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In the digital age, it often seems as if the human worker is an endangered species. As the digital economy constitutes an ever-greater share of the economy, mass employment can no longer be taken as a guaranteed product of growth. This disconnect between growth and employment stems from the fact that, compared to traditional industry, the employment intensity of the digital economy is astonishingly low. In 1990, the top three carmakers were worth $36 billion and employed 1.2 million people; in comparison, the top three firms in Silicon Valley are valued at about $1 trillion but employ just 137,000 workers. The advent of new technologies, such as artificial intelligence (AI) and industrial automation, will only make the situation worse. According to a 2013 paper by two Oxford academics, 47 percent of all jobs in America are threatened by digital disruption.\(^1\) These trends threaten to exacerbate the already unsustainable levels of income inequality by bifurcating the labor force, with highly paid, highly skilled workers in fields such as architecture and programming on the one hand and low paid, low skilled workers forced to flip burgers and bag groceries to make ends meet on the other.
Learning from Luddites

There are good reasons, however, not to jump to fatalistic conclusions. It is false to assume that there is a finite amount of work to be done, and therefore automation (or digitization) means there is less to be done by humans. In fact, history is ripe with examples of new technologies provoking such unfounded anxieties. From the invention of the steam engine to the introduction of computers in the office, history has shown that technology does not destroy jobs but ends up creating more, albeit in other sectors. This is because automation usually makes it cheaper to do some task, thereby making the process more efficient, which increases the demand for labor in sectors that have not been automated. Take the ATM for instance. While the numbers of tellers required per bank branch has decreased, the savings have allowed banks to open more branches and hire workers in other areas such as sales and customer service. The same is true for e-commerce, as there are more jobs in the retail sector today than there were before its rise. Even AI technologies require human beings to manually label huge datasets that are then used to train algorithms. To put it in technical terms, the cheapest non-linear computer is still a human being.

This Time is Different

Nonetheless, there are two aspects that make today’s context more challenging and hence demand the immediate attention of policymakers. First, work is becoming increasingly computer intensive. Working with computers will become an essential for most, if not all, jobs in the future. While the occupational hazards of working with a computer are far less than,
say, working in a factory, computer skills require specialized training and are harder to grasp with age. Second, the pace of change due to digital disruption will be much faster than anything we have seen before. The McKinsey Global Institute estimates that the impact of AI technologies will be 10 times faster and 300 times the scale of the Industrial Revolution.³ To put it differently, while it takes a couple of years to get a factory running from scratch, it takes just weeks to create new software and mere days to release updates to fine-tune it. There will still be a gap between invention and implementation, but governments will not have the luxury of decades to respond as they once did.

Change, Yes We Must

To ensure mass employment in the future, there must be a fundamental break from the approach of the past.

First, the industrial-era-inspired primary and secondary education system needs to be rethought. There should be an em-
phasis on inculcating computer skills from an early age. In the coming decades, being able to use a word processor and understanding the basics of programming will be as important as literacy and numeracy is today. Further, future citizens will have to work in fields that have not even been conceived yet. Therefore, instead of focusing on making students experts in specific disciplines, the curriculum should focus on developing skills such as abstract thinking and collaborative problem solving. Finland is leading the way in this regard by experimenting with a system that replaces traditional subject based pedagogy with one that emphasizes on cross-subject learning of topics and group projects.

Second, societies must accept that learning will be a lifelong process. Governments should increase funding for programs that successfully retrain workers from disrupted industries to ones where there is demand. In this pursuit, they should take advantage of the vast amount of data that is available and build comprehensive Labor Market Information Systems (LMIS); these systems provide real-time snapshots of the labor market, identify sectors with scarcity and surplus, and forecast demand. Implementation of LMIS should be combined with policies that make it easier for firms to hire and fire while at the same time providing support to displaced workers that incentivizes them to undergo retraining. Denmark’s “Flexicurity” system has shown success with such an approach.

Third, governments must do much more to address income inequality. Even if the above policies were implemented perfectly, many will still slip through the cracks. With the inevitable inversion of the age pyramid, an ever-increasing share of the population will be unable to find gainful employment. Even with the best systems in place, it may not be possible to retrain a 50-year-old truck driver in to a software engineer.
Further, already strained welfare systems need to be simplified and made more efficient. States should consider experimenting with policies that guarantee a basic income for all. While this has the advantage of being easy to administer, the unintended consequence could be severe. Therefore, small-scale experiments should be conducted to gauge viability; Canada has piloted such programs previously, while the Netherlands will do so this year. In the interim, proven ideas such as a negative-income tax that seeks to top-up the income of the lowly paid should be implemented. These encourage people to stay in the workforce rather than go on dole. Some states in America have successfully implemented such policies.

Time is of the essence. The rise of populist far-right politics throughout the developed world should serve as warning: failure to combat the damaging effects of globalization and income inequality will have destabilizing effects on the international order. Future disruption through the likes of AI will be increasingly ‘collar-blind’ (Figure 1). The threat that this poses to social stability cannot be overstated.
Will the Game Be Great Again?

Understanding Russia’s Growing Interest in Afghanistan

By Sayed Madadi

Nearly three decades after its defeat in Afghanistan, the Kremlin is moving into Afghan politics once again. 2016 was replete with news of Russian efforts to stake its claim in the increasingly turbulent country. In the face of foreign policy uncertainty out of Washington, Russia is stepping up its engagement with new objectives. In February, several news outlets reported that Russia was hiring mercenaries to fight on its behalf in Ukraine, Syria, and Afghanistan. Russia has publically acknowledged its ties with the Taliban, the main insurgency in Afghanistan, which it claims are intended to facilitate peace and stability. Russia’s interest in Afghanistan and its support of the Taliban is best understood through the lens of its broader regional objectives.

Moscow’s interests in Afghanistan are threefold. First, Russia’s earliest concern after 2001 was the massive inflow of Afghanistan’s opium. With more than eight million drug addicts, Russia is a large market for Afghan opium, as well as a trade route to the lucrative European market. Russian officials and their Central Asian counterparts have long complained about the Europe-bound narcotics trade from Afghanistan. At times, they have criticized the US and their NATO allies for not committing to eradicating poppy cultivation. Opium is gen-
erally grown in areas under the Taliban control and is the group’s main source of revenue. Russia’s earlier opposition to the Taliban, among other factors, could be understood as efforts to decrease poppy cultivation in Afghanistan before it hits the road to Russian markets. Moscow’s Central Asian protégés bordering Afghanistan—Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, and Turkmenistan—have also criticized the Afghan government for not controlling the narco-trade.⁴

Second, Moscow is worried about the US presence in Afghanistan. Since Putin’s return to the presidency in 2012, Russia has growingly shown disgruntlement with the US mission in Afghanistan as part of a more belligerent larger international posture. Moscow initially welcomed the US’s military campaign to oust the Taliban and helped them establish contacts with the Northern Alliance, the Taliban’s prime rival. It was with Russian approval that Uzbekistan allowed the US to use the Karshi-Khanabad Airbase, across the border from Afghanistan, for their operations against Al-Qaeda and the Taliban regime. In 2009, Moscow granted NATO access to an alternative, and cheaper, supply route—the Northern Distribution Network (NDN)—minimizing its reliance on the costly and turbulent route that passed through Pakistan’s tribal areas.⁵ In reciprocity, Americans did not express significant worries about Russia’s malignant role in the Afghan war either. Afghanistan, as former President Hamid Karzai put it, remained the only place where Russian and American interests aligned peacefully.

That has changed in the past five years, particularly after relations between Washington and Moscow soured over Ukraine and Syria. In an interview last year, Zamir Kabulov, Putin’s Special Envoy for Afghanistan said that Moscow was uncomfortable with the US presence in Afghanistan, comparing it to a hypothetical Russian presence in Mexico or Cuba: “Why
in Afghanistan?” He rhetorically asked, “where is Afghanistan and where is America?” In 2016, Russia hosted two rounds of trilateral talks with China and Pakistan to discuss the future of Afghanistan. The efforts were widely viewed as Moscow’s move to offer an alternative to the failed Quadrilateral Cooperation Group (QCG)—the US-led talks aimed at finding a political solution to the Afghan conflict which disintegrated after Afghanistan withdrew accusing Pakistan of shaky and dubious commitment to peace. The Afghan government criticized the Russo-Sino-Pak talks for not involving Kabul. In response, in a joint statement, the three countries promised to invite Afghanistan for the next round of the talks, and in February, the new round of discussions convened in Moscow with not only Afghan, but also Indian, delegates in attendance.

Third, Russia is worried about the expansion of the Islamic State in Khorasan, an ISIS affiliate based in Afghanistan. Moscow is increasingly concerned that the extremists who have joined ISIS from the region will eventually return home as the caliphate continues to wither in Syria and Iraq. Afghanistan provides ISIS with a strategic operating base to expand into
the far north. Muslims make 16 million of the Russian population, mainly Sunnis living in the northern Caucasus region—five percent of them are Salafi or Wahhabi, an ultraconservative brand of Islam welcomed by ISIS.9 According to Russian intelligence, 2400 Caucasian Muslims have joined ISIS, others estimate the volunteers between 5000-7000 from Russia and Central Asia. Deep wounds from the Moscow Government make the Caucasian Muslims a potentially strong recruit pool for ISIS. In addition to the Imamrat Kafkaz (Emirate of Caucasus), which is linked to the Al Nusra Front in Syria, the Caucasus Province of the Islamic State, an ISIS offshoot, is also gaining influence among Russian Muslims.10 While Moscow initially considered ISIS as a boon to its interests—shifting Washington’s focus away from its machinations in Ukraine—it now finds it a curse in disguise.

