of an unbelievable career in government was as the U.S. assistant secretary of state for conflict and stabilization of operations. Next to him is Ambassador Grant Harris, now CEO of Harris African Partners. His last role of a long career, also in government, was as the point person in the White House with President Obama overseeing Africa. Next to him is Paul Stares, senior fellow for conflict prevention at the Council of Foreign Relations. Far away, you look so far, John, John MacArthur, wearing two hats as the senior fellow at the Brookings Institute and senior advisor of sustainable development at the UN Foundation. Gentlemen, welcome.

I'm going to try and go through a couple of rounds. We'll see if we have time for questions from the audience, but I'm going to start on really trying to dig into this question of causes of conflict. Rick, I can't think of anyone better than to start with you, given that your entire career in diplomat has been in some of the toughest places in the world. I think from everything I understand, 40 different countries you have worked in, places like Burma, Rwanda, Haiti, Afghanistan, Iraq, the list goes on, my goodness. You have done it all. You set up and founded, were the director at USAD, the office of transition initiatives, and then started this office of conflict and stabilization operations at the State Department. Start us off. There's no one country that is the same, but could you start us off with some common threads you have seen of what creates conflict instability in some of these state conflict zones that you've seen?

RICK BARTON: Great. Well, thank you, and thanks to all of you for being here today. Thanks, Liz. It's always a pleasure to be with you. Your introduction was more generous than the last one I received where somebody said, "And most of the places Rick worked are still very much at war," so you can  
Pearson Global Forum 2018 (Completed 10/10/18)  
Transcript by [Rev.com](http://Rev.com)



# THE PEARSON INSTITUTE

FOR THE STUDY AND RESOLUTION OF GLOBAL CONFLICTS

discount what follows. I really see it as a witch's brew with a mostly male coven that is disrespectful of large parts of its own population. If you start with that kind of complex mix I don't buy that it's economics or that it's-of the place first and foremost. Because many of us come from institutions or we come from official jobs, we're very inclined to relate to our counterparts and if you really do the hard work, and we'll talk about it as we go on, a finding the people and creating the data around the people, you're going to be a much better informed person. Just as a quick rule of thumb. If the United States required that we know one hundred people well in every country that we send soldiers into, we'd probably would have avoided several of the most recent disasters.

LIZ SCHRAYER: I wanna come back to you on that one. But let me ask- you said one thing that I wanna pick up on to ask Grant this question. I spend a lot of time in the political arena and I always come back to it's the economy stupid. And that seems to come up a lot when we talk about causes of conflict. So Grant, I think a lot about your work and there's often these questions about the economy. When there's not economic opportunity, is that a driver or is that the driver especially in places where you've worked? Where there's these huge youth bulges, particularly in Africa, when there are not as many economic opportunities. How much is that driving some of these conflict areas, particularly again, in Africa?

GRANT HARRIS: That's a great question. Thank you for having me. Thank you to the Pearson Institute. Congrats on the inaugural forum. In Africa, in many of the cases that I've seen and maybe to paint the picture as you've said because there is great demographic change underway. And though the continent is 1.2 billion people right now, by 2050, Africa will be one quarter of the world's population.

If you think about that from a conflict lens, about what will it take then to make sure there's the democratic and economic growth that we would want to see? And to Rick's points, I think there is sort of an 'all of the above' needed. But the economics are very important. Because the median age right now is 19 years old, there are a lot of jobs that need to be created. Specifically, according to the IMF, 18 million jobs per year need to be created just to absorb this young population. Just to essentially maintain the static unemployment levels right now. Let alone, to really achieve the economic growth we wanna see. And that is a very tall order.

What recent surveys have shown, particularly in looking at Boko Haram in Nigeria, and somewhat al-Shabaab and elsewhere, is that the economics are a driver towards extremism. One non-profit estimated that for \$600, you could lure someone into an extremist group in West Africa. Others have said, in terms of the survey results, that religious ideology played a role in some cases but that it was really the lack of jobs and economic hopelessness combined with a sense of injustice. And that's governance at its core. And that those factors together, that's the witches' brew I think that I saw most often in looking at Boko Haram and other groups that were really attracting youth at an incredible rate. And we were trying to pinpoint why.



Traditionally, I think we collectively put more emphasis on religious ideology than we should have. We need to think about the economics. We need to think about the justice, the rule of law. We need to think about that entire picture.

LIZ SCHRAYER: Alright Paul, you're gonna make this more complicated because a lot of- you and I talked last week and so much, when we look at causes of conflict, we look country by country. But you said something to me that was really powerful. A lot of these conflict places, Burma, South Sudan, Syria, we could keep making the list, are really proxy wars. These are geopolitical, international issues and we have to look at in multidimensional, three dimensional chess. So, bring in the complexity. Causes of conflict are not just country by country. They're happening at the international level and we have to look at it in that way as well. Paul.

PAUL STARES: Absolutely. Let me also add my thanks to the organizers of this forum. Just a terrific opportunity to come out to Chicago and talk to a lot of really smart people. So yes, Liz, you're right. The 'witches' brew', to use Rick's term, is actually getting even worse and more dangerous. And it's really because of this trend that we've been seeing since the early part of the century, the increasing internationalization of conflict, of civil conflict in particular. By that, I mean the involvement of outside powers directly or indirectly through proxy forces.

In the mid 90's, around 5% of all civil wars were internationalized. Depending on how you count it, they're now about 25%-30% are internationalized. Why is this something to worry about? Firstly, internationalized civil conflicts tend to be the most dangerous, the most vicious kinds. 80% of all combat deaths currently over the last year in civil conflicts were on internationalized conflicts.

Secondly, they last longer. The average duration of a civil conflict used to be around seven, eight years. It's now more like 10, 12 years. So, if you think of Syria that began in what, 2010, 2011, we've still got a few years to go by this calendar.

And thirdly, they're harder to resolve because there's many more players. It's essentially a two level game. There's the local actors and then there's these higher level actors. So, this is making the landscape of conflict analysis and conflict resolution so much harder and frankly, as the largest geopolitical climate worsens, a great power rivalry you hear all the time, this is just gonna make things a lot worse.

LIZ SCHRAYER: So, we're gonna keep talking about causes of conflict. I know the afternoon sessions are gonna look at what do we do as solutions, but I can't have all of you up here and not make sure I ask about solutions. So John, I'm gonna start to move into a little bit of solutions.

You spend a lot of time on the multilateral system, particularly the UN. I just came back. A lot of us were at the UNGA, the UN General Assembly, and conflict in fragile states was a big topic there. The UN secretary general called on the private sector to invest in in this arena. Made it a priority. What do you



# THE PEARSON INSTITUTE

FOR THE STUDY AND RESOLUTION OF GLOBAL CONFLICTS

see, in terms of the UN multilateral development banks, where is the conversation going around the role of the multilateral system when it comes to fragility, when it comes to conflict? What are they doing that's working or not working?

JOHN MCARTHUR: It's a great question, thank you. And just to echo the thanks to our hosts. I think that the UN is going through a period of reform. It's actually a very multilayered answer because some people think multilateralism isn't working right now. But, one of the interesting things is that the UN has just gone through a reform process. One can argue whether it's effective or not but the secretary general came to office with really a single tagline of prevention. The reforms include management reforms, they include merging the political affairs and peacekeeping operations where there was a bit of a false divide many would argue beforehand. The staff that were focused on peacekeeping were divided from those focused on the politics that's being brought together. And crucially, there's a merger of those that are focused on politics and development. The UN development system is reformed and even the way the UN will organize itself in each country is different. The idea is more political freedom.

This will all take effect January 1st. So the answer is, we'll see. There's also a lot of operational cooperation with the world bank. That is, I think, very positive but again, we'll see. And getting to the points that Paul just made, the UN is only as good as it's member states. If the great powers are arguing or can't agree on anything, then we'll have problems. The countries with the top five numbers of violent casualties don't have peacekeeping operations right now because the great powers can't agree. So there's a lot of layers.

The final thing I'd say just to start is there's of course the discussion, what does prevention mean? And I think there's obviously the point on what I call the 'guns and bombs questions' of how to stop those being taken up. But the sustainable development goals are the global agreed, economic, social, environmental objectives and there for all countries. So there's an extreme poverty bit, there's also an inclusive society bit. Crucially, we're seeing more and more of the conflict linked to climate, I would argue. There's arguments about Syria. Roll of drought there. But there's certainly a lot of evidence in Ted Miguel and Solomon Hsiang and so forth around the role of climate in conflict, even globally.

We're seeing, I think, an increase in the need to not just think in the near term but in the longterm around how inclusive society strategies can be promoted, at least, by the UN and are the other multi laterals to take a slightly wider aperture on how we think about prevention.

LIZ SCHRAYER: So let me pick up on your inclusive society and go back, Rick, to you. I brought a copy of your most recent book, maybe your only book. Here's the title, if you haven't seen it. 'Peace Works'. So you're an optimist. 'American's unifying role in a turbulent world.' And I told Rick I actually got through about half of it in my plane ride. It was a little delayed coming in from DC. And if you haven't read it, read it.



I want you to comment on this part of it. The chapters, one of them is called 'Rwanda'. 'Syria'. 'Afghanistan'. And they're these heartbreaking stories of your arrivals, and they're just painful to read. But you end with 'Lessons Learned'. It picks up on John's point. Your 'Lessons Learned' all go back to the beginning. If we only knew 100 people. Local, local, local. Get to know these local voices.

So go back to causes, and now solutions. What is it about getting to know the local communities and the local leaders that you think are the lessons to conflict? To solving conflict.

Well, thank you. I was advantaged early on when I was at AID. AID did not have a deep experience in conflict countries and didn't have much of an ambition to work there either. There were not that many employees who said, 'send me to a terrible place on Earth'.

It was a relatively uncharted area, and I had the advantage of having worked in business in Maine, and in politics. And when I didn't know something, which was most of the time 'cuz I'd been pretty young during those years, I had a very simple model which was to just go out and talk to as many people as I possibly could. I then ran into a guy named Bob Garconi, who's really the premier American field researcher of the last three decades. He's done 55 exhaustive studies on the ground in places where the data stinks and the stories are rumor-filled.

He won't take a job if you don't give him at least three months and you promise for at least the six hour, or however many hour briefing when he gets home. If you're the secretary of state, you have to sit there and listen to him if you have commissioned him to figure out what's going on in one of these places.

He has a very simple rule: talk to enough people in an exhaustive way that is completely replicable. Data that is not replicable is not good data by rule. He will go out there and people will doubt his conclusion that after the Rwanda genocide, there were tens of thousands of killings by the people, by the Tutsis, when they won the war. That is not a conclusion that the Tutsis wanted to have publicized to the world. It was a report that was buried in the UN. My boss, Saddaco got this closet basically for years. It's now on the Internet.

His methodology was so exhaustive and it was, again, completely grounded in talking to the people. The people are always there. And when I say, 'no 100 people,' it doesn't mean no 15 at the ministry of finance. That counts, but not really as deeply as if you've really gone to 25 different places. I don't know if that quite answers your question.

It's a local compact of making sure they're involved?

The first cardinal sin of most of us is that we think we know the place much better than we do. And it's obviously that we don't. Take the Israelis in the Gaza Strip. Every conceivable advantage, real estate the



# THE PEARSON INSTITUTE

FOR THE STUDY AND RESOLUTION OF GLOBAL CONFLICTS

size of this room, they run the place and they have the most sophisticated intelligence in the world. They go into the place and what happens? Surprise after surprise.

Put yourself, put the Americans in Afghanistan. 17 years later, many people now in their third and fourth tours, some of them going back to the same places, but they don't have the knowledge to lead to an immodest conclusion. Modesty, humility, but the rigor of really listening to people because you'll always find out how dispossessed they are, how disrespected they are, and what their most simple ambitions are because they do have those. Otherwise they would have run or died by this point.

LIZ SCHRAYER: So, I'm a stick with my book theme but I didn't bring a copy Paul, so I'm sorry. You wrote one which I think plays on some similar themes of preventative partnerships and a tool of how America can avoid war. Who are these partners, and is it similar to what Rick's talking about which is causes of conflict because we're not engaging with people?

PAUL STARES: Rick was smarter than I, I should've slipped you a copy of my book for the plane ride too.

LIZ SCHRAYER: Both of them!

PAUL STARES: The logical implication of everything we're talking about here is we have to go upstream to deal with these sources of conflict. We can't let them deteriorate and face all these other challenges. But what is going upstream to do to early conflict prevention, risk reduction, there's all kinds of terms. What does that actually entail? It's amazing, all the times we've invoked this need, we've never developed a real kind of preventive doctrine or a systematic, rigorous policy framework for doing this. And there are many things involved in preventive action and there are many partners that one can involve from the multilateral, bilateral, alliance relationships, regional organizations, right down to local NGOs and churches and foundations. It's a huge number here that can be mobilized and leveraged. They all bring something to the table. But you have to have this overarching conception of what you're trying to do. Unless you really have that, you're just throwing, you know, spaghetti at the wall and hoping it sticks. So you really have to think about it and I tried to do this in my book. To actually provide a comprehensive framework where everyone can say, 'oh yeah, this is where I fit in here'.

It's upstream, risk reduction, it's dealing with fragile states before they start to deteriorate. There's more; being able to identify when countries on the cusp of slipping into conflict, and there's a whole menu of measures that one can take then. And then dealing it when things start to unravel. Each stage, you can look at it like a multilevel campaign. There are interventions that you can do but no one really has a clear idea of what's available. So when we get round the table and Grant knows this from being at the top table in US government, choices tend to devolve to binary choices of either doing a lot or nothing. And a lot seems very intimidating, so we end up doing nothing. The problem gets worse. And this is what we've seen so many places.



# THE PEARSON INSTITUTE

FOR THE STUDY AND RESOLUTION OF GLOBAL CONFLICTS

LIZ SCHRAYER: So I wanna open up to a few minutes of questions but let me ask one more to Grant and to John, and it picks up on doing something or nothing. So it's a similar question to both of you.

In the last year, we've seen on the US side but it's also happening around the world. I'm gonna ask Grant the US side and John the around the world question. We've seen some pretty dramatic proposals to cut what we're doing in terms of our international development and diplomacy program. So in the US, we saw proposals of the US government to cut literally 30% of our development and diplomacy programs. Now, Congress said, 'no, we're not gonna do that'. But it could've had some real impact on our health programs or education programs, or economic development programs, our stabilization programs. And so, Grant, my question to you is, these poverty reduction programs, do they make a difference? Would that have made a difference?

And John, we're seeing some of the donor countries having battles internally that have been the leaders in the world. We're seeing the battle going on in the UK, in Canada, and Denmark. What are the ramifications that, as we even learn what's working to respond, we're seeing real international conversations about pulling back?

So Grant, and then John, and then I am gonna open it up for a few questions we can have time to take.

GRANT HARRIS: Sure, and another big question that's hard to digest in this amount of time.

LIZ SCHRAYER: I know [crosstalk 00:53:39].

GRANT HARRIS: It won't surprise you or anyone in the audience to give my personal view that we're trenching and pulling back this type of outreach and assistance would be wrong headed. And fortunately, Congress did step in. But I think the rationale is pretty clear. We're talking about America's role in the world, to be clear of course. But we're also in a public policy environment and we need to think about what then is driving our desire to reduce conflict. It's for stability, it's for our own stability, it's for our own national interest as well. There's a humanitarian side to a lot of our work. There are other rationales as well.

But even for those with a very narrow lens worried about only counter-terrorism, or only what they would consider a very discrete set of national interests, that still make sense through that lens because when you don't have job creation or economic growth, when you don't have health, when you don't have governance, when you don't have rule of law, that fosters instability. And I mentioned, of course, when you've got large populations of disaffected youth, that can be a highly volatile mix. But it feeds into regional conflicts, it feeds in to then proxy wars, it feeds into the whole panoramic display of threats.





I think at its core, we need to think about how we see ourselves as a country, we need to think about our role, our values, and our principles. Even as we're making the case to, I think what is a very wrong-headed approach of just this limited set of issues, there again, we need to be engaged. We need to be pursuing these types of programs. We need to have these relationships because if we don't, there are other players in the world that certainly will, whether it's China or any other country that is engaging, for instance, African states. They are not engaging with the same interests about transparency, or environmental considerations for their investments, or the social considerations of their debt, or anything that they're doing or who they're selling arms to, whether it's a Sudanese government and they're ending up in Darfur and the like.

We need to be thinking about our foreign policy holistically and a big piece of that is what we're doing with respect to health, what we're doing with respect to assistance, what we're doing with respect to promoting American investment and helping US companies work and operate and be successful abroad.

LIZ SCRHRAYER: Great, great. John?

JOHN MCARTHUR: Well, I'm Canadian, so I'm glad you mentioned, thank you. I think that a lot of it comes down to two schools of thought that need to merge their thinking. One is the school of global affairs, which is the classic kind of foreign policy community. Which is a lot of the military defense stuff. And there's the school of thought which is around quality of life. Promoting wellbeing around the world.

One of the things we've seen is that people, and many military leaders even will make the case these days, if you don't deal with the quality of life issues and the inclusive society issues, you're gonna have to deploy a lot more troops. We spend of course vastly more resources on the troop side of life. But the bigger issue, I think, is we're not terribly rational about the strategies.

Even in Canada, where I follow closely, many people don't realize the Harper Conservative government was investing more than the Trudeau government on these issues. The Trudeau government actually made a big boost in its investment in defense spending last year. The same increment would have got the country to 0.7% in our national standard if it was on the development side. There's a logic of that being the highest return on investment, which might or might not be the case. But I think if one were to say, 'what's the value of each dollar?', one could think differently.

The other thing I'd say quickly is this notion of societal scorecards is increasingly how I'm looking at sustainable development goals. In a way I never expected to because there's one side of it which is how's your society doing on an absolute basis. But I use the analogy of if you're driving in a car on a road trip, moment to moment, you care about how fast you're going compared to the car next to you. Not necessarily how many minutes you are from your destination. And what we can see in many of these issues, including the health ones, is even the most fragile states are making progress.



# THE PEARSON INSTITUTE

FOR THE STUDY AND RESOLUTION OF GLOBAL CONFLICTS

Child mortality has come down 2-3% a year in even the most fragile states right now. This is extraordinary success. But what we also see is the problems of extreme poverty are certainly becoming concentrated around the Sahel in Nigeria in particular. We have issues of child mortality, maternal mortality, Nigeria's again the number one country in the world for those issues. If we don't have an answer to those issues, we're not gonna have an answer to the security issues. And this is where I think a place like this forum in University of Chicago and the Pearson Institute can help to reframe what's the debate we need to have.

I would argue that we need to be thinking much more about even the basic livelihoods of irrigation. So, one of the great investments for mitigating farm risk and strains between pastoralist and agriculturists and so forth is small scale irrigation. We don't have any, in my experience, serious conversation about that. I've seen multiple instances in the Sahel where the first time water gets discussed is when it's for water for the troops. It's a caricature, but I think it's a deeper problem we need to be thinking through.

LIZ SCHRAYER: Terrific. Alright, we're gonna take three questions and gentlemen, you can pick and choose how you want to respond. Are we bringing microphones to people? Yes. Okay so raise your hand. Not speeches. If you can ask quick questions, introduce yourself, and we'll get some help out there.

Who's first? Question right here. Please.

ELLIE: Hi, I'm Ellie. I'm a student formally with the Locus Coalition FHI360 Crisis Response Team. Considering that we have a new development finance corporation here in the US as of this week because of the Build Act, how might we structure that new agency in order to support conflict prevention and local ownership?

LIZ SCHRAYER: Terrific, great question. The Build Act, we're gonna have a new OPEC. A new development finance to try to keep up with the rest of the world.

We have a question over here. I'm sorry, you have to run over here. Thanks Ali.

SHARON REGEL: Hi...

LIZ SCHRAYER: If you talk, it'll start to come on.

SHARON REGEL: Okay. Thanks. I'm Sharon Regel, I'm with the United Nations Special Representatives Office for Children in Armed Conflict. A lot of these things that we've heard this morning have really resonated with what we're seeing and hearing. I wanted to pick up on a comment that one of the colleagues made on the stage about the pathways in and out for some of these children into violent extremism because we're talking about conflict, but we're also talking new type of conflict. We're talking



# THE PEARSON INSTITUTE

FOR THE STUDY AND RESOLUTION OF GLOBAL CONFLICTS

about protracted conflicts, we're talking about international, as was mentioned, but we're also talking about ones that have violent extremist elements to it as well which has a very, very political undertone.

Anyways, I wanted to just draw attention, this is a university setting. I was part of a UN university study. It was a document produced called 'Cradled with Conflict'. It's fantastic information for those of you interested on pathways in and out for some of these children and how ideology is not the primary driver. Sometimes economics, but that's low down on the list as well. It's social relations they join for pro-social reasons. This is I'm talking children versus adults. But it's also very interesting information I draw your attention to. It also implicates the adults as well.

LIZ SCHRAYER: Thank you.

SHARON REGEL: So I wouldn't mind hearing more from any of the panelists on some of the violent extremist issues.

LIZ SCHRAYER: Thank you. Let's take one more. Please.

JULIANA DANKUR: Good morning, thank you. My name is Juliana Dankur. I'm a Masters student in Harris school of public policy and I'm from Colombia and my question is related with income generation opportunities for ex-combatants.

One of the biggest problems that we have right now is to involve different stakeholders within our peace process, especially the private sector. My question is what will you recommend to involve not only international corporation revenue agencies, but also with a built in finance approach to our peace process? Especially the ongoing one with the former [inaudible 01:02:22] members.

LIZ SCHRAYER: Terrific. Great, great different questions. Also Grant, I know you want to talk about the private sector as well. Do you wanna talk about the question from over here?

RICK BARTON: I've always been a fan of how important culture is and the social environment. There are people who say American institutions that culture eats strategy for lunch or whatever it happens to be. I'm very drawn to ways of reaching people directly through trying to avoid as many filters as possible and spend a lot of time really going back to the experiences in the Bosnian war on using media. Media is one way that you can bypass a whole lot of filters of managers of it.

My last experience in Nigeria in particular, we realized in a highly complex society of 165 million people where you only had five or ten million dollars and you want to address a national narrative that violence pays kind of problem, what can you do? It turns out that Nigeria has every form of media that exists anywhere in the world. Nigeria's Got Talent, Nigeria's got Survivor, Nigeria's got every one of these things. We partner with Nollywood there, which is the largest film industry in Africa and actually reaches



all the way to Pakistan. We partnered with the Steven Spielberg of Nollywood who is superstar director Jeta Amata, and that's what everybody calls him. He doesn't get introduced as 'Jeta Amata', it's always 'superstar director'.

He was a phenomenal contact and connection to the younger people in that country. Again, a very young country. When you end up doing something of real quality, you suddenly are able to reach as close to 160 million people as anybody in the country has in a country that's had social protest movements and everything else going on. The socialization issues that you mentioned to me are terribly important, but you have to get around the usual blockages.

LIZ SCHRAYER: Paul, do you wanna pick up on the question?

PAUL STARES: I'm not sure I'm the best qualified to talk about it but it's clear there are places, many places, like Colombia that are going through a period of transition. They're coming out of conflict or going in and unless we think about how to engage the communities, find jobs for people, re-integrate fighters back into society, deal with trauma, and this is done in a sustained fashion, then we're just setting it up for repeat process. I think this audience knows how vulnerable these kinds of societies are to regressing back into violent conflict having experienced it.

We've got to do a lot more work in thinking how we can manage this problem with societies that have limited resources and where there's donor fatigue and all this and other places that require a lot more effort and where it's easy just to turn your back on these places because they're coming out of conflict. It's like, 'well, done and dusted, we move onto the next one'.

I'm not sure I have an easy-

LIZ SCHRAYER: We don't have a lot of saying power. Grant, private sector. Where do they fit in and both of you may wanna talk about that we now have more capacity on development finance and what does that mean for the US?

GRANT HARRIS: I think the private sector has to be a crucial part. We talked a little bit about the causes of radicalization. It's complex, it varies, it depends. I do think jobs and economics are a piece of that. Governance and other issues as well, very much so.

But to the development finance and the role of private sector and how we can support it, that is key. By way of background, many people are probably aware that Congress just passed the Build Act is the question or reference, this is going to double the size of the overseas private investment corporation and incorporate a piece of the US Agency for International Development. Long story short, it'll be about 60 billion dollars of capacity in a new development finance institution. This is fantastic, it's great, it's long overdue. It's also necessary, but not sufficient.



What the United States and other countries should be doing all the more so is commercial advocacy, more political risk insurance, more financing options, and really amp up the amount of support so that investment climates are more attractive from the private sector side in terms of supporting companies for making the investment. And then, from the governance side, I think that the private sector is a way to get at this conversation because each government wants to attract more investment, but then when you start talking about a government, what will it take to do that? You need an investment climate, what does that take? It takes sanctity of contract, rule of law, all of these same things that go to the heart of governance and that would also be solutions to many of these issues.

So it's a two-sided coin, and I think we just can't talk about the private sector enough in making sure we're really attracting them.

LIZ SCHRAYER: Without security, they're not going.

GRANT HARRIS: That's right.

LIZ SCHRAYER: John, do you wanna add anything to this part of the conversation?

JOHN MCARTHUR: Yeah, just two quick things. One is on the private sector. When I talk about irrigation, just to be clear, that's agriculture, which, in the low income places, is the private sector. Again, we need to reconcile in our minds. I would also say in the deeper economics jargon of capital widening versus capital deepening, when you have these big demographic bulges, there's no capital deepening. One of the big, big things we're also not paying attention to if you could ask me for a magic wand, would be massive investments in girls secondary education. This is the apple pie of the global system, we're just not doing it. There's a lot of deep reasons why that would be transformational.

The other thing I just quickly say on the society bit. We just published a paper looking at trajectories on a bunch of people-focused issues around the world. In rough, rough math, there's people in the room who know much more than me, but in rough math, there are about four times as many violent homicides per year as there are conflict affected casualties. About 400,000 versus 100,000. There is a sustainable development goal for homicides. One of the things we looked at was if you were to see who's on track to cut it in half, who's not, two thirds of the world's lives at stake are in just five countries. And this is Brazil, Mexico, Pakistan, Venezuela, and India. It's about a million and a half lives. What does that mean for the fragility of those societies? I think we have to be thinking much more systematically about the longer term sources of fragility and what conflict means and where it might erupt even on a pure social contract basis.

LIZ SCHRAYER: Alright, this is the closing lightning round. Here's the question I wanna ask each of you, you get about 30, 40 seconds to answer.



# THE PEARSON INSTITUTE

FOR THE STUDY AND RESOLUTION OF GLOBAL CONFLICTS

One of the things that I think about the Pearson Global Forum, is I know they don't want this just to be a lot of talking heads, but to make a difference. If I were to ask us all to think about, not just coming back a year from now, but if we came back five years from now and said, 'you know what? That panel we got to join on, it made a difference.' And one of the ways it's gonna make a difference is if we give back to the academic...One of the ways it's gonna make a difference is if we give back to the academics, the researchers that are here and say, "Here's your big bet. Here's where you can invest in. Here's the research when it comes to causes of conflict that there's still a hole." Or, "I know what we should be investing in, and here's the one to invest in. Where would you make your big bet? Where would you say this is the cause of conflict to invest in?" Because we've talked about a lot of different ones. John, where's your big bet?

JOHN MCARTHUR: Well, I just said my two I guess. It's a agricultural credit for irrigation in particular, and the girls secondary education.

LIZ SCHRAYER: Okay. Paul, where's yours?

PAUL STARES: Mine would be, how can we get to \$5,000 per capita GDP? Because beyond that threshold, there's almost no country that goes into violent civil conflict. And when we're now confronted with alternative economic models of growth, the Chinese model, how can we promote countries to get to above that threshold without necessarily compromising on our democratic and human rights principles?

LIZ SCHRAYER: Okay. Master's and Ph.D students, there's your next one. All right, Grant?

GRANT HARRIS: I feel like a broken record, but I do think jobs and economic growth is key, and I think teeing off of Paul's point, infrastructure and just the basic investments that are necessary and the private sector support that it will take. In Africa, there's a \$50 billion a year gap in the spending that is needed to promote an increase infrastructure, and we're talking about access to power, we're talking about roads, we're talking about the backbone of what could be significant economic growth. And that is going to take private sector investment. It won't be public sector spending that does it, and I would just encourage those in the room who are students to be thinking about private sector experience and to be thinking how capital moves, and what investment climates look like so that we can be ... having this is a key part of the conversation.

I found in government that there was not enough knowledge and information and comfort with those issues, and I think that that will limit us over time.

LIZ SCHRAYER: Fantastic. Rick?



RICK BARTON: So, I would encourage direct, iterative field research. So, people who actually get out and create the data, don't count on the [rural 01:12:14] bank, don't count on these other institutions. That data is flawed, and it's not gonna lead to good conclusions. And then the second thing I would say is that really put an emphasis on what I consider "silence the majorities", that in almost every country if you start really looking at what's happening to women, to young people, even the business community, they're silenced for different reasons, but they all have probably more constructive views of the future than many of the leaders that we end up developing key relationships with.

LIZ SCHRAYER: Ladies and gentlemen, please join me in thanking these gentlemen for what they've done and what they [deserve 01:13:00].