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The World Peace Foundation (WPF) is an operating foundation affiliated solely with The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University. It provides financial support only for projects that the Foundation has initiated itself.

WPF aims to provide intellectual leadership for peace. Our view is that the world needs a debate about world peace, drawing rigorously on evidence and theory. The World Peace Foundation was established by Edwin Ginn, a Boston-based publisher of educational texts and an advocate for international peace. Created initially as the International School of Peace on July 12, 1910, the WPF was tasked with educating a global audience about the ills of war and promoting international peace.
Eighty-five years ago, the Harvard microbiologist Hans Zinsser wrote what he called a ‘biography’ of the disease typhus from the viewpoint of its non-human hosts. In his book, *Rats, Lice and History*, he argued that the rat, the louse, and the typhus bacillus had done more to determine the course of human history than any statesman, general or revolutionary. Typhus is the paradigmatic ‘war fever’ and Zinsser demonstrated how typhus and other ‘camp epidemics have often determined victory or defeat before the generals know.’ He wrote:

We might expostulate in the minor causes of war in a more convincingly thorough manner if we were writing a tract for a peace foundation instead of the biography of a disease. But since we are primarily interested in the subject of typhus fever, we cannot give too much space to these matters.

Are microbes the unacknowledged legislators of our age?
How might we write ‘a tract for a peace foundation’ that takes Zinsser’s rebuke seriously? How do we place the human and political causes of war, repression and economic crisis in a perspective that gives proper place to the microbe?

Everywhere we turn, the military, political and economic impact of epidemic disease is hiding in plain sight. We can start with the most influential modern writer on the ‘minor causes of war,’ Carl von Clausewitz, who himself fell victim to cholera’s first European visitation in 1831. Not only did he die from the disease, but his last military operation was to command the Prussian divisions deployed on the Polish border to implement a *cordon sanitaire* intended to keep cholera out of the kingdom (they failed.) His widow Marie von Clausewitz, who was his intellectual partner and scholarly peer, took on the task of fashioning his leaves of unfinished writings into a publishable book, *On War*. Her contribution has only recently been recognized. Among other things, the famous phrase, ‘war is merely the continuation of politics by other means’ first appears in her hand in the margins of his manuscript.

In the 20th century, a good case can be made that influenza in 1918 stopped the last major German offensive of World War One and saved the French and British defenses. While generals sometimes blame disease and hunger for defeat (as the Germans did), it’s rare for the victors who write the history books to credit their triumph to microbes (the Allies awarded those honors to themselves, not the virus). Historians have also suggested that President Woodrow Wilson’s disastrous capitulation to the French and British at the Paris peace talks in 1919—abandoning ‘peace without victory’ in favor of punishing Germany—was due to a bout of influenza impairing his capacities.

If we want to privilege bacteria and viruses, we should also recognize the ways in which human beings have succeeded in controlling them, and what that has meant for politics and society. One example is the development of large-scale urban society which followed large-scale smallpox vaccination. Another is the safe settlement of the southern states and the U.S. occupation of Panama, both made possible by the control of Yellow Fever.

In the present moment, in the midst of the first year of pandemic SARS-CoV-2, we can only see the contours of the virus’s short-term consequences. Neither medical science nor public health have cracked the code of the virus, mastered its logic, or (in the default language of politicians) conquered the invisible enemy. We are in that protracted liminal phase when the future is molded by the political response to fundamental uncertainty. During this time of confu-

The pathogen may be new; the politics are depressingly unchanged.
sion, we take comfort in narratives that give meaning to the event and chart the political course.

The pathogen may be new; the politics are depressingly unchanged.

By definition a pandemic is seeded by a microbial protagonist for which we are not prepared. Had we been prepared, it would have been prevented or contained. To qualify as a pandemic, it has to be a traumatic and disordering. And unique. There’s a trope among crisis epidemiologists: if you’ve seen one pandemic, you’ve seen just one pandemic. The point is that each new pathogen that succeeds in travelling worldwide and causing sufficient mayhem (meeting the microbiological and popular criteria for ‘pandemic’) follows its own distinct logic. The great pandemics of history—the medieval plagues, smallpox in the Americas, cholera in 19th century Europe, influenza in 1918-1919, and HIV and AIDS in late-century Africa and around the world—were distinctly different from one another. Typically, the playbook developed for one was used for the next—the plague measures against cholera, tuberculosis containment measures for influenza, etc. And they don’t quite work because every new pathogen spreads its own brand of unhappiness in its own particular way.

The uniqueness of every ‘emerging disease’ poses profound problems for those concerned with preventing the next contagious pathogen with pandemic potential—what the WHO calls ‘disease X’. The technical and organizational problems of microbial surveillance and rapid response on a scale that is at once planetary and microscopic are serious enough. In the case of the imagined ‘pathogen X’, its clearly better to be prepared than not prepared, but what does it mean to prepare for something that will by definition escape our preparedness? For those who study risk, uncertainty and disorder, pandemics are an engaging topic.

The politics of pandemic crisis are by contrast utterly predictable. In the absence of scientific knowledge, politicians write scripts drawing on cultural archives. Some of these are as old as the Old Testament, others as recent as the last threatened outbreak that caused a stir in the newspapers. We can trace the emergence of a standardized ‘pandemic plotline’ over the last two hundred years. In outline, the script runs this way:

*We are at war against an invisible enemy. While our doctors and nurses combat the disease at the frontline in hospitals, while our scientists seek the medical magic bullet in their laboratories, the population must make sacrifices on the home front. The pandemic will end with victory for society and science and we will return to our way of life.*

This is like those well-worn, half-forgotten clothes at the back of the wardrobe that are pulled out for an unexpected occasion. They don’t really fit but there’s nothing else to wear on the day.

Even those politicians who challenge the cautionary advice of scientists or deny the need for compromising on everyday liberties usually stick to the same plotline. President Donald Trump may disregard scientific method and data, but he believes fervently in the catechism of the magic bullet, probably more so than politicians who are scientifically literate. Naming the U.S. project to develop a vaccine ‘Operation Warp Speed’ is straight out of science fiction, not science. This political language is extraordinarily similar across countries and contexts, repeating without fundamental alteration.
What has become ever clearer as the months pass is that the initial storyline doesn’t hold. For Covid-19, the script was pandemic influenza with a magic bullet vaccine: a few weeks’ lockdown will ‘flatten the curve’ and allow us to return to normal; and a vaccine will complete the unconditional victory.

The lockdown model was adopted as an off-the-shelf combination of travel restrictions and quarantine, isolation and social-distancing, along with case surveillance and contact tracing. It was adopted globally for countries with widely different population risk profiles, and implemented usually without either close attention to exit strategies and full explanation to the public. The origins of lockdown as a social instrument lie in control measures for restive prisons and psychiatric hospitals and its lineage as a disciplinary instrument sheds light on why it is attractive to many governments, and instinctively distrusted by many citizenries.

The lockdown is a crude tool, but more precisely-designed measures were not available because SARS-CoV-2 was novel and there was not enough knowledge about its epidemiology. It is a respiratory infection mainly spread by airborne transmission, and the closest available control model was for pandemic influenza. The influenza model was duly used, and adapted for local circumstance in an ad hoc manner by different countries (and in the U.S. which has had no national containment strategy, by different states). It has several built-in assumptions, including that there will be one-to-three short-duration epidemic waves and that a vaccine can be developed, manufactured and administered in six-to-nine months. It follows that the lockdown will be brief and that little attention needs to be paid to exit strategies from lockdown.

The end of SARS-CoV-2 is not in sight, and our expectations have gradually recalibrated: a second or third wave was considered, and finally the prospect of a ‘new normal’ of endemic SARS-CoV-2. What this ‘new normal’ might be, and when and how we will accept it, isn’t decided by science or by public deliberation based on evidence. Rather, it’s set in motion by political speechwriters with their faded old tropes.

Political leaders have rarely given much thought to the big questions posed by pandemics. They unthinkingly use the vocabulary of ‘fighting’ disease. Military metaphors are so versatile and used in so many different ways, that they are both very difficult to avoid and shouldn’t be taken too literally. Warlike language is a recurring trope throughout the story of modern pandemics, a default setting in the mental thesaurus. The militarization of public health can sometimes be absurd, and can be the butt of simple jokes. Why did President Obama dispatch the 101st Airborne to ‘fight’ Ebola in West Africa when it isn’t an airborne pathogen?
The military hospital ship in New York harbor, its physicians and nurses prohibited by Department of Defense regulations from coming into contact with Covid-19 patients (presumably to ensure they were fighting fit in case they were called upon for a ‘real’ national emergency involving armed combat) was also a floating joke of sorts.

Martial or exclusionary rhetoric is occasionally sinister, notably when authoritarians use an epidemic as a pretext for a crackdown on dissent or xenophobia. Labeling a virus as an ‘enemy’ can imply that those who carry it are enemies too. The word ‘lockdown’, so innocuous in the white suburbs, has the resonance of the New Jim Crow among communities familiar with incarceration. The convergence between pandemic preparedness and the military uses of biosecurity research are disturbing. But we shouldn’t assume that the war-fighting metaphor is hauling too much public health freight: military language is used so widely in public life that its connection to real war is much attenuated.

Medical science will deliver something—probably not according to the promised schedule and rarely as decisively as politicians hope. Therapies are improving, vaccines are promised. Meanwhile, epidemiology is the first mover in providing an arsenal of technologies.

As the dust storm of a pandemic emergency clears, the societal landscape looks different. Many of the changes are opportunistic: who can seize the moment for factional advantage or commercial gain? Others are transformational: cholera prevention was the birthplace of urban sanitation; social mobilization around HIV and AIDS has brought stigmatized groups out of the shadows. Each pandemic pathogen has also compelled science to rethink the nature of disease. Cholera was crucial to the emergence of the germ theory of infectious disease—not only in science but also in the public imagination—with both the strengths and limitations of that approach. Influenza shaped what we define a virus—and the problems of specifying a shape-shifter as an entity in itself. It also led to an obscure but fascinating debate over how to define a ‘pandemic’: is it when a new strain of the virus emerges, or when an outbreak causes global disruption? And how should we then define ‘new strain’ or ‘global disruption’? An overdue focus on the ecological context of zoonotic infections—deforestation and factory farming especially—should make us attentive to rethinking homo sapiens’ place on the planet.

The ‘war on disease’ pandemic plotline skates over some of the ethical challenges of emergency public health. Who is at the front of the queue for prevention? Colonial medicine was presented to metropolitan publics as part of a civilizing mission, but it was provided selectively and cheaply. There are some disturbing cases of how public health went badly wrong in the past, including epidemics unleashed by medical error (for example, hepatitis B). Research into extremely virulent pathogens, intended to identify candidates for pandemic status, runs the risk that a laboratory accident or the field infection of a virus hunter could spark an outbreak, even a pandemic (which happened for 1977 influenza, a virus that escaped from a Soviet or Chinese laboratory). Virologists are uncomfortable talking about this, and we have to turn to the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists for candid debate on these dangers.

The military-scientific model also obscures the agenda of a democratic, inclusive and liberal public health. It’s discomforting for political progressives that the public health measures that are most immediately efficient at controlling epidemics are often statist, illiberal,
conformist and exclusionary. Implicitly, these measures are accepted on the basis that they are a stopgap until biomedicine delivers a definitive cure. History shows that these measures are the response.

What is the alternative? This is an agenda in the rough, needing to be chiseled into shape. We can see an encouraging example in how citizens’ activism led the way in changing the behaviors that risk HIV and in directing pharmaceutical research and production to affordable anti-retroviral treatment. Another case is how the ‘people’s science’ of community epidemiology explains success against Ebola.

At the height of Covid-19, some of the crucial struggles are becoming clear.

One is equity in vaccine provision. The level of investment in developing vaccines against SARS-CoV-2 is without precedent. This involves science, manufacturing and delivery mechanisms. Although there are some multilateral and collaborative efforts, the greater resources by far are devoted to rivalrous nationalism projects in the U.S., China and Russia. Vaccine nationalism is the order of the day.

There is no guarantee that any of the vaccines under consideration will be safe and effective. We also don’t know what regulatory mechanism will certify their efficacy, which will be crucial if certificates are needed for international travel (among other things). Just as important is the level of public trust needed for the 60-70% coverage levels needed to provide herd immunity in a population. If certified vaccine coverage is a precondition for opening countries to travel and trade, inequities in provision and certification will become a new driver of global economic inequalities, with the disadvantaged countries in the global south being hampered in their economic recovery by their limited access to a certified vaccine.

Similar dynamics of inequality and distrust could play out within the U.S. and other countries. Already we see how Covid-19 has accentuated inequalities. People who are essential workers, and those who have no option but to work, and people in overcrowded and multi-generational homes, are more exposed. Those with underlying conditions and co-morbidities are more susceptible. It follows that the poor and people in minority communities suffer disproportionately. They also suffer the greatest economic hardship from the lockdown measures and associated economic recession, and suffer in the longer term from interrupted schooling. Members of these communities are generally less likely to obtain vaccinations, either through difficulties of access or because they don’t trust the authorities. If they are under-served in vaccination it will add yet another layer to their disadvantages.

The Black Lives Matter public protests articulate an agenda against not only overt police brutality but also the structural racism that deprives African American communities of healthy housing, jobs, education and nutrition, and exposes them to coronavirus infection and Covid-19 morbidity and mortality. As the color-selective resonance of the word ‘lockdown’ implies, the epidemic control measures also raise the question: who is being protected from what? A prison lockdown protects the confined prisoners from immediate physical harm, but its main purpose is to protect the prison itself from being overrun by rioting prisoners. The most disadvantaged and discriminated against in our society are well aware that they are the most immediate risk from Covid-19, but—if the history of epidemic-related social unrest is any guide—they will soon come to regard the restrictions as designed to keep in place an unjust social order.

A second set of questions is about how
As the dust storm of a pandemic emergency clears, the societal landscape looks different.

ongoing restrictions on social and economic life will be sustained. The arithmetic of the coronavirus is becoming clear: it is going to be with us for many years. More immediately important than the politics and ethics of a vaccine roll out is the question of the goal and strategy of lifting lockdown restrictions. If this isn’t worked out in a consultative and equitable manner, it will be done in a way that accentuates power inequalities and sparks social conflict.

A third area of change and conflict is economic restructuring. In contrast to pre-modern pandemics that killed so many people that they caused labor shortages, the coronavirus and the lockdown containment model are accentuating the global problem of surplus labor. Entire labor-intensive sectors are being decimated. Jobs are being automated. The downward pressure on unskilled wages will continue. Economies that depend on these jobs at home, or on migrants who take these jobs abroad, are being ravaged. Corporations with deep pockets, good credit ratings and with preferred access to the policymakers who deliver financial aid packages will do better than smaller enterprises that don’t have any of these things. The big exception to the consolidation of economic power is fossil fuels, where decarbonization is being accelerated.

Finally let us return to Zinsser’s challenge: what is the microbe’s story? The coronavirus is hosted by bats, one of the earliest mammals to evolve and one of the most diverse—the 1,400 species of bats are about 20 percent of all mammal species. In certain niche ecologies, bats are numerous, diverse, and a large proportion of vertebrate biomass. Globally they are a tiny component of biomass and are becoming more and more marginal as their habitat shrinks with deforestation. Today in the Anthropocene, about 96 percent of the planet’s terrestrial mammalian biomass is humans and domesticated livestock. Our factory farmed pigs, cattle, and poultry, along with sheep, horses and dogs, are huge in number but extremely narrow in species diversity. Viruses have adapted to epochal transformations since the beginnings of multi-cellular life and with an evolutionary speed about a million times faster than mammals, they are well-placed to thrive in the Anthropocene. For about two hundred years, human science and social engineering have created conditions in which urban and industrial civilization can expand.

To maintain our way of life we need constantly to stay ahead of microbial evolution, including zoonotic viral jumps and anti-biotic resistance. Evolutionary biologists call this the ‘Red Queen’ dynamic, after the character in Alice through the Looking Glass who tells Alice she must run as fast as she can to stay in the same place. The microbiology of the Anthropocene suggests this is an under-statement: we must accelerate as fast as we can to keep up with the quickening pace of ecological crisis. And the history of pandemics suggests that we should not trust magic bullets and lockdowns. We need a public debate on democratic public health in the Anthropocene.

Alex de Waal, Executive Director, World Peace Foundation
WPF PROGRAMS

PEACE AND GLOBAL TRENDS

Our work aims to chart global drivers of peace and conflict, revealing how emergent trends require us to reimagine policy, scholarship and activism. WPF projects examine the politics of how public health, climate change, the law, economics, and corruption intersect with the possibility for peace and threats of conflict.
Dissemination of the above document was successful.
Reinventing Peace in the Anthropocene

The intersections between climate crisis and peace will be a major focus for our work going forward.

Climate change is an issue that intersects with each of our main programs, including the work on the politics of pandemics, mass starvation, global arms and corruption, conflict research and the political marketplace, mass atrocities, and peace in Africa. One focused research activity arising from this is an examination of the role of natural resources in peace negotiations and agreements.

This in turn has several elements:

- The role of ‘carbon compacts’—the allocation of oil revenues to elites as a reward for political loyalty—in peace agreements, and relatedly, the implications of the transition to a post-oil global economy for the political systems of ‘carbon compact’ fragile states.
- The ways in which consociational peace agreements often consolidate ethnic territories, in a manner that may be an obstacle to sustainable management of natural resources.
- How historically recent cases of societal disruption involving major environmental change (e.g. large-scale land loss due to colonial expropriation) have affected conflict and peacemaking.
- ‘Traumatic decarbonization’ and its political impacts. This refers to the unplanned collapse in revenues from hydrocarbons in fragile states. This phenomenon, already observed in several countries due to the exhaustion or loss of oil reserves, or on account of armed conflict, has been accelerated by the Covid-19 crisis and the oil price war between Russia and Saudi Arabia.
Changes due to Covid-19

The scaling up of these activities has been delayed by Covid-19.

Activities

- Alex de Waal has written a paper analyzing the politics of climate change in the Horn of Africa and the Red Sea for the African Union. This will be published shortly.

- We have received a grant from the US Institute of Peace for a comparative study of traumatic decarbonization in Iraq, Nigeria, South Sudan and Sudan, and the role of ‘carbon compacts’ in peace agreements across the world. This project starts in October and will include collaboration with the Center for International Environmental and Resource Policy at the Fletcher School.

- Related research is ongoing on the local implications of climate crisis in Somalia and Sudan as part of the Conflict Research Programme.
Peace and Global Trends

Global Arms and Corruption

Why has the global arms trade proven remarkably resistant to effective controls – directly enabling belligerents to fight wars?
There is consensus that the arms trade is driven by security relationships that are a mixture of:
(a) foreign policy, (b) national security/defense industrial concerns, and (c) major corporate
interests. However, very little work has focused on precisely how these factors intersect in
diverse national contexts.

Our new project, Defense Industries, Foreign Policy and Armed Conflict, aims to fill that gap in
two ways. First, it uses quantitative data to provide a broad overview of arms exports to conflict
parties by ten top arms exporters, including countries that avoid voicing support for humanitar-
ian criteria, such as Russia and China. Second, it uses qualitative research to consider the
role of the arms industry in the US, UK, and France in influencing policy, whether through direct
lobbying, media campaigns, privileged access to decision-makers, or other means, and how
these may affect policies relating to arms supplies to conflict zones. The project is funded by a
two-year grant (2020-22) from the Carnegie Corporation of New York, and includes a research
team of Sam Perlo-Freeman (Campaign Against the Arms Trade), Jennifer Erickson (Boston
College), Emma Soubrier (Arab Gulf States Institute in Washington), Anna Stavrianakis (Sussex
University) and Bridget Conley, with partner organization, the Center for Responsive Politics
(Washington, DC).

Changes due to Covid-19

All of our researchers were impacted by the pandemic in ways that introduce potential delays.
For now, we are focused on making adjustments within the larger parameters of the grant peri-
od, but we may need to ask for an extension.

Separately, we continued our collaboration with Corruption Watch, UK, planning a seminar
that would have taken place in June, but was postponed.

Activities:

• Co-hosted with the Center for Responsive Politics a project organizational meeting and by
invitation only forum with 18-arms trade experts in Wash-
• We are working with Corrup-
tion Watch, UK, to develop a ‘corruption tracker,’ that
draws on the contents of our Compendium on Arms Trade Corruption and will serve as a
tool for an emerging network to document historical and emerging instances of corrup-
tion.

Outputs:

• Sam Perlo-Freeman, ‘Red Flags and Red Diamonds: the warning signs and political drivers of arms trade corruption,’ World Peace Foundation Occa-
sional Paper No. 21, September 2019.
Peace and Global Trends

Conflict Research and the Political Marketplace

The framework of the political marketplace is intuitively resonant among policymakers who have to deal with the manoeuvres of unscrupulous politicians and seek to manage, rather than to resolve, armed conflicts.
Alex’s 2015 book, *The Real Politics of the Horn of Africa: Money, war and the business of power*, stimulated new policy and academic thinking on how to conceptualize and engage with political systems in which transactional politics overruled institutional politics. In the countries of north-east Africa—and indeed more widely across Africa and the Greater Middle East—transactional politics is conducted according to a set of rules that closely resemble a marketplace, in which the laws of supply and demand apply to power as a commodity, so that political allegiances and services are subject to a price function and politics is organized according to the same broad principles as oligopolistic competition in a market.

The Conflict Research Programme, funded by the UK Department of International Development with the London School of Economics as the consortium leader, investigates the political marketplace in five countries: DR Congo, Somalia, South Sudan, Iraq and Syria. The political marketplace is not of course the only logic of politics and violence in these countries, and the program also examines the logics of identity formation and of ‘civics’. The framework of the political marketplace is intuitively resonant among policymakers who have to deal with the maneuvers of unscrupulous politicians and seek to manage, rather than to resolve, armed conflicts. The insights about the principles of organizing mercenarized transactional politics, combining kleptocracy with gangsterism, are sadly not limited to this part of the world but can also be seen as an emergent factor in mature democracies.

**Activities**

- We created a ‘political marketplace toolkit’, which is developing a set of heuristic tools for analyzing particular situations (e.g. conflicts, complex humanitarian emergencies) and particular responses and policy tools (sanctions, security sector reform (SSR), conflict mediation, humanitarian action).

- We applied versions of the toolkit to South Sudan (focusing on the dynamics of the security sector), Somalia (focusing on elections in federal member states and on the food aid sector), Syria (initiating an analysis of sanctions), and Iraq (contestations over provincial government). The WPF-associated team includes Dan Maxwell (Feinstein Center), Aditya Sarkar, Ben Spatz, Sarah Detzner, Mulugeta Gebrehiwot and Jared Miller.

- In partnership with the ‘Yemeni Voices’ group, a coalition of civil society actors that advises the UN Special Envoy for Yemen, we are undertaking a political marketplace analysis of the Yemeni conflict.

- In collaboration with other members of the CRP consortium, we are developing frameworks for other competing logics, including identity formation, violence and ‘civics’. We have a special issue of a journal forthcoming on identity politics and the political marketplace, a project on developing a comparative typology of local peace agreements, and will conduct additional comparative research on people’s law and justice initiatives ‘from below’ and on the local politics of contestation over land and natural resources in the context of climate change. Alex has published a theoretical paper on analyzing the varieties of disorder that we see in these countries.

- We are conducting political marketplace analyses of humanitarian crisis and response in DR Congo, Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syria and Yemen,
and plan to produce a comparative analysis of the interplay between transactional politics, militarized kleptocracy, famine and humanitarian programming. The project leader for this is Prof. Dan Maxwell, at the Feinstein International Center.

**Changes due to Covid-19**

This aspect of our programme has been disrupted due to Covid-19 with planned workshops on Somalia, South Sudan and Yemen, and on the overall analytical framework, either cancelled or delayed and moved to remote/online. Field research has also been suspended. However, desk research and writing continues, and we have published several papers. Our planned workshop on the political marketplace and humanitarian crises has been reconfigured as a series of remote sessions and a webinar. We have revised the plan to take into account the impacts of Covid-19 on food security.

In addition, Alex has general supervisory responsibilities over the work on Somalia, South Sudan, the Middle East/Horn of Africa/Red Sea region, and over cross-cutting themes.

The current phase of the program, funded by DFID through the London School of Economics, comes to an end in March 2021. We are working on a proposal for a five-year extension which has been well received informally. The focus of my involvement in the extension will be on (a) concluding the theoretical and comparative work on the political marketplace and (b) the role of natural resources and climate crisis in conflict, including traumatic decarbonization, and an analysis of the role (or lack of role) of climate and environment issues in peace agreements.

**Outputs:**

- Alex de Waal, Alan Boswell, David Deng, Rachel Ibreck, Matthew Benson and Jan Pospisil, ‘South Sudan: The politics of delay,’ December 2019.
- Sarah Detzner, ‘Security Sector Reform in Sudan and South Sudan: Incubating Progress,’ December 2019
PROTECTING VULNERABLE GROUPS

Over the course of the twentieth century, one of the most dramatic changes to the concept of peace was the idea that it must include the experiences of civilian populations, not just interstate relations. One outcome of this shift was the development of a civilian protection paradigm, that has both made significant contributions and been sorely tested. A key challenge today is applying a critical lens to the politics and activism around protection policies, with the goal of invigorating new approaches.
Protecting Vulnerable Groups

Detentionville: Covid-19 and American Incarceration

Unlike other cities in the US, Detentionville is not limited to a single geographical location; rather, its population are clustered in separately administered fiefdoms.
As is now well known, Covid-19 spreads through close contact, disproportionately impacting older people and those with pre-existing health vulnerabilities. Places where people cannot enact social distancing are reporting significantly higher rates of infection than among the general public. One of the contexts where people are at elevated risk is detention. Nowhere is magnitude of challenge nor diversity of responses more apparent than in the United States. The US has the highest incarceration rate in the world: 698 per 100,000. Imagine it as a single city, Detentionville, composed of 2.3 million inhabitants– a city the size of Houston, TX, Chicago, IL, or Paris, France. The people of this city are aging, with the +55 demographic representing over ten percent of the population. The population is also disproportionately poor, African American and Hispanic, and many have pre-existing conditions that render them vulnerable to chronic diseases.

Unlike other cities in the US, Detentionville is not limited to a single geographical location; rather, its population are clustered in separately administered fiefdoms. These include Federal prisons, ICE detention centers, state prisons, juvenile detention centers, county-level jails (which often house ICE detainees), as well as work release programs, parole offices, and other facilities. Detentionville is not separate from the ‘rest’ of America: it exists in most counties, every state and across the country. This strange ‘city’ also has a significant fleet of commuter-workers: lawyers, judges, police, bailiffs, parole boards, officers, facility guards (corrections officers), medical staff, social workers, teachers, volunteers, etc. And of course, it includes the children, spouses, parents, friends and loved ones of those incarcerated.

All of them have been impacted by the epidemic behind bars—but how these impacts are felt and who has the capacity to change conditions varies significantly from detention site to site. This project builds on emerging data, policy debates and personal narratives to track the path COVID-19 has carved through detention sites.

**Activities**

Our project on Covid-19 in Detentionville began with a goal of collecting data across sites within five states, Massachusetts, Illinois, California, New York, Louisiana and Michigan, over the course of the first months of the epidemic (March – June). On April 23, we launched the project page. Several occasional papers and additional research are forthcoming AY 2020-2021.

Bridget also has continued her work with the Tufts University Prison Initiative of Tisch College (TUPIT), and in AY 2020-2021, will be a Tisch Faculty Fellow. She is contributing to the MyTern project, focused on creating re-entry opportunities for recently released people, notably the students enrolled in TUPIT’s degree program at MCI-Concord who have or will be leaving prison.

**Outputs**

- Case studies: Massachusetts, Illinois, Michigan, California, New York, and Louisiana at Tracking COVID-19 in Detention
Protecting Vulnerable Groups

Accountability for Starvation

The key challenge for ending mass starvation is to render such policies and the leaders who choose to deploy them morally toxic.

After six years without famine, in 2017, the UN warned of imminent threats— north-eastern Nigeria, Somalia (where starvation was actually averted), South Sudan and Yemen. All were war-related. Political repression brought the Rohingya to the brink of starvation. So too, in Venezuela, economic collapse interwoven with political repression has driven food crisis. Syrians in besieged enclaves suffered mass starvation during the height of the war and the prolonged endgame to the war has seen other forms of widespread food deprivation. In each case, political and military leaders’ policy decisions were the primary culprit: starvation was intentionally inflicted upon entire civilian populations. The key challenge for ending mass starvation is to render such policies and the leaders who choose to deploy them morally toxic. Could international criminal law be harnessed towards this overall goal?

Our collaborative project with Global Rights Compliance, a law firm based in The Hague, aimed
to answer this question, by identifying how international law may be used to advance the prevention, prohibition, and accountability for mass starvation. The past year witnessed important progress: the Assembly of States Parties to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, meeting in The Hague on December 6, 2019, unanimously approved an amendment to the Rome Statute that prohibited the use of starvation as a weapon of war in non-international armed conflicts. Noting that starvation was already prohibited (in identical terms) in international armed conflicts, this amounts to a wholesale prohibition. Our project, which began in Fall 2018, undoubtedly contributed to this step.

Activities

Alex and Bridget organized a panel and presented on the project at the International Association of Genocide Scholars meeting in July 2019 (in Phnom Penh, Cambodia), and co-authored a chapter, ‘Genocide, Starvation and Famine,’ for the forthcoming Cambridge World History of Genocide, Vol I., edited by Scott Straus and Ben Kiernan. We published a paper on ‘the intent to starve’ in a special issue of the Journal of International and Criminal Justice.

We convened a high-level expert workshop at the Tufts International Center in Talloires, France, bringing together legal scholars and practitioners charged with documenting crimes in ongoing conflicts, diplomats with inside view on how starvation is addressed at the UN and in preparation for the Assembly of State Parties in 2020, humanitarian actors, and country experts. The meeting provided a unique opportunity for these actors to share insights.

The project’s final product is a volume, Accountability for Starvation; edited by Bridget Conley, Catriona Murdoch, Alex de Waal and Wayne Jordash, and will be published by Oxford University Press (2021). It will be the first of its kind: a comprehensive guide to starvation and international law. It includes several chapters written by Alex and Bridget, as well as Dyan Mazurana and Dan Maxwell, with contributions from five current, former or incoming Fletcher students.

Changes due to COVID-19

The project was winding down this year, with our efforts concentrated on the final writing and editing for the book. The donors approved a second phase of the project, with a stronger legal focus and in which WPF planned for a much-reduced role. However, the process of finalizing the grant was interrupted by the onset of the pandemic, with the donors overwhelmed by priority shifts. It is unclear at this point how the project might proceed.

One potential, unexpected event that might draw on the resources developed through this project is the possibility that former Sudanese president Omar al Bashir will stand trial at the International Criminal Court, or in a Sudanese court assisted by the ICC. We have begun looking into how starvation-related charges could be framed by the prosecution.

Outputs

- Alex de Waal and Bridget Conley, ‘Hunger Als Kriegswaffe’ (Starvation as a Weapon of War), Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte, January 2020.
- Batul Sadliwala, ‘Fleeing Mass Starvation: What we (don’t) know about the fam-
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Children and Youth Staying Safe in Violence Conflict

What it is that makes some young people able to not only survive but to thrive in the face of tremendous odds?

Is there something special about them as individuals? Is it something about their family environment? Or is it a particular combination of both?

To answer this question, children’s and youth’s voices, perspectives, actions, and ideas are important and should be heard. Their stories may surprise us, causing us to think and act differently. Through their voices we learn about these young people, their families and friends, and the context in which they live and grow. We hear what they prioritize and how they strategize to meet their priorities. We discover what they actually do to try and protect themselves, their families and their communities from violence and harm. We begin to understand what helps them to cope, mature and thrive. We explore their goals, hopes, and plans for a better life. We see their attempts, often against great odds, to create a better future. In fact, these young people may be the very ones we turn to in order to understand and address some of the most serious problems besetting their countries and our world.
Activities

Dyan Mazurana has completed the draft of her single authored trade book, `We Have Hope': Resilience Among Violence Affected Youth (working title). She has secured a literary agent, who identified two publishers interested in the book.

Mazurana has utilized her own research and other scholarship she explored in writing ‘We Have Hope’ to create a new graduate course at Fletcher, “Children, Violence, Protection & Resilience.” Over 50 students enrolled from Fletcher, Friedman and Brandeis. (Fletcher pays Mazurana’s salary to teach the course.)

Related Outputs


Kimberly Theidon and Dyan Mazurana (editors). (Challenging Conceptions: Children Born of Wartime Sexual Violence. Rutgers University Press (anticipated publication date fall 2020). In addition to serving as an editor, Mazurana wrote a chapter building specifically off the work carried out under ‘We Have Hope’: “The Role of Spirituality in the Acceptance of Children Born of Conflict Related Sexual Violence.” Bridget also participated in the seminar and has a chapter in the volume. The seminar was funded by Tufts Collaborates!
Protecting Vulnerable Groups

Dignity for the dead: ‘In their presence’

Dignity does not end with death; concern for the remains of the deceased are a measure of respect for those who survive.

Perhaps unlike any other material object, human bones connected to injustice provoke diverse and divergent interests, exposing questions about what it means to be human and the experience of an irreducible “presence” that occurs when viewing another person’s remains. Many museums display human remains: e.g., mummified bodies, elaborate reliquaries, and “scientific” collections. Museum guidelines exist to govern these and the wide array of similar collections. However, existing principles do not reflect the specific interests and conundrums of displaying human remains from contexts of state-sponsored violence and oppression, an increasingly common practice. Advances in forensic identification of remains have further complicated the issues.

In a new collaboration between Bridget Conley and Diane O’Donoghue (Public Humanities, Tisch College, Tufts University), we have developed a project titled, “In Their Presence: Displaying Human Remains.” It draws on Conley and O’Donoghue’s research, professional and activist experiences, in conversation with colleagues and professionals in related areas, to formulate ethical and practical guidelines for the display of these particular types of remains in museum contexts. We have opened discussion about connecting our project with colleagues at Sites of Conscience, a non-profit that works with memorial museums around the world. The project is funded by Tufts Collaborates.

Changes due to Covid-19

We had to postpone our seminar, scheduled for March 26 – 27, and secured a one year, no cost extension from Tufts Collaborates. We have shifted our plans to holding the six panels as a year-long speaker series (AY 2020-2021) that will be open to the public via zoom. We have received permission to use travel funds towards honorarium for speakers.

Activities

Bridget and Diane completed a review of literature addressing human remains, and Bridget supervised our RA, Amaia’s comprehensive review of memorial museums that display human remains. Planning was completed for a seminar at the end of March. Bridget and Diane supervised the development of technical guidelines for care of human remains with contractor on the project, Ingrid Neuman, Senior Conservator, Rhode Island School of Design.
Outputs


- Bridget interviewed a former Fletcher student, Adrienne Klein, about her experience volunteering in a hospital mortuary in New York City at the height of the epidemic. The interview was published on our blog on April 22, 2020.

Additional Program Updates:

While the atrocity endings project has mostly concluded, a final output was published this year that emerged from Bridget’s collaboration with UCLA political scientist, Chad Hazlett: “How very massive atrocities end: A dataset and typology,” Journal of Peace Research July 2, 2020. The article was mentioned by New York Times reporters Max Fisher and Amanda Taub in their Interpreter newsletter of July 17, 2020.

Bridget was quoted in Richard Hall, “‘When they come, they will kill you’: Ethnic cleansing is already a reality in Turkey’s Syrian safe zone” The Independent, November 29, 2019
AFRICAN PEACE PROGRAM

Our engagement with African policymakers on urgent peace issues continues, including ongoing media work, writing and advisory.
African Peace Program

COVID-19 and Africa

Africa has its own specific demographic and health profile, which mean that responses have to be designed specifically for local circumstances.

Africa presents distinct challenges to responding to Covid-19, requiring public health measures specifically designed to maximize the governments' and peoples' capacities and minimize the potential harm of pandemic response policies. Alex de Waal’s work has highlighted three central issues. First: Africa has its own specific demographic and health profile, which mean that responses have to be designed specifically for local circumstances. Epidemiological models cannot take into account the specificities of local interpersonal behavior and sanitary practices, which are crucial to the spread or control of the disease. However, communities know these factors. For this reason, community consultation is essential to an effective response.

Second, responses such as lockdowns can only work by consent, not forcible imposition. The secondary impacts of the epidemic, including unemployment and food insecurity, will be at least as significant as the direct impacts of illness and death. And finally, drawing on his earlier work on governance and disease, de Waal has proposed a research agenda on the implications of Covid-19 for state capacity, peace and security, and human rights. One core issue in all of these writings is the question of what constitutes a democratic public health system.

Activities

Alex has advised the Sudanese prime minister, Abdalla Hamdok, and the former Ethiopian PM, Hailemariam Dessalegn (who advises the current Ethiopian PM), on variant forms of a lockdown and alternatives to a state of emergency.

Outputs

- African Arguments and WPF blog, Reinventing Peace
- BBC News, “Why lockdowns may not be the answer”
- BBC Real Story (Podcast): Coronavirus: Is Africa Ready
- Podcast with Crisis Group “Bracing for the Post Pandemic Storm”
- Research memo, “Governance Implications of Epidemic Disease in Africa: Updating the Agenda for COVID-19”
African Peace Program

African Voices, African Arguments

The new podcast series features African scholars, writers, policy makers and activists on issues of peace, justice and democracy.

The new podcast series “African Voices, African Arguments” features African scholars, writers, policy makers and activists on issues of peace, justice and democracy, and is produced by World Peace Foundation and presented in partnership with African Arguments and the Institute for Global Leadership at Tufts University. We have produced two per month since the series launched in June.
We continue to sponsor the book series African Arguments and the associated website. The book series, which is managed by the International African Institute, has up to now been published by Zed Books, but following the unexpected sale of Zed to Bloomsbury, the IAI has shifted the series to the independent publisher Hurst in order to safeguard the integrity of the series including its priorities of mentoring African authors and ensuring distribution in Africa. We have also been involved in supporting a new “debating ideas” page on the African Arguments site.

**African Peace Program**

**Research Working Group on the Horn of Africa in support of the African Union High-Level Implementation Panel.**

We have ongoing support to the peace and security thinking at the African Union, especially through the AU High-level Implementation Panel for Sudan, South Sudan and the Horn of Africa. This project takes the form of a collaboration with the Horn of Africa Social Policy Institute (HESPI), and the Center for Dialogue, Research and Cooperation (CDRC), both in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, and Goldsmiths College, University of London, funded by a donor consortium (Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Switzerland). The aim is to synthesize research on the Horn and the adjoining areas (especially the Red Sea) to inform a high-level African Union conference provisionally scheduled for early 2021. Alex de Waal has written one paper (on climate crisis), and is supervising others, including synthesizing research on the wider ‘Red Sea Arena’ as an integrated security/political marketplace and what this means for a peace and security agenda. This is a two-year project that began in September 2019.

**Changes due to COVID-19**

The activities of the Research Working Group on the Horn of Africa have been delayed because of COVID-19. The research (conducted by partner organizations) has been reconfigured as desk research and remotely-conducted interviews and the scheduled workshops will be held remotely in October. Our outputs will include research papers and a synthesis paper for the final conference.
African Peace Program

African Peace Archive

The academic study of peace in Africa has long been handicapped by the paucity of internal documentary material from peace processes themselves.

This means that conflict resolution as a practice does not always learn lessons and the field is often criticized for a supposed lack of scholarly rigor.

The WPF has an extensive archive of documentation of African peace processes which we are making available to researchers. The biggest of these is the Sudan Peace Archives, building on Alex work with the AU mediation. A second is that of former senior UN official and advisor to several high-level mediation exercises, Vladimir Zhagora. He has provided us with his files, which cover his career from the transition to democracy in South Africa to Kofi Annan’s intervention in the Kenyan crisis in 2008, as well as the negotiations with the Lord’s Resistance Army and the Sudanese peace process.

Activities

Alex is collaborating with Willow Berridge, a historian of contemporary Sudan (Newcastle University, UK), who will join us as a fellow this year to write a history of the African Union mediation in Sudan, drawing on our archive, and also the documents from the late Princeton Lyman, for U.S. Special Envoy. Alex will assist in this and co-author the resulting book. Conditions permitting, Dr. Berridge plans research trips to Sudan and South Sudan and neighboring countries. The USIP is supporting this activity.

Changes due to COVID-19

Dr. Berridge’s research travel plans are indefinitely postponed, and she will conduct desk research and zoom interviews for the time being.

We are no longer letting students access the files in our offices, so the cataloguing of the Zhagora archive is on hold for the time being.

Additional Program Outputs and Media

Together with Noel Twagiramungu, Mulugeta Gebrehiwot and Allard Duursma, Alex published a paper “Re-examining Transnational Conflict in Africa,” in the *Journal of Modern African Studies*, along with shorter articles in *Foreign Policy* and *African Arguments*, and a policy memo.

An edited collection of papers, ‘Nationalism and self-determination in the Horn of Africa,’ drawing on a seminar we convened in 2018, will be published in the journal *Nations and Nationalism* at the end of this year.
Occasional Papers:


Other Related Media:

- **Justin Lynch**, ‘It’s Not Enough to Topple a Dictator’, *The Nation*, December 20, 2019
- El-Ghassim Wane, Abdul Mohammed and Alex de Waal, ‘Sudan will never prosper while it is on the US terrorism blacklist’, *The Guardian*, December 12, 2019
- Alex de Waal, ‘Sudan’s revolutionaries pin hopes on PM Abdalla Hamdok’, BBC, August 28, 2019
- **Who finances the Sudanese regime?** BBC Sounds podcast interview, August 2, 2019
- Max Bearak, ‘Sudan’s military, civilians sign power-sharing deal, setting up elections in 2022’, *Washington Post*, August 17, 2019
- Alex de Waal, ‘Cash and contradictions: On the limits of Middle Eastern influence in Sudan’, *African Arguments*, August 1, 2019
Teaching 2019-2020

Bridget taught “International Law and Civil Society” to incarcerated undergraduate students at MCI-Concord through TUPIT (Tufts University Prison Initiative at Tisch College).

Alex taught ‘Conflict in Africa’, during Fall 2019. He will be teaching this online in Fall 2020. He is also contributing four sessions to a new class on pandemics taught by Prof. Sulmaan Khan.

Bridget has had a new course accepted, ‘Critical Theory and Why all International Relations Professionals Need to Read It.’ She will teach the course at Fletcher in Spring 2021.

PhD/MALD committees/supervision

Three of Alex’s PhD students successfully defended in the last 12 months.

Sarah Detzner defended her PhD in July 2019. Her dissertation is entitled, “Nothing For Us Without Us? The Impact of Popular Participation on Security Sector Reform Progress in Transitional States.” She completed the most systematic study of the success or otherwise of security sector reform efforts in democratization states around the world. This involved developing her own indices to measure SSR. Her principal conclusion is that successful SSR requires the combination of a major political disruption and a coalition of civil and political forces demanding SSR. Sarah is working with us applying her research findings to SSR challenges in Africa and the Middle East.

Roxani Krystalli defended her PhD in November 2019. She completed a dissertation entitled, “We are not good victims”: Hierarchies of Suffering and the Politics of Victimhood in Colombia.” This was an outstanding piece of political ethnography analyzing how the categories of “victim” are interpreted and applied by civil servants, victims’ groups and wider society. It will soon become a book. Roxani has got a lectureship at St. Andrew’s University in Scotland. She is a WPF alumnus, having been a research assistant in 2013-2014.

Sarah and Roxani were jointly awarded the Ackerman Prize for outstanding PhD dissertation at Fletcher at commencement in May 2020.

Ben Spatz defended his PhD in August 2020. It is entitled “Cash Violence: Sanctions and the Politics of Power, and Peace.” It is an extremely detailed study of politics in Liberia during the civil war and its aftermath (the dominance of the violent warlord Charles Taylor) and the transition to democracy (the presidency of
Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf). Ben applies the political marketplace framework to the transactional politics of the Liberian elite, and analyzes the impact of sanctions within that framework. Among his findings are that when Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf took power, she chose not to use violence against her rivals, with the implication that she needed to use cash in greater quantities (in Liberian parlance, “cash violence”) to secure their political cooperation. Ben is using his expertise on sanctions as part of the Conflict Research Programme.

Alex is on the committee for the following four Fletcher PhD students: Ben Naimark-Rowse, Andrea Walther-Puri, Julie Zollmann and Jared Miller, as well as one former Fletcher PhD who transferred to Yale, Sophia Dawkins.

Bridget is on Bret McEvoy’s PhD committee.

Events

Sponsored in the Fall 2020 – early March 2020:

- 5th Annual Conference on Gender and International Affairs, November 15 & 16, 2019
- Decolonizing International Relations Conference, October 25, 2019
- Fletcher Japan Club, Testimony from a Hiroshima survivor, October 7, 2019
- Center for Strategic Studies, Military Intervention Conference, October 4-5, 2019
- ‘Transnational Conflict in Africa: New data, new paradigm,’ with Noel Twagiramungu.
- ‘Laying the Past to Rest: The EPRDF and the Challenges of Ethiopian State-Building,’ book launch with Mulugeta Gebrehiwot

Events WPF sponsored that were postponed:

- “Ukraine is not dead: Religion, Pluralism and Geopolitics in Eurasia”, Fletcher
Religion, Law & Diplomacy (revised as a virtual event scheduled for October 2020)

- Refugees in Towns Festival & Conference, Feinstein International Center (re-allocating WPF conference funds to cover student research work in support of the project).

**Students Support**

PhD support was provided to Fletcher student **Xiaodon Liang** for his research on, ‘Military Rule and Military Industry: Prerogatives and Interests’, and **Benjamin Naimark-Rowse** for ‘Liberating the ‘Enemy’ in South Africa’s Anti-Apartheid Movement’.

WPF invited Fletcher School students to submit short essays reflecting on the impact of coronavirus for a blog series titled “Fletcher Voices”. WPF hosted submissions by Fletcher students and graduates, **Zihao Lui**, **Kevin Dupont**, **Alexander Tenney**, **Archisch Mittal**, **Akshobn Giridharadas**, **Samantha Chen Xiaodan Huang** and **Kudrat Dutta Chaudhary**.

In response to the challenging circumstances surrounding COVID-19. WPF provided additional support for summer research through the Fletcher Office of Career Services for students **Elizabeth Klapheke** and **Grady Jacobsen**, and provided funds for **Exequiel Caceres** summer internship for the Initiative on Religion, Law, and Diplomacy (RLD).

WPF directly supported Fletcher student **Jules Offino Loffler** for summer research on preventing human rights violations during COVID-19, and **Ella Duncan** for writing on responses to Covid-19 in Africa. Research Assistant **Amaia Elorza Arregi** continued through the summer with Research Director Conley for work on COVID-19 in Detention, and Fletcher Student **Kinsey Spears** was hired to work with Director Conley to support research that applies a protection framework to US contexts.
ORGANIZATIONAL UPDATES

Governance and Board

- Jeff Summit was appointed to the World Peace Foundation’s Board of Trustees
- Trustee Catherine Henn stepped down from the Board in advance of the February 2020 meeting
- Board of Trustees Meeting on Wednesday, February 5, was joined by The Fletcher School Dean Rachel Kyte,
- The Board meeting on Wednesday, May 13, 2020, was our first via zoom.
- Meetings with the Ginn Trustees were held on November 14, 2019 and April 30, 2020 (via conference call). In their annual vote, the Ginn Trustees determined that world peace had not been achieved and consequently the Ginn Trust will continue to fund the WPF for the coming year.
Staff

Academic Year Assistants

Amaia Ellorza Arregi
Research Assistant

Jared Miller
Assistant (CRP)

Aaron Steinberg
Communications Coordinator

Teaching Assistants

- For Bridget’s course, “International Law and Civil Society” at MCI-Concord: Amaia Ellorza Arregi, Moriah Graham, and Jacob Dietz.
- For Alex’s course, “Conflict in Africa”: Jared Miller and Ben Spatz

Fellows

Sarah Detzner
Mulugeta Gebrehiwot
Dyan Mazurana
Catriona Murdoch

Sam Perlo-Freeman
Aditya Sarkar
Paulos Tesfagiorgis
Noel Twagiramungu
COMMUNICATIONS AND OUTREACH

Our outreach and communications have been aided considerably this year by the hiring of our Communications Assistant, Fletcher student, Aaron Steinberg.

In 2018, we began publishing a monthly blog series, “Employee of the Month.” The funds that support the WPF program are contingent on world peace not being achieved, because this would cause the Ginn Trust to cut off our funding and direct it instead to the Charlesbank Home for working women. On this basis, the employee of the month is the person who has done most to hinder peace that month and thereby assure that we remain solvent. We have sought to make the award globally representative.

WPF 2020 Employees of the Month:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employees of the Month</th>
<th>August 2019 Hong Kong police By Bridget Conley</th>
<th>September 2019 Jacob Rees-Mogg, MP, aka “The Sovereign Individual” By Alex de Waal</th>
<th>October 2019 White male supremacy By Bretton James McEvoy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2020 The Pentagon Script on Afghanistan By Bridget Conley</td>
<td>April 2020 Covid-19 Policy By Alex de Waal</td>
<td>May 2020 The Coronahawk By Xiaodon L. Liang</td>
<td>June 2020 Viktor Orbán By Aaron Steinberg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During FY 2020, our followers grew 10% across platforms.

Our Twitter and Facebook posts garnered 247,796 cumulative impressions, with average engagement rates of 1.2% and 3.6% respectively, which is well above the industry average according to 2020 social media benchmark reports.
Social Media

We ended the year with 2821 followers - a 15% increase from last year.

Among our most popular posts were the announcement of our grant from the Carnegie Corporation, the launch of the African Voices, African Arguments podcast series, and Alex de Waal’s article on Abdalla Hamdok’s visit to Washington D.C.

Sudanese Prime Minister Abdalla Hamdok’s current visit to Washington DC to negotiate #sanctions is a critical juncture for the future of the country. Alex de Waal outlines what is at stake in his latest piece for our blog, Reinventing Peace: U.S. Policy on Sudan: Business as usual.

Our Facebook engagement rate was nearly 28 times higher than the non-profit industry average in FY 2020.

Popular posts included the announcement of Dan Maxwell’s occasional paper, Alex de Waal’s Foreign Policy article on Hemeti, and the release of the African Voices, African Arguments podcast, which reached over 1400 people.

We ended the FY with 3334 page “Likes,” which is a 5% increase from last year.
Our website visitation is down this year, partially a reflection of the fact that several of key projects were nearing completion or just beginning (hence, fewer outputs); and partially a reflection of the disrupted academic year, which impacted one of our key audiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Visitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2018</td>
<td>66,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2019</td>
<td>76,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2020</td>
<td>36,443</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our five most popular pages were: (FY20): homepage, famine, Strategies of the Coalition in the Yemen War, Staff and de Waal publications.

Compared with (FY19): the homepage, Strategies of the Coalition in the Yemen War, Famine, Staff, de Waal Publications.

Reinventing Peace received 59,096 pageviews, down from 70,354 (FY 2019), and up from 56,731 (FY 2018). And the separate blog that houses the Compendium of Arms Deals received 20,742 (FY20), down from 33,304 page views (FY 2019), and 29,799 (FY 2018).

The five most popular blog essays on Reinventing Peace newly published in FY 2019 are:

- General Mohamed Hamdan Dagolo ‘Hemedti’
- Fletcher Voices: When Shelter in Place is a curse: Intimate Terrorism during COVID-19
- Towards a world with a greatly reduced arms trade?
- U.S. Policy on Sudan: Business as usual