Combined, these three objectives highlight the core interests sustaining Moscow’s relationship with the Afghan Taliban. Prior to 9-11, the Taliban hosted a large population of Caucasian and Central Asia extremists, including the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan, who were fighting with Al-Qaeda. While the main base of operations for these groups shifted to Pakistan’s tribal areas, the continuing conflict in Afghanistan fostered an environment beneficial to the group’s survival and gave a potential access route back to their home countries. The growth of poppy cultivation in Northern and Northeastern Afghanistan and the subsequent increase in the amount of narco-trafficking through Central Asia to Russia and Europe further strained Russia’s relationship with the Taliban.
However, Russia’s opinion of the Taliban changed after it concluded that the US and NATO missions did not see the fight against the drug economy as a priority. The major turn came after 2012 as Putin sought to reignite Russia’s imperialist posture, leading to growing discontent with the US and its allies over Ukraine and Syria. Accordingly, Moscow befriended the Taliban to undermine the NATO mission in Afghanistan and to later counter the growing threat of the Islamic State. According to Putin’s envoy for Afghanistan, “the Afghan and Pakistani Taliban have said they don’t recognize [Abu Bakr] al-Baghdadi as the caliph; that is very important.” A Taliban source confirming that the Russian support intended to jeopardize the US and NATO, told Agence France-Presse (AFP) that Russian intelligence helped them recapture the Kunduz City—the first provincial capital to fall in the hands of the Taliban since they were ousted from power in 2001. The US believes the group also receives funding and weapons from Moscow, a claim Russian officials have rebuffed.

In the regional stage, Russia is a patron to Afghanistan’s northern neighbors in Central Asia and a close ally of China’s, India’s and Iran’s. Moscow’s recent efforts to make amends with Islamabad completes its mission to engage all regional parties interested in Afghanistan. Recently, the two countries carried out their first ever joint military exercise, much to the chagrin of Pakistan’s arch-rival and Moscow’s ally, India. Moscow also lifted its arms embargo on Pakistan in 2014 and is expected to deliver four Mi-35H helicopters to Islamabad in 2017. This new friendship was on display last year during the Heart of Asia summit in India when Putin’s Af-Pak envoy, Zamir Kabulov, publically defended Pakistan against harsh criticism from Indian Prime Minister, Narendra Modi, and Afghan President, Ashraf Ghani, for harboring terrorism.
However, there is a major caveat in Moscow’s Afghanistan policy: Russia supports the Taliban while maintaining close ties with the Kabul Administration—equipping the Afghan National Army (ANA) with Mi-35M gunships and assault rifles. The ultimate fight is between the Afghan government and Taliban, not between the Taliban and ISIS. Russian support to the Taliban bolsters their capabilities primarily against the Afghan Army and its western partners, rather than against ISIS. With the ANA paralyzed by a strengthened Taliban, the threat of extremism in the region—and ISIS to Russia—will only become larger and more imminent, making Moscow a prey of its own hunt.

On the other hand, the Afghan government relies heavily on the US and its European allies for its civilian and military budget. That reliance is set to grow even more with the Trump Administration’s possible deployment of up to 5,000 more troops—in addition to the 8,500 US forces currently in the country—to train and advise the Afghan Army at a roughly $23 billion annual cost. Were the Russian-Taliban cooperation to continue or even expand, Kabul will need to rethink its relationship with Moscow.

As it ramps up its presence in Afghanistan, Russia looks determined to ensure that its recent history repeats itself, not to mention the litany of non-Russian failed conquests in the country. In early 20th century, the British Empire and the Tsarist Russia engaged in a protracted rivalry known as the ‘Great Game’ to control Afghanistan, neither of them with much luck. A century later, the US and NATO, despite their
massive spending and protracted campaigns, remain in a stalemate that shows no sign of abetting. Russia’s reengagement in Afghanistan will be a bold move beyond its traditional sphere of influence in Eastern Europe and Central Asia and a rite of passage, in a way, for Putin to cross the Amu Darya southward, a walk his Soviet predecessors did not survive.
The Dodik Sanctions
Questions About Unilateral US Sanctions Against the Republika Srpska

By Emily Gray

It has been six months since the Obama administration signed its last sanctions into effect. These sanctions were not placed on any of the usual Obama-era suspects, but rather against Milorad Dodik, president of the Republika Srpska (Bosnia and Herzegovina’s Serb-majority entity). On the surface, these sanctions make sense: the US government determined that the culmination of President Dodik’s actions represent a serious threat to peace and security in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH). Yet the Bosnian Serb leader has been threatening to hold a secession referendum for years—the actual enactment of US sanctions in January 2017 were precipitated by the “illegal” celebration of a holiday and a false invitation to Trump’s inauguration in Washington D.C. Dig a little deeper, and the complexities underlying the unilateral US sanctions on Dodik raise questions about their effectiveness.

Initially a moderate supported by the US and EU, Dodik has become the leader of the nationalist-protectionist social mobilization in the Republika Srpska (RS) with his claims that the
central Bosnian state has continually overreached its power, threatening and discriminating against the Serb people. The Dayton Accords—which ended the Bosnian War in 1995 and still function as the country’s constitution—established a post-war government akin to a federal system with two semi-autonomous entities (the Republika Srpska and the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina) under a central state government. In 2015, Dodik declared that a referendum on the secession of the Republika Srpska from this central state would take place in 2018. Although he has since backed down, Dodik’s most recent challenge to the state (his loudest thus far) made many diplomats rethink their assurance of Bosnia’s quasi-stability.

The recent challenge is over the official RS holiday Dan Republike Srpske, or Day of the Republika Srpska, on January 9th. On this day in 1992, after the former Yugoslav republic of Bosnia had decided to declare its independence, Bosnian Serbs insisted on remaining part of the then Serb-dominated Yugoslavia, infamously founding the Republika Srpska and taking a significant step towards war. The existence of this holiday twenty years following the end of the Bosnian War—and
the current fight to keep it alive—highlights the fundamental, unresolved disagreement between Bosnian citizens over territorial integrity, separation of power, and the creation of Bosnian national identity.*

Thus, the holiday is controversial: many non-Serb Bosnian citizens believe that the Republika Srpska was founded on violence and genocide, and the holiday is a symbol of this history. Because Dan Republike coincides with the Serbian Orthodox holiday St. Stephen’s Day, in 2015 the Constitutional Court of BiH ruled for the second time that the official celebration of Dan Republike was unconstitutional on the grounds that it discriminated against non-Serb citizens living within the territory. Because entities legally have the power to create and celebrate their own holidays, Dan Republike could be celebrated on another day, but not on a religious holiday unique to Serbian Orthodox Christianity.† The Republika Srpska refused to change the date. Echoing a common Serb criticism of the Court’s structure, that its Bosniak (Bosnian Muslim) judges are often able to outvote judges from other nationalities, President Dodik said in November, 2015 that “the Constitutional Court of Bosnia and Herzegovina is nothing but a Muslim court against Serbs.”2 On January 9, 2016, the holiday was “illegally”

* It is a question for another article as to whether the Constitutional Court’s rulings on the holiday and the referendum as unconstitutional are politically-motivated. What is clear here is that existing legal tools are being used as a band aid for deeper fundamental structural questions regarding territorial integrity and separation of powers.

† Whether or not this stated reason does, in fact, discriminate against other groups or make the holiday unconstitutional, this argument held up in the Constitutional Court whereas broader arguments based on the holiday’s implicit symbolism do not.
celebrated in the Republika Srpska, and no action was taken to stop it.\textsuperscript{‡} This was a clear indication that the Bosnian state and the international community lacked the ability to control the RS: if the Serbs in the RS wanted to celebrate the holiday, neither the Bosnian state nor the international community had any means of preventing them. Clearly torn over how or whether to address the issue, the international community took no punitive action of any kind against Dodik in 2016.

In an attempt to demonstrate legitimacy through popular support for the holiday, Dodik held a \textit{Dan Republike} referendum in September, 2016 despite severe condemnation from the state and the international community. Meanwhile, Dodik and his party were using intense rhetoric and media messaging to encourage support among their population: in July, just a few months prior to the referendum, the deputy speaker of the RS parliament declared, “Continuation in marking January 9th as Statehood Day, and the referendum to be held to this end, is the only possible response and a way for the existence and survival of the Serbs in Bosnia.”\textsuperscript{3} Although contested (and unmonitored by the Central Election Commission), the referendum had a turnout of 55.67%, in which 99.81% of voters voted in favor of celebrating the holiday; it was made an official secular entity holiday shortly thereafter.\textsuperscript{4} Dodik’s party, SNSD, experienced victories in local elections held a week later, causing some to speculate that the holiday was really about securing Dodik’s party’s place in the government.\textsuperscript{5} Although one might assume that all Bosnian Serbs were thrilled by these events, the reality of the situation in the RS was one of discomfort, tension, and fear. People there are aware of the risks inherent in such political acts.

\textsuperscript{‡} Celebration of the prohibited Dan Republike 2016 was, in fact, very much encouraged by the entity’s government. In the capital Banja Luka, for example, the city posted official notices on the doors of residential buildings encouraging citizens to display Serbian and Republika Srpska flags from their homes on the holiday.
Nevertheless, the *Dan Republike* preparations began. For weeks leading up to January 9th, billboards around the entity bearing Republika Srpska colors (red, white, and blue) read, “Right to celebrate” in reference to the holiday. In the RS “capital” Banja Luka, each lamppost down the entire main street flew not only one large RS flag, but also two medium-sized flags and a string of small flags hanging from post to post across the width of the street. The Constitutional Court condemned the celebration of *Dan Republike*, and the Bosnian government, the US, the EU, and the High Representative Valentin Inzko also strongly denounced the “illegal” referendum, its disputed results, and the planned celebrations. The unease among citizens was palpable, particularly in light of claims made by Bosniak politicians threatening military action. Finally, in defiance of the Constitutional Court’s nullification of the referendum results, on January 9, 2017 Serbs across Bosnia finally celebrated *Dan Republike* with flags and parties, and the government held an official parade. Dodik declared to a crowd that day, “The Serb Republic is determined to live its life as a state.”

Dodik’s challenge clearly goes beyond a holiday: it is an attempt to assert the independent power and autonomy of the RS against the Bosnian state (in the guise of democracy). Furthermore, this comes on the heels of a year in which the RS denied war crimes and officially rejected the results of the national Census. Looking at the facts in isolation, some action on the part of the US government to prevent the escalation of a separatist movement following *Dan Republike* 2017—arguably the most significant challenge to the existing peace in the past twenty years—seems justified. And, in fact, eight days after this holiday, the US government put sanctions on Dodik. Taking advantage of a class of sanctions already on the books, the 2003 “Balkan Sanctions,” the US was able to easily freeze Dodik’s US
assets and property and forbid him from conducting business with Americans by naming him an individual who has “actively obstructed or pose[s] a significant risk to actively obstructing the Dayton Accords.”7 This language is repeated in official statements made by John Smith of the Office of Foreign Assets Control and Ambassador to BiH Maureen Cormack, both of whom make clear that the US is committed to the territorial integrity of BiH as well as its continued European integration, and that Dodik threatens both.8 President Trump extended these sanctions in June 2017, removing any doubt that he would show a more tolerant face towards corrupt or autocratic Balkan leaders.

Also in June, an announcement from Dodik appeared to demonstrate the success of these sanctions: the president told Politico that he would no longer plan to hold a secession referendum in 2018, as he believes that it “would cause many reactions” and claims, “[W]e still want to build up the momentum to have it legitimiz[ed] as our right.”9 He called Bosnia a failing state and indicated that the RS was simply biding its time until it was ready for independence or unification with Serbia. Despite this apparent victory for those who believe in the territorial integrity of BiH, just six days later, Dodik had returned to talking about holidays: at a press conference, he stated that the Republika Srpska had “no place in Bosnia and Herzegovina” if the Constitutional Court of BiH decides, in response to a complaint made by RS legislators, that BiH’s nation-wide March 1 Independence Day and November 25 Statehood Day are constitutional.10 Regional and international media reported this as a swiftly renewed threat of secession.

Dodik’s challenge clearly goes beyond a holiday: it is an attempt to assert the independent power and autonomy of the RS against the Bosnian state.
One interpretation of these events might be that the US sanctions have had a coercive effect. This is unlikely to be the case. Not only is Dodik’s latest declaration not an admission of defeat or a change in policy, but in fact, it has probably occurred in spite of the US action. It is telling that no commentator on the topic attributed the success to the US or its sanctions. Europe’s diplomatic influence (by way of Serbia) and Russia’s lack of financial support are likely to be far more significant in Dodik’s calculus, and they may produce some short term positive impact on regional stability. US sanctions, on the other hand, are likely to be counterproductive for US interests and risk wider consequences.

The fact that the Bosnian state has failed to maintain the rule of law over Dodik and that the international community has been unwilling to act in response delegitimizes their presumed authority.

The enactment of sanctions is no guarantee that they will have their desired effect. One reason for this is that sanctions are known to be more effective when they include a coalition of actors who can apply more significant financial pressure on the individual. When the US initially took unilateral action in spite of the sanctions’ anticipated backlash, it was clear that no other international partners would join them in this. This has the potential to be counterproductive with respect to overall US policy goals in Bosnia because their potential failure could threaten US legitimacy there. Unilateral sanctions may ultimately fail for two reasons. First, they may not have a huge impact on Dodik’s assets if they are not located in the US, as he claims. American diplomats say that Dodik likely has assets in banks that are partially owned by American financial institutions, and he will be unable to touch assets in those
accounts. Dodik’s patterns of interaction with the US have actually been forced to change as a result of the sanctions. He can no longer personally spend millions of dollars lobbying Washington to improve the image of RS and build economic relations, for example. Instead, Dodik has merely operated through his party colleagues in order to pay $1.5 million to the RS Office for Cooperation, Trade, and Investment, a quasi-RS “embassy” office located in Washington, D.C., and to the US lobbying firm Picard Kentz & Rowe LLP to get the sanctions lifted. It remains to be seen whether the sanctions’ financial impact on Dodik has actually impacted his behavior or whether it will produce any kind of lasting change.

The second reason these may not be impactful is that they belie division amongst the international community regarding policy towards the RS. If Europe were to join the sanctions, the action would present a united front from the international community even more significant than crippling financial pressure. Such a public joint condemnation would demonstrate to Dodik and to his supporters that everyone was watching him, and no one would let his behavior slide by unnoticed. Instead, the Europeans appear to have taken a different tactic as opposed to sanctions— influence through Serbia. Following Serbia’s presidential elections and the nomination of the new Prime Minister, Ana Brnabic, and her cabinet, as well as the opening of new EU accession chapters for Serbia and increased European focus on the region over the past months, the pro-EU rhetoric coming from the Serbian government has strengthened noticeably. The signals from Serbia, and possibly the direct messages to Dodik from Vucic, are that Serbia is willing to cast aside the Bosnian Serbs for the EU. Thus, the EU has a different channel through which to influence Bosnia which does not involve US-led sanctions. Whether this type of division on strategy and message is ben-
eficial to the international community’s goals in Bosnia remains to be seen; on its own, the US threat appears not to be a credible one.

If the sanctions have a lackluster impact or are sidelined by EU policies, they are then likely to be counterproductive to US interests in Bosnia because they may catalyze backlash against the US. The American role in the Bosnian War and the US-led NATO bombing of Belgrade in 1999 already allow Serb leaders to construe the United States as an enemy among Bosnian Serbs today. Dodik has given every indication that he believes there is very little that can stop him from challenging the authority of the Bosnian state in the name of protecting Serbs. He publicly dismissed sanctions entirely: “I am proud,” he said, “and these sanctions are proof that I was not ready to trade off with the interests of Republika Srpska.” He has called for Ambassador Cormack to be declared persona non grata in Bosnia. Bosnian political analyst Srdjan Susnica told Reuters that the sanctions “will only strengthen his image of the Serb leader, which could have far reaching consequences.
if he presses ahead with the idea of secession and some announcement that he might form his own police and army.” Political analysts Zarija Seizovica and Ivana Maric comment that these actions serve only to promote politicians’ own success in elections—however this in and of itself is concerning, as it indicates a public responsive to such claims. Even if the sanctions are working, in conditions such as these, Dodik can always claim that other forces were more influential in changing his behavior. While Europe’s tactics appear to be having some impact (if short-term), the US policy seems to primarily serve to create this backlash.

Perhaps most importantly, the international and domestic political climate assures Dodik that nothing will happen to him in the long run. The fact that the Bosnian state has failed to maintain the rule of law over Dodik and that the international community has been unwilling to act with definitive response delegitimizes its presumed authority. After the sanctions on Dodik, Bosnian Croats made declarations that they also plan to seek independence from Bosnia and Herzegovina, indicating that the sanctions have had an emboldening effect on nationalist politicians in general. Moreover, the support from Serbia and Russia (the two natural “protectors” of the RS) allows politicians to create an “us vs. them” mentality amongst the people of the Republika Srpska. Russia in particular has consistently supported the right of the Bosnian Serbs to secede, with Putin referring to the 2016 referendum as “the right of the people.” Although recent meetings between Dodik and Russian officials have indicated that little financial or investment support from their Slavic brothers is forthcoming, the cultural narrative runs strong. This may help to explain why Dodik can safely continue his strong rhetoric and simultaneously back down from secession claims.
This all puts the US and EU in a difficult position regarding policy options: both action and inaction risk wider destabilization. The US decision to sanction Dodik is counterproductive for this exact reason: by imposing sanctions that have a slim chance of seeing success, both practically and politically, the US isn’t just risking a failed set of sanctions—it’s risking a failed reputation and therefore a potential host of unintended consequences in the Republika Srpska. Dodik’s change of heart regarding the secession referendum was more likely a product of the actors, Serbia and Russia, who utilized their political leverage in a way that Dodik had no choice but to respond to, than it was one of US-imposed limits on his finances. Dodik’s rhetoric, therefore, can continue to villainize the US, increasing the probability that future action taken will be deemed illegitimate by Bosnian Serbs. US policy towards the RS needs to anticipate the fears and demands that its residents have demonstrated through events such as the referendum. It must acknowledge that although these feelings are the result of social mobilization by a leader who threatens stability, they are nevertheless real and thus need to be accounted for when designing coercive policy measures. Furthermore, this highlights the need for greater policy coordination—if the international players in the region cannot unite behind an effective strategy, a new political reality in BiH will be forced upon them by the future actions of political leaders in the state. And if the US cannot help foster this unified policy, it must justify that the benefits of its unilateral actions against Milorad Dodik outweigh the risks.
WHO’s Responsible?
A Retrospective Analysis of the World Health Organization’s Response to the 2014 Ebola Pandemic

By Carly Houlahan

Global health analysts have characterized the World Health Organization’s (WHO) response to the 2014 Ebola outbreak as “woefully inadequate” and a plain “failure.”¹ The most recent Ebola outbreak began in West Africa in 2013; for the next two years, it exposed the deep inadequacies of national and international institutions responsible for protecting the public from the social, economic, and political consequences of infectious disease outbreaks.² Considering the inevitability of a subsequent Ebola outbreak, it is crucial to deconstruct the deficiencies of WHO’s 2014 response. In order to adequately scrutinize these efforts, this review will address the characteristics of the most recent outbreak that made it particularly lethal, WHO’s repeated failure to intervene, and recommendations WHO can implement moving forward to amend past weaknesses. In order to prepare for future pandemics, WHO must mobilize international support, amend its internal governance structure, and re-direct its scope towards outbreak resolution and prevention.
An Analysis of the Ebola Strain

Since 1976 Ebola has wreaked havoc on the African continent, resulting in 27 virulent outbreaks. The Ebola virus is a severe, often fatal, disease that originated near the Ebola River in the Democratic Republic of the Congo in 1976. Experts claim that fruit bats were the original vectors of the Ebola virus. The virus spreads through contact with blood, secretions, organs, or other bodily fluids. Unlike other virulent agents, Ebola is not transmitted through the air. Therefore, individuals must be symptomatic to be contagious. The Ebola Virus that circulated West Africa in 2014 was not new; however, it killed more people than all the previous Ebola outbreaks combined.

Virulence Analysis

Sequencing data shows that the 2014 outbreak in West Africa was traced to the most virulent strain of Ebola, known as Zaire Ebola Virus or EBOV. EBOV is the deadliest member of Filoviridae family, surpassing Sudan (SUDV), Tai Forest (TAFV), Bundibugyo (BDBV), and Reston (RESV) sub-types. Although this strain of Ebola is known to be more virulent, the mutation rate associated with the 2014 Ebola Virus Disease (EVD) outbreak was surprisingly low. Additionally, the fatality rates of the 2014 EVD outbreak were not unique; however, the sheer number of EBOV cases in the 2014 outbreak was astoundingly high. In the past outbreaks, the number of contracted cases has presided within the hundreds. The 2014 outbreak witnessed around 28,616 cases. Considering the 2014 strain did not have unusual rates of mutation or fatality, the abnormally large number of Ebola cases must be attributed to an alternate factor.
Although the mutation and fatality rates of the 2014 EVD outbreak generally reflected those of previous epidemics, the geographic range and focal concentration of the most recent outbreak were entirely unique. Prior to the most recent outbreak, EVD epidemics were concentrated in the DRC, Gabon, Sudan, Zaire, and Uganda. None of the 23 prior epidemics involved concurrent EVD episodes occurring in multiple nations. The 2014 EVD outbreak was concentrated in Guinea, Sierra Leone, and Liberia and spread to seven other nations and three continents. This outbreak was therefore the first to reach pandemic status. The 2014 EVD outbreak was also unique in its duration; no prior EVD epidemic lasted more than several months. The 2013-2016 pandemic dragged on for two years and four months. Additionally, this was the first EVD outbreak where patients contracted EVD in urban areas. Previous EVD outbreaks largely impacted rural and forested areas. The high density of Liberia’s and Sierra Leone’s capitals facilitated in the rapid transmission of Ebola. These factors resulted in the need for a prompt, comprehensive international response.

Phase I: Inadequate Investments in Health Infrastructures

The initial phase of the Ebola pandemic is underscored by inadequate investments in health infrastructures. The first infections occurred in a remote area in Guinea where no outbreaks of Ebola had previously been identified. The lack of capacity in Guinea to detect the virus is a crucial factor in the spread of Ebola across borders to Sierra Leone and Liberia. Per capita health spending in Guinea, Liberia, and Sierra Leone has been...
relatively low, contributing to poor conditions of publicly funded health facilities. Human resource constraints are particularly acute among healthcare providers in the affected countries. In Sierra Leone, there are fewer than two health workers per every 10,000 people. However, the control of Ebola is incredibly labor and resource intensive due to the excessive need for containment measures (isolation facilities, protective equipment, and expertise in EVD case handling). As the 2014 Ebola outbreak intensified, many local health workers abandoned their posts, citing both unsafe conditions and frustration over payment. Local staff at health centers in Liberia complained of over three months without pay. WHO estimates that a facility treating 70 Ebola patients needs at least 250 healthcare workers. The health care facilities in the affected countries were chronically understaffed and underpaid.

Phase I: Organizational Weakness

Currently, one of WHO’s greatest organizational challenges is that it is grossly underfunded and has little control over its
Since 2012, WHO’s biennial budget has decreased 12% to less than $4 billion. Of the overall budget, nearly 80% of WHO’s funds are provided by member-states for specific projects designated by donors. This means that the allocation of the majority of WHO’s budget is pre-determined. In instances of public health emergencies, WHO must therefore ask for donations from member-states, further slowing response time. For these reasons, WHO’s annual budget is not the solution for the underfunding in Sierra Leone, Liberia, and Guinea.

**Phase I: Recommendation**

However, WHO is in a unique position to steer the overall direction of epidemic response. According to the Harvard-LSHTM Independent Panel on the Global Response to Ebola, it is in WHO’s power to convene governments and other major stakeholders to begin developing a clear global strategy to ensure that governments invest in building core capacities to mobilize adequate external support to supplement efforts in poorer countries. After the disastrous events of the 2014 Ebola pandemic, the United States Government committed $1 billion to build core capacities in 30 emerging markets, including Guinea, Sierra Leone, and Liberia. Additionally, regional and sub-regional actors such as the African Development Bank must invest in the infrastructural backbone for laboratories, information systems, and training. WHO must leverage this momentum in order to ensure that the required
monetary support is designated towards the establishment of critical infrastructures and core capacities in countries like Sierra Leone, Liberia, and Guinea prior to the next pandemic.

**Phase II: A Lack of Mobilization**

The second phase of the 2014 EVD pandemic is marked by WHO’s failure to mobilize despite clear evidence that the outbreak had overwhelmed national and non-governmental capacities. This failure is associated with WHO’s fractured system of governance. In March of 2014, health workers struggled to control the spread of Ebola, lacking the proper drugs, vaccines, diagnostic tests, and protective gear to properly combat the potency of the agent. Despite Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) warnings regarding the unprecedented scope of the outbreak, WHO publicly characterized the epidemic as “relatively small.” WHO’s global Alert and Response Network sent a small team to support national efforts; however, WHO withdrew this team from Guinea and Liberia when cases reportedly decreased in May. In late May, Sierra Leone became the third country to declare an Ebola outbreak to WHO. There was a clear disconnect between the level of need on the ground and WHO’s response. In retrospect, WHO attributes this disconnect to a failure of communication.

**Phase II: Organizational Weakness**

This disconnect can be traced to a lack of internal cohesion within WHO. The organization’s regional framework does not support accountability. WHO is composed of six semi-autonomous regional offices. Historically, Directors were elected
by regional governments through a process of political “horse-trading” rather than on a basis of expertise.\textsuperscript{11} Within the current election process, WHO’s Regional Committees nominates their Regional Directors, with the Executive Board rubber-stamping their appointments.\textsuperscript{12} This process makes Regional Directors accountable first to their region’s health ministers, rather than to headquarters.\textsuperscript{12}

The WHO Regional Office for Africa is therefore quasi-independent from the Geneva secretariat with limited accountability to the center.\textsuperscript{12} During the most recent Ebola pandemic, WHO’s regional office did not convene health ministers or open a regional coordination center until three months after Ebola was confirmed in Guinea.\textsuperscript{12} The delay of WHO’s Regional Office in Africa was associated with concerns over political opposition from West African leaders, the creation of mass hysteria, or the potential of economic ramifications.\textsuperscript{12} According to Bruce Aylward, WHO’s Assistant Director-General, international partners began to believe that WHO was “compromising rather than aiding the mission.” \textsuperscript{12}

### Phase II: Recommendation

According to the findings of the independent panel, the best way for WHO to restore its international credibility is to seize this short window of opportunity to reform WHO’s internal structure.\textsuperscript{12} During this period of reform, WHO must establish an “Inspector General’s office” to monitor the overall performance of the organization and its entities.\textsuperscript{12} In line with a re-formed approach to human resources, the panel also suggests
that all upcoming leadership selection (both at headquarters and regionally) must be based upon personal and technical merits.\textsuperscript{12} Other suggestions include a return to WHO’s constitutional origins, whereby the Executive Board appoints regional directors.\textsuperscript{12} Within this model, a search committee creates a short-list of candidates using transparent selection criteria. Ultimately, both of these reform models strive to create a system that elects qualified regional directors who are accountable to the headquarters and committed to global priorities.\textsuperscript{12}

Phase III: Too Little Too Late

The third and final opportunity for intervention within the 2014 Ebola pandemic is underscored by WHO’s unstable financial model.\textsuperscript{12} Media attention and public interest substantially increased as two infected American public aid workers were evacuated from Liberia.\textsuperscript{12} Hysteria led to the quarantine of public aid workers in the United States as they returned from overseas. On August 7th, 2014 WHO convened the International Health Regulations Emergency Committee, and the next day the Director-General declared the Ebola outbreak to be a public health emergency of global concern. However, despite an increase in mobilization and international attention, the operation commenced slowly. It took months for funding, personnel, and other resources to reach the affected countries.\textsuperscript{12}

Phase III: Organizational Weakness

One of WHO’s greatest vulnerabilities is that it is subject to the whims of donors. After the 2008 financial crisis hit, WHO
experienced a significant decline in resources, including a 20% staff reduction and a $500 million budget shortfall.\textsuperscript{11} WHO eliminated more than 300 jobs in the outbreak and crisis response programs.\textsuperscript{13} WHO’s hands remained tied as 80% of its funding is from voluntary contributions and 91% is earmarked for specific activities.\textsuperscript{13} The Ebola pandemic is further proof that mobilizing funds after a crisis strikes is largely ineffective.\textsuperscript{13} It is also a reminder of WHO’s failure to implement the 2011 IHR Review Committee Recommendation for a standing $100 million contingency fund to be released in a declared emergency. Instead, should tragedy strike or disease ensue, WHO must request donations from member-states, further slowing the response time.\textsuperscript{13} The organization’s small budget and lack of control over spending render WHO unprepared to respond in an adequate fashion to a global health emergency.
Phase III: Recommendation

In order to cut cost and regain trust, WHO should substantially scale back its range of activities to focus on core functions, such as the containment of infectious disease outbreaks. Considering the instability of WHO’s financial model and its reliance on donors, the January 2016 Executive Board should begin a new model based upon financing its core functions. By strictly defining its “core functions” and focusing on “good governance,” the independent panel believes that WHO can convince the member states to shift most of their financing to assessed and non-earmarked voluntary contributions. Although it is certainly true that WHO should focus their attention on outbreak prevention and resolution moving forward, the panel’s recommendation regarding a re-modeling of the budget ignores one important factor that is inherent in the designation of global health funding: global health funding is biased and underwhelming.

Conclusion

Considering the consistency of Ebola outbreaks throughout history and the continuation of deforestation, the chances of another Ebola pandemic are incredibly high. WHO’s primary constitutional mission is to be the “directing and coordinating authority on international health work.” It is clear that the plight of Ebola has only intensified over the years, reaching pandemic status as recently as 2014. During the lulls between outbreaks, WHO must assume the authority it claims within its constitution and champion Ebola response and prevention. In order to prepare for this role, WHO must amend its governance structure and financial model. WHO must also leverage
the current funding momentum and direct it towards building health infrastructures in east and west Africa. Considering WHO is largely reliant on the United States for funding, it is essential that Congress give USAID the funding and flexibility to adequately contribute to international preparedness. The 2014 Ebola pandemic was historically unique; however, it is largely indicative of a new wave of outbreaks to come. One of the largest issues facing international public health is the common misconception that borders can protect us from disease. No matter how much security is instituted at airports, Ebola will find a way—just as Cholera, Malaria, AIDS, and Plague did before it.
The Post-Genocide Transformation of the Rwandan Healthcare System

Lessons for the Healthcare of All People

By Timothy G. Singer and Dr. Andrew Patterson, MD

Four years before the Rwandan Genocide in 1994, a child born in Rwanda could expect to reach their thirty-second birthday.¹ This was the absolute lowest life expectancy in the world. Twenty-two years later, life expectancy in Rwanda is still significantly different from its neighbors in the Great Lakes Region of Africa (GLR)—only now it is for the better. From 1994 to 2015, life expectancy in Rwanda increased by 31 years compared with 8 years on average among Burundi, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Tanzania and Uganda (Figure 1).² Here we explore the unique progress of the Rwandan healthcare sector in the aftermath of the Rwandan Genocide. We argue that by aligning its healthcare priorities with its desired post-genocide identity, Rwanda achieved unique healthcare progress in the Great Lakes Region.

Timothy G. Singer, MD, MSc candidate, Stanford University School of Medicine and Emmett Interdisciplinary Program for the Environment and Resources, Stanford, CA, USA
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When Rwandans spoke of reconstruction and reconciliation, they spoke of the need to liberate themselves from ‘old mentalities’ of colonialism and dictatorship, and from the perfect pecking order of intimidation and obedience that had served as the engine of genocide.³

Philip Gourevitch, *We wish to inform you that tomorrow we will be killed with our families*, 1999

From April through June of 1994, an estimated 800,000 Rwandans were murdered. Even amongst the long list of 20th century atrocities for which the term “genocide” was created to describe, the efficiency and scale of death in Rwanda was unique.⁴ It is widely accepted that the international community failed to intervene to prevent or stem the Rwandan Genocide.³ Therefore, as the ashes settled, leaders of the post-Genocide reconstruction effort did not intend to rely upon international aid to drive recovery and development. Rwandans would forge the new Rwanda themselves. Between 1998-1999 Rwanda’s leaders gathered to engage in a process of deliberate self-reflection about the future of Rwanda. The result of this process was Vision 2020, a plan which detailed the principles and practices

Forging of a New Rwandan National Identity
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*Figure 1: Great Lakes Region life expectancy, 1960 – 2013*
meant to bring Rwanda out from under the long shadow of the genocide, and to transform Rwanda into a socially equitable, middle-income country by 2020. From its opening lines—“How do Rwandans envisage their future? What kind of society do they want to become? How can they construct a united and inclusive Rwandan identity?”—Vision 2020 articulates that the future of social progress in Rwanda would be a manifestation of its national identity. The post-genocide Rwandan identity is perhaps abstract with only identifiable themes. But principal among them, and essential drivers of improving health outcomes, are the identification of individual Rwandans with “Rwandan” nationalism versus tribalism and inclusion in social systems versus exclusion and marginalization.

Three examples of Rwandan healthcare successes illustrate the ways in which efforts to build a new national identity have driven health outcomes: the *Mutuelles de Sante* community based health insurance program, decentralization of the Rwandan health system, and the attraction and leveraging of foreign aid.
Theme 1: Healthcare coverage incentivizes community unity

Article 41, Rwandan Constitution: All citizens have the right and duties relating to health. The State has the duty of mobilizing the population for activities aimed at promoting good health and to assist in the implementation of these activities.7

The Constitution of the Republic of Rwanda, 2005

The national health priorities stated in Vision 2020 focused largely on the development of primary healthcare infrastructure. Subsequent “Health Sector Strategic Plans” in 2005, 2009 and 2012 expanded improvements in community health and specialty areas of medicine, but the early priorities of Vision 2020 were meant to stabilize a health system in disrepair. To align these priorities with broader efforts to foster unity and nationalism, signature programs of the Rwandan healthcare system emphasized community inclusion and basic healthcare coverage. For example, in 2004, Rwanda established Mutuelles de Santé, a “Community-based health insurance” program (CBHI) in order to extend basic health services nationally. This model of healthcare delivery pairs a health insurance package (e.g. what is covered) with the capacity of a community health center to enroll community members. Thus, in accordance with a national priority to extend basic health services to all people, local health centers must enroll community members as their payer base. Community outreach and engagement are therefore critical to the success of the Mutuelles system. Enrollees pay approximately $6 per year plus a 10% service fee per visit to a health center or hospital.8 The poorest are exempt from premiums and approximately 91% of Rwandans are reportedly enrolled.9 The system is far from perfect as service packages at local health facilities are limited and out-of-pocket costs for health expenditures can be prohibitively expensive.
Yet, overall, healthcare utilization and health status are significantly greater for those with coverage compared to those without. In 2017, Rwanda remains the only GLR country with a national health insurance system, and one of few globally that has successfully implemented a CBHI on such a broad scale.

Theme 2: Decentralization strategies empower locals for community and national health gains

In Rwanda, we have found that empowering local leaders, while demanding accountability, is an effective catalyst for development.


The driving theme of decentralization is that the national government empowers lower tiers of government to lead development. This is a strategy that has been employed for decades throughout the GLR, with varying levels of success. Specifically, what stands out upon closer examination of examples’ success and failures of decentralization in healthcare throughout the GLR are themes of individual engagement toward a greater national aim in Rwanda compared with fractiousness and difficulty with engagement elsewhere in the GLR. The relative success of decentralization in Rwanda illustrates how the emerging Rwandan identity is helping to drive improved health outcomes.

Tanzania adopted a decentralization approach in its health sector in 1982. Over time layers of bureaucracy and the high cost of maintaining this system undermined its clinical efficacy. An initial early success of the Tanzania decentralization program had been its community health worker (CHWs) program comprised volunteers charged with working on the front line of public health to carry out health surveillance and de-
livery of basic medicine. Yet, in 2006, the Tanzania Ministry of Health and Social Welfare (MOHSW) decided to officially end its decentralization policy citing bureaucratic difficulty and inefficiencies managing a decentralized community healthcare worker program. In turn the policy of decentralization was replaced by a hybrid “centralization-decentralization.” In this model programs such as vaccination campaigns, distribution of medications for communicable diseases (e.g. HIV and TB), and healthcare workforce training are under the direction of the central government and carried out in periodic campaigns.

Similarly in the conflict-ridden DRC and Burundi, decentralizing the healthcare systems has faced substantial challenges. For example, in 2004 the DRC established a “Minimum Partnership Program for Transition and Recovery” that aimed to strengthen decentralization in the healthcare system. However, this system has been largely ineffective due to lack of government coordination between donors and the public sector. Likewise, Burundi struggles to manage its healthcare system as funding constraints and a highly tenuous political climate significantly delay healthcare sector reform.

A notable decentralization success in the GLR is seen in the case of Uganda, which began its program in 1994. However, the results are uneven, as rural populations have continued to be underserved in the decentralized schema. For example, even in light of strong gains in national anti-retroviral (ART) coverage for HIV treatment, which in 2010 was estimated to be 53.5 nationally, ART coverage in some areas among adults

---

The emerging themes of the new Rwandan identity – nationalism and inclusion – have enabled the success of decentralized health programming in Rwanda.
was as low as 10% and 2% among children. For comparison, one study of ART coverage from the same time period reports that 44% of children in rural Rwanda were covered.19

The process of decentralization has taken a markedly different course in Rwanda. Perhaps the most poignant example of its success is the national Community Health Worker (CHWs) program. CHWs are elected by their villages in teams of four and are unpaid. There are two general CHWs (binome), one social affairs CHW (CHSA) and one maternal and infant CHW (Anamatrice de Santé Maternelle, ASM). By 2013, an estimated 60,000 CHWs were working in Rwanda.20 No other country in the region boasts a coordinated front-line healthcare workforce. In 2017, Rwanda is the only CHW program in the GLR with 100% of municipalities covered.21 The emerging themes of the new Rwandan identity—nationalism and inclusion—have enabled the success of decentralized health programming in Rwanda and in turn brought about improvements in health outcomes compared with other GLR countries.
Theme 3: Attraction of international aid coupled with national spending accelerates healthcare gains

In Rwanda, we are on course to meet all the MDG targets. But for us the MDGs are a floor, not a ceiling.\textsuperscript{22}


In September, 2000, world leaders convened in New York for the ratification of the Millennium Declaration. Contained within this Declaration were eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) “to free our fellow men, women and children from the abject and dehumanizing conditions of extreme poverty.”\textsuperscript{23} Notably, the Rwandan Vision 2020 planning process coincided with the Millennium Summit. Paul Kagame was in attendance in New York. Since that time, official Rwandan reports include a table displaying progress with respect to both the MDG and Vision 2020.” Yet, in many instances the Rwandan goals are more ambitious than the MDGs. As Kagame noted before the U.N. General Assembly in September 2013, “In Rwanda, we are on course to meet all the MDG targets. But for us the MDGs are a floor, not a ceiling.”\textsuperscript{24}

The role of foreign aid has been significant but not dominant in driving this progress. In the immediate aftermath of the genocide, Rwanda received a marked spike in international aid. Yet by 1996 aid per capita in Rwanda returned to levels on par with its neighbors (Figure 2).\textsuperscript{25} Thus, while foreign aid for healthcare in the years leading up to the Millennium Summit was not significantly different per capita among GLR regions, Rwanda’s steady health gains in the early 2000s served as a signal to donors of its seriousness in achieving health system development. Accordingly, as the perception (and reality)
of Rwanda’s commitment to health took root, aid began to steadily rise with Rwanda surpassing all other nations in per capita aid in 2004. This influx of aid has not only enabled Rwanda to focus on international health objectives set forth in the MDGs but also to direct international funding towards its own healthcare priorities. As former Rwandan Minister of Health Dr. Agnes Bingawaho and Dr. Paul Farmer noted in a 2014 article in the *Lancet*, Rwanda has channeled the majority of foreign aid directly through its public health system and increased its own government expenditure on healthcare over time.\(^{26}\) Effectively, Rwanda doubled down; increasing the aid it was attracting for healthcare and increasing the contribution from its own coffers. Since 2010, Rwanda has spent the highest amount per capita of any country in the GLR on healthcare (Figure 3).\(^{27}\) The benefit ultimately has been to the Rwandan people. Rwanda was the only country in the GLR on track to reach each of the health specific MDGs at the end of 2015.\(^{28}\)
Conclusion: Rwandan Healthcare Progress Post-Genocide, Lessons for the healthcare of all people

Out of the ashes of Genocide, Rwandans have sought to forge a new Rwandan identity and in doing so, build a new Rwanda. By objective measures the progress has been remarkable. Here we have argued that the quest for a new identity has brought about health gains that have transformed Rwanda from the country with the poorest health outcomes in the Great Lakes Region in 1994, to the country with the best today. To achieve this, Rwanda’s strategy has emphasized inclusion and ambition. National health efforts have both reinforced the emerging national identity and become its manifestation: unity and progress. Through expansion of healthcare access, decentralized local empowerment and aggressive health financing Rwanda has demonstrated that prioritizing healthcare bolsters national cohesion and wellbeing, an example for nations wealthy and poor alike.
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Thinking About Truth in the Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia

By Alina Petra Utrata

The Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia (ECCC) is one of several international tribunals and special courts established since the 1990s. The proliferation of international tribunals in the past two decades has been driven by the potential political benefits of these courts, which inter alia acknowledging the truth about mass atrocities. As American diplomat, Madeleine Albright, proclaimed: “Truth is the cornerstone of the rule of law... And it is only the truth that can cleanse the ethnic and religious hatreds and begin the healing process.” ¹ Albright and other members of the international community often claim that these courts bring “truth and justice,” that societies and individuals “need to know the truth,” and that “truth heals.”² However, it is not always entirely clear what “truth” means in the context of transitional justice or what truth brings to countries and societies that have suffered massive atrocities, such as Cambodia under the Khmer Rouge.

The atrocities committed by the Khmer Rouge during their regime from 1975 to 1979 were brutal. The genocidal communist group swept into Phnom Penh in 1975 and emptied the city, part of an attempt to turn back the clock, purify the coun-
try of any corrupting Western influence, and create the perfect communist state. Over the next four years, the Pol Pot regime banned private property, currency, and forcibly relocated Cambodians to communal farms across the countryside. Anyone suspected of possessing intellectualism—demonstrated by speaking a foreign language or wearing glasses—was killed. By the end of 1979, nearly two million people had died.³

Twenty-two years after the Khmer Rouge regime was defeated by Vietnamese troops, the Cambodian government approached the United Nations for assistance in establishing a tribunal to try the senior leaders of the Khmer Rouge. After years of negotiations between the Cambodian government and the UN, the ECCC was created in 2001. The court sits in the domestic Cambodian legal system and applies a mixture of Cambodian and international law. International and Cambodian employees staff the court, with both an international and a national lawyer co-leading the prosecution, defense and civil parties. Considering the value proponents place on truth in the international justice context, this paper will examine the different types of truth that courts, like the ECCC, can provide and its impacts: “truth-telling,” when victims tell their stories; “truth-finding,” when victims discover the truth about what happened to their loved ones; and finally “historical truth,” when the court establishes a historical record.

Truth Through Testimony

The architects of the Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia recognized the value of victim participation in its proceedings and, for this reason, established channels through which Cambodians could be involved in the trials. The ECCC allows for Civil Parties, individuals who have suffered injuries
that are “the direct consequence of the offense [by the defendant],” to participate directly in the proceedings. These Civil Parties are able to “participate in criminal proceedings against those responsible for crimes...by supporting the prosecution; and...seek[ing] collective and moral reparations.”

One of the theories behind victim participation is that individuals receive some sort of benefit or “cathartic value” from telling their story in court, also reflected in the emerging popularity of “testimony therapy.” Victims and nonprofessionals often believe that “simply pouring out the story will solve all their problems...[rooted in] the belief is the fantasy of a violent, cathartic cure which will get rid of the trauma once and for all.” However, the actual evidence surrounding the psychological value of testifying is mixed, with many mental health professionals arguing that testifying in court is just as likely to re-traumatize individuals as it is to provide emotional relief while others arguing that “telling your story” does have psychological benefits.

Regardless, evidence suggests that this type of narrative telling must occur under specific circumstances in order to provide emotional benefits to the victim. Only in situations where the victim can control their environment, is able to tell a cohesive and meaningful narrative, gains validation and respect from the audience, and has an appropriate amount of time after the traumatic event is it likely that victims will receive psychological benefits.

First and foremost, victims must feel they are in control of their environments and are able to tell a cohesive narrative. By intentionally constructing a narrative rather than flashes of traumatic events, victims feel as if they regain control over their story because their experiences are compartmentalized
into a controllable narrative, which they can recall or communicate to others without being re-traumatized. Unfortunately, though, witnesses and Civil Parties do not usually have the opportunity to tell their stories from start to finish because lawyers are seeking specific information to prove the defendant’s guilt or innocence, details which can seem irrelevant and disruptive to the victim’s story. Hav Sophia, who confronted Kang Kek lew, AKA Comrade Duch, about her father’s death in the Tuol Sleng prison, recalls, “When I saw the accused I felt quite tense…he said he wasn’t sure if I was my father’s daughter. That really upset me. Why did he have to say that?”

Additionally, victims need validation from their communities in support of their truth-telling. Judith Herman, a researcher on domestic violence, found that women usually felt the most important objective of criminal proceedings was “acknowledgment of the basic facts of the crime” and that they “wanted their communities to take a clear and unequivocal stand in condemnation [of the perpetrator].” In the Cambodian context, the ECCC is well placed to provide this external valida-
tion in the form of a guilty verdict, and victims may feel validated when the court issues this type of public condemnation.

Notably, however, community validation does not necessarily have to come from a victim’s hometown or neighborhood. In fact, many Civil Parties said that one of the most important parts of their experiences was meeting other Civil Party participants because they provided validation among themselves. Civil Party Martine Lefeuvre said, “The group of civil parties were able to talk to one another...We listened to the stories of others because some of us have the same lawyers. For others we also heard their stories in the group, and it created solidarity, kindness, empathy—that is one of the things I really liked about the process.”

Unfortunately, the conclusion of the Duch trial may have undermined the community and denied validation to many of the victims as the court rejected twenty-four of sixty-six applicants as Civil Parties. These individuals, who had participated as Civil Party applicants throughout the proceedings, were rejected primarily because they failed to prove their connection to the crimes committed by Duch at S-21, and these rejections had severe emotional repercussions. For example, one rejected applicant said, “I feel so exhausted. I feel pain in my head and in my chest. I am here to find justice for my mother, who was killed at S21, but I did not succeed.”

Finally, victims need time. Many psychological studies have found that debriefing trauma in the immediate aftermath of
the event can actually increase the likelihood of developing post-traumatic stress. Indeed, in the years since the Khmer Rouge left power, many individuals said they coped with their trauma by remaining silent. These individuals needed time for the traumatic events to pass before they were able to effectively talk about their stories. Although the ECCC was criticized for being established nearly 20 years after the atrocities of the Pol Pot regime, this may have inadvertently helped the individuals who would be called to testify.

Ultimately, there is value for individuals in telling their stories—but only in certain circumstances. None of these criteria is fundamentally at odds with the structure and goals of a court, and the ECCC has certainly met some of these criteria, if not all. If international lawyers and politicians are dedicated to ensuring that individuals receive some psychological benefit from testifying, they should consider these factors when structuring victim involvement.

**Discovery, Memorialization, and Closure**

In the aftermath of war and genocide, the most important goal for victims is often to discover the fate of their family and friends. This goal is particularly important in Cambodia, where Pol Pot evacuated Phnom Penh and forcibly moved Cambodians to collective farms across the country. The importance of finding the truth about loved ones is usually to provide some sort of symbolic closure for victims. For example, many victims wanted Duch to tell them “where the remains of their loved ones had been interred so that they could gather soil from the spot and perform a proper death ceremony at their homes...and had already created shrines in anticipation.”
Courts, though, are not always the best venue for discovering this type of personal truth. The prosecution and defense are attempting to prove the guilt or innocence of a specific person, and, therefore, focus on presenting evidence to build a case around one defendant rather than providing information on missing persons. Additionally, the defendant often has little incentive to accept responsibility or provide information about specific victims if they feel it will further incriminate them. The case of Duch at the ECCC, however, was unique. At the beginning of his trial, Duch had accepted responsibility for the deaths at S-21 and asked for forgiveness from the victims and their families. Through the Civil Party scheme, many individuals were able to question Duch directly about the fate of their loved ones in S-21. It is unclear whether this type of truth-finding will be possible in future cases. Duch was a single individual to whom victims could identify as the primary culprit responsible for the death of their loved ones. Unlike commanders who often do not know exactly what is going on in the battlefield, Duch kept careful records and had specific information about the prisoners.\(^{20}\)

Although future ECCC cases may not provide victims with answers about their specific loved ones, the court may still contribute to the ultimate aim of symbolic closure, either through personal or traditional rituals.\(^{21}\) Incorporating these symbolic ceremonies may help victims achieve the same sort of sense of justice or closure they would have with a guilty verdict from the ECCC. Including reparations that acknowledge the value of symbolic closure for victims may be an important component of alleviating the psychological suffering of those victims. For example, the reparations ordered in Case 002 were more robust and included, inter alia, a National Remembrance Day project and the construction of a memorial in Phnom Penh to honor victims of forced evacuations.\(^{22}\)
International courts could do more to facilitate the discovery of truth about loved ones or to incorporate cultural traditions to achieve spiritual closure, particularly when deciding upon reparations. More of an effort should be made to incorporate traditions, which may help individuals come to terms with the past and their own trauma.

Former US Ambassador-at-large for War Crimes David Scheffer claimed: “The trial of Duch demonstrated that the Cambodia Tribunal is establishing a historical record of profound importance for the people of that scarred nation and for a global audience.” For Scheffer, one of the important functions of the ECCC was its contribution towards the final type of truth: historical truth.

Proponents of international justice articulate several reasons why establishing historical truth is an important function of
courts: it prevents denials, promotes reconciliation, and ensures that these types of atrocities never happen again. One survey reveals that about 80% of the Cambodian population agreed, “it is important and necessary to know the truth” and that “national reconciliation is not possible without a better understanding of what happened under the Khmer Rouge regime.”

Proponents argue that because historical facts are subjected to the rigors of a judicial examination in court, international tribunals establish an “objective” historical narrative that dispel or refute denials about who and how atrocities were committed. For example, the Khmer Rouge during the 1990s broadcasted on its radio show that “those skeletons at Tuol Sleng, they are purely and simply part of the psychological war waged by Vietnamese in its aggression against Cambodia.” Therefore, proponents argued that when the ECCC issued its verdicts for Khmer Rouge leaders, the factual evidence it cited would dispel the myth about a Vietnamese conspiracy.

However, courts face major challenges in communicating with the public, particularly with rural populations. The first two ECCC cases have taken almost ten years to adjudicate, and the legal proceedings are often confusing for Cambodians to watch or understand. Therefore, effective outreach is an important component of disseminating factual information among the population. TV and radio can be an important component of this—according to survey by TPO, about 50% of respondents said their main source of information about the ECCC was TV and radio, and frequently cited the television show “Duch on Trial.”

Additionally, it is never certain that different communities will accept the legitimacy of international courts, even when they
do hear about the verdicts. Many studies have found that other factors contribute to a population’s acceptance of a verdict, including “political parties, personal loss of status, proximity to conflict, and identification with and need for acknowledgement of one’s national group as victim.” Courts can certainly play a significant function in dispelling denials, but only when their findings are accepted as legitimate and are effectively communicated to the population.

The second argument in favor of establishing historical truth is that it allows nations to acknowledge and move on from the past. UC Berkeley professors Fletcher and Weinstein note that transitional justice scholars argue, “Just as individuals become mired in past traumatic events, so too do societies. Thus, in the conventional vocabulary, trials are a critical mechanism to discover and convey the truth about the horrors of the past and set societies free.”

But it is not always clear than an acknowledgment of the past promotes reconciliation. For instance, one Cambodian explained, “it is true in the Cambodian community—even in my village, the people who killed people in the past—they are still with us, and still live in our community and no one talk about them or why they kill in the past, because that is the past. But now people are talking about them, because everyone is talking about the [Khmer Rouge] and the ECCC, now the people are saying ‘oh he’s a bad man’.” In this context, where tacit silence and acceptance existed between former Khmer Rouge members and the community, talking about the past may have increased the likelihood of violence. Individuals who hear about the ECCC’s condemnation of the Khmer Rouge may now believe those individuals are “bad men,” which may promote violence or acts of retribution.
In the immediate aftermath of conflict, particularly when groups need to co-exist in one space, silence can be an acceptable solution. Time to process and come to terms with atrocities may be necessary before real discussion of the events can happen without inciting violence. One 5th grade student in Cambodia remembered after he was taught a lesson about the Khmer Rouge in 2003, “I was not incensed and did not hold a grudge against the [Khmer Rouge]. I simply thought it was an event that happened long-ago and was meant to remind us of that history.” 31 The idea that society needs time before discussing historical truth is comparable with the fact that individuals need time before debriefing about trauma. 32 Discussions of the genocidal periods might be best left for future generations to grapple.

Finally, proponents argue that teaching future generations about how these atrocities were committed can provide lessons about how to prevent them in the future. 33 The ability of the court to establish historical truth is particularly important in Cambodia because so little is taught about the Pol Pot regime in schools. The Documentation Center in Cambodia
found that in the 2002 edition of Cambodian textbooks, there was no mention of the Khmer Rouge: “the [Pol Pot] regime had disappeared from junior and senior high school texts...the section on modern history was torn out as a result of an intra-government dispute over the treatment of the 1993 elections.”

The ECCC is the perfect vehicle to fill this gap: the facts of the case are established beyond a reasonable doubt, and therefore the verdicts will provide awareness among the general population about crimes during the Khmer Rouge regime.

Implications for Contemporary Courts

Although establishing truth is often lauded as one of the accomplishments of international justice, it is often unclear what truth actually means. There are at least three different types of “truth” a court can provide: truth-telling, truth-finding, and historical truth. Discovering, acknowledging, or telling truth are not inherently beneficial things, but need to be structured properly in order to provide psychological healing to victims.

Some argue that the goals prescribed to the court by the international community, like providing truth, fostering peace, and contributing to reconciliation, are inappropriate functions to ascribe to courts. An international court, like a domestic court, is supposed to prosecute people; that is it. But the fact remains that when the UN Security Council is gridlocked or the international community refuses to intervene in situations of mass atrocities, courts are often the only measure international actors can agree on implementing. They are therefore uniquely placed to be able to achieve political goals the international community cannot. Courts that have been set up to try situations of mass atrocity cannot simply be copies of the domestic legal system, and they cannot ignore their po-
tential to affect politics. They may not be the best mechanism for providing these services to societies, but they may be the only feasible one. Therefore, international courts should think about designing rules of procedures and mechanisms to provide the most positive impact in societies whose crimes they prosecute—including providing truth to communities in ways that will benefit them.

32. Individuals who debrief in the immediate aftermath of trauma have a higher likelihood of developing PTSD.
Innovative Financing Strategies for Local Infrastructure
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Delivering quality infrastructure systems is a problem that every city, region, and country faces. In many cases, technology exists to address a range of issues, but cities still cannot provide adequate access to basic infrastructure. One reason this challenge persists for local governments is the need for large amounts of initial financial capital for construction. Traditional infrastructure financing is becoming insufficient to address growing needs. As this has become a larger obstacle for infrastructure delivery, the opportunities for introducing innovative financing strategies have expanded.

Framing the Problem: Approaching Local Infrastructure

Local infrastructure serves a localized population and is governed by one controlling jurisdiction, unlike regional projects with multiple jurisdictions and a wide range of stakeholders. Even though local governments have limited concerns regarding topography and property rights, they must be cognizant of
infrastructure investments to meet present and future service demand. Additionally, because there is little diversification of assets and portfolios of infrastructure projects (like those of state and national governments), local infrastructure projects are privy to localized economic fluctuations.

**Urbanization**

Numerous reports and studies show that intense urbanization is occurring around the world. Currently 2.3 billion people live in cities and projections show another 2.5 billion population growth in urban centers by 2030.¹ Cities are not only growing in size, but they are also growing in impact. They are the lifeblood of the global economy and responsible for social and environmental movements.² For the first time, more than half of the world’s population lives in cities and more than 80% of the global GDP is generated by cities.³

The top 600 cities around the world are home to 22% of the global population and generate over 50% of global GDP.⁴ Moreover, three quarters of these 600 cities are emerging economies, projected to expand at 1.6 times the global population growth rate. This rapid population growth in localized areas will increase the need for efficient and effective infrastructure systems. Infrastructure must address urbanization issues at the same time as environmental concerns, operations and maintenance issues, financing concerns and incorporation of local and expert knowledge during the project delivery process.
Financing as the Leverage Point

In the past, financing has been used as a way to direct and motivate funding. Agencies are able to tie in contingencies and planning goals with funding allocation. Many times financing is the main constraint for infrastructure development. Regardless of policy decisions and technical design completion, project implementation will not occur without adequate financing. Because of this relationship and the ability for financing to address many of the obstacles listed previously, financing strategies serve as a leverage point for creating more sustainable infrastructure development.

Solution: Addressing the Future of Local Infrastructure Financing

Unlike other goods and services, infrastructure depends on public sector management and action. In competitive marketplaces, individuals engage in transactions at a set price when both the seller and the buyer value the good or service at the same price. Infrastructure is a unique service because it is difficult to quantify all externalities and identify a single or group of customers to pay for these benefits. At the same time, infrastructure is usually a monopoly good and service that does not reap the benefits of market competition. Therefore, financing for traditional infrastructure has fallen under the purview of the government.5

Taxes paid to the government at the local, state/regional, and national level provide funding for yearly capital and operational expenses. Historically, developed countries relied on national agencies to decide which larger, regional capital infrastructure projects will move forward by allocating funds. Developing
countries, with limited tax resources for infrastructure development, rely on multilateral institutions, such as the World Bank, to help identify and craft plans for large infrastructure projects. These traditional methods of infrastructure funding cater to larger projects that impact many stakeholders. Local governments can plan for local infrastructure development, but funding available through traditional means is usually not sufficient for existing operations and maintenance activities, let alone new construction.

Shift from Public Funding

As it has become more and more difficult to rely upon government dollars for infrastructure development, innovative finance has become an option for local governments. Innovative finance shifts away from traditional methods, such as use of tax payer dollars and bank loans, and usually incorporates organizational and contractual innovations to capture value. Additionally, the context of infrastructure development has changed today to allow for more local management and delivery.

Decentralized markets have shifted the focus from national support for local infrastructure towards more local decision making and system implementation. With new modular technologies, it has become easier for local governments to take the responsibility of providing infrastructure. One such modular technology, point-of-use water purification, is allowing households and neighborhoods in urban and peri-urban settings to get easy access to clean water without large investments from government for centralized water sanitation systems.

Urbanization has also increased the need for localized knowledge during infrastructure planning. This has been reflected
in the decentralization of infrastructure funding and the shift of responsibilities from federal government and national agencies to local governments. As a result, local governments have become more robust and segmented to increase capacity and serve constituents. For example, in developing countries, water infrastructure in smaller urban centers is increasingly becoming a responsibility of local committees who develop plans for initial construction and operations and maintenance.7

Innovative Finance shifts away from traditional methods, such as use of tax payer dollars and bank loans, and usually incorporates organizational and contractual innovations to capture value.

Innovative Finance

Innovative finance refers to strategies that look beyond public tax dollars and grants. These strategies are founded in financial principles and collaboration across sectors. The MDGs were approved by the 192 United Nations member states in 2000 and included goals to address water, sanitation, energy infrastructure needs. Traditional financing, the use of debt and equity and public tax dollars, had been the primary focus up until this point. But, two years after the MDGs had been announced, there was still a lack of sufficient funds to address the needs. In 2002 at the International Conference on Financing and Development, the Monterrey consensus was signed by those present as an initiative to develop innovative financing mechanisms as a means to achieve the Millennium Development Goals.8 The principles associated with innovative financing are:
• Scaling-up (ability to encourage more funding from untraditional sources),
• Additionality (seeking supplement funding and not replace traditional sources),
• Complementarity (capitalize on the resources of active stakeholders and not add additional agencies or organizations), and
• Sustainability (reassurance that financing would have a long-term perspective)

Examples: Examining Innovative Finance Applications

These two case reviews provide examples of the innovative financing strategies. While one strategy looks at a lateral approach to providing infrastructure investment with outside investment, the other strategy capitalizes on local resources to motivate infrastructure development.

Project Aggregation for Private Investment

Project aggregation is a method for infrastructure investment that relies on the diversity and multiplicity of folding many similar projects into a single project. In developing areas where projects are not scaled for private investment, but private investment is still interested, there are additional political and social risks considerations. Adding multiple local projects together reduces these risks and increases the attractiveness of the bundle for potential investors. As more and more projects are brought together from other local governments in a strategic way the social and political risks can balance, the project size is becomes large enough to be profitable for an investor, and there is potential for economies of scale. Best practices
for this technique include a centralization of operations and maintenance agencies to ensure that all projects are supported with equal capacity. Additionally, the multiple system owners must be able to easily communicate and arrange the details of the pooled fund. The Tamil Nadu case below shows how pooled funding (resulting from project aggregation) can be a beneficial strategy for nearby local governments to fund similar infrastructure projects and reduce project risk.

Case Review: Tamil Nadu, India

India has numerous urban local bodies (ULBs) that hold their own elections and work with the State Finance Commissions to develop strategies (such as assigned taxes, devolved taxes and grants in aid) for local finance. ULBs derive their legitimacy from their respective state governments and work independently to manage and maintain their infrastructure policies. Because of the independent policies for ULBs, the state of Tamil Nadu has become a model for decentralization of power from national agencies. Tamil Nadu is among the most urbanized Indian states, with 44% of the state population within the urban center. With rapid urbanization in the early 2000s, it was difficult for Tamil Nadu to keep pace with infrastructure services. This spurred a period of new initiatives for innovative finance. With the help of the World Bank, the state government of Tamil Nadu reevaluated the role of ULBs in infrastructure development.

The Tamil Nadu Urban Development Fund initiated an aggregate water and sewerage infrastructure project involving 14 ULBs; and, in 2002 the Water and Sanitation Pooled Fund was created. With the diversity of local governments involved in the project and large pooled project size, financial partners
were able to participate in financing all 14 projects without increasing contingent liabilities. The financial structure included an unsecured, multi-layered credit enhancement mechanism, allowing 15 year bonds with 9.20% annual interest. USAID was able to step in and provide the crediting arm and guarantee 50% of the bond’s principal. The collaborative and well-planned approach to this pooled project plan was economically sustainable and successfully provided more people with adequate water and sanitation infrastructure.
The Tamil Nadu case has been cited many times as a success story for innovative local infrastructure finance, especially as the first successful pooled project financing outside the United States. Years later, Bangalore tried a similar strategy to connect eight local governments in suburban Bangalore to the piped water and sanitation system. This time, pooled financing was not successful. There was a lack of planning to address increasing population and poor accountability for charging future water customers. The result was a delayed infrastructure service, decreased user rate, construction cost over runs, and insufficient revenue stream from customers.

Business Improvement Districts

Business improvement districts (BIDs) are an innovative and localized method for paying for infrastructure maintenance and construction. This strategy is based on the principle that infrastructure improvements increase the land value and economic development of the local area. Business in the local area are able to capture this value by initially investing in the surrounding area infrastructure and using increased land value benefits to either reimburse their initial investment or continue to finance new development programs. This circular process is also known as tax incremental financing. BIDs were first brought to the market in the 1960s in Canada; and, soon afterward the United States, Great Britain, and South Africa were using the idea to bring life into their urban centers. In each
of these places, BIDs go by a different name such as special improvement districts, public improvement districts, neighborhood improvement districts, local improvement districts, and city improvement districts. Each name recognizes slight differences in the structure and function of the BIDs. Because BIDs are meant to supplement, not replace government services, they work alongside the public sector to revitalize public areas (a type of public-private partnership). How a BID operates and manages infrastructure improvements is customized given a specific area. But, one thing can be sure, BIDs can only exist where there are policies that allow private entities to contribute to infrastructure development. Historically, these improvements have been useful for transportation infrastructure, public space improvement, and sidewalk beautification.

Case Review: Johannesburg, South Africa

In the 1990s, the Central Johannesburg Partnership was created in South Africa to help establish City Improvement Districts (CIDs). As the economic core of South Africa, Johannesburg (at this time) produced 16.4% of the national GDP and housed 7.2% of the population. In the years following the apartheid in South Africa, Johannesburg’s unemployment grew, as did violence. Businesses in the city center were unable to remain open due to the violence and business owners had little confidence in the government to take action. Additionally, the local government did not follow its own policies for applying universal services for social and economic development.

In this case, the Central Johannesburg Partnership stepped in to establish the first CID, named the Central Business District (CBD). The purpose of this district was to focus on se-
curity infrastructure as well as facility cleaning, maintenance, and rehabilitation. Prior to creating the CBD, the Central Johannesburg Partnership notified all the property owners and major tenants and passed a referendum among all parties to agree upon the mission and structure of the CBD. The board that would make the decisions would be comprised of 25% of property owners (who had a collective ownership of more than 50% of the property in the area), but all property owners were required to contribute financially. As the CBD began to implement projects and programs to address safety and facility deterioration, crime levels began to decrease. This successful case of a BID highlights the ability for the private sector to use alternative forms of value capture (in this case increased economic and social development) to invest in infrastructure.

Implementation: Bringing Innovative Financing Strategies to Life

Innovative finance depends on a many variables. And, to mitigate such variables that could have a negative impact on infrastructure outcomes, strong planning and leadership is re-
quired.

The challenges for financing local infrastructure will continue to grow as urbanization becomes a larger issue. None of the financing mechanisms discussed are perfect solutions for facing all challenges; but, they provide a unique approach for local governments looking to repair and implement infrastructure services. Based on the findings from the case studies above and best practices in infrastructure delivery, there are key principles and steps local governments should consider to prepare projects for being “investor ready.” The process is divided into two phases: Community Level Organization and Project Risk Mitigation. Together, all of these steps should be followed by local governments, especially those that do not have experience with infrastructure project development.

**Community Level Organization**

The Community Level Organization steps are not specific to a project and should be completed well in advance of considering project implementation.

1. **Establish a development vision:** The vision statement is typically used to guide and influence policy decisions and project implementation. Experts define community visioning as “the shared image of what they [local governments] want their community to become.” To develop a strong vision statement, local governments must prioritize consultation and engagement with their respective communities. Without having a strong relationship between local government and the community (exemplified through a vision statement), it is difficult for investors to understand the community goals, political risks, and impact of one particular project on the future of the community.
2. Identify infrastructure needs: During this step, local governments must keep an objective perspective of infrastructure services needed to support current and future quality of life goals. First, future service levels (considering population, demographic, economic, and land use changes over the future time horizon) must be evaluated. Then, information regarding current infrastructure services should be recorded, aggregated, and assessed. Next, the gap between current service provisions and future infrastructure service levels should be determined.

3. Publish a development plan: Even though identifying future infrastructure service levels is helpful for conceptualizing project scope, engineers and planners working with local governments must integrate these needs into a larger development plan to lend more credibility for individual projects. The development plan brings together the infrastructure needs and community vision in a single document. Additionally, urban development plans provide investors with a better understanding of how a particular project will interact with other systems to increase quality of life and/or economic development.

Project Risk Mitigation
The Project Risk Mitigation steps will need to be tailored for specific projects. Each time a new project is considered, these steps must be readdressed.

1. Establish policies and best practices: Political corruption, unpredictable processes, and mismanagement are an easy way for investors to lose money and become involved with legal action during infrastructure projects. Local governments must provide a level of reliability to limit future risks and help investors feel comfortable while participating in infrastructure projects. Policies can establish a distinct, transparent, and accountable rule of law (such as legislative, regulatory,
and licensing systems, processes, and procedures). Enforcing these policies limits the risks (primarily political risk) associated with infrastructure and urban development.

2. Aggregate city information: Documents regarding the local government’s policies, past projects, and localized information should be easily accessible for potential investors. In many cases, this information is used for giving a credit rating for projects seeking debt financing. If the locality is not credit worthy, it is essential that this information is available for investors to become familiar with the political landscape and develop relationships with pertinent stakeholders. In addition to supplying economic and political information, local governments should list potential revenue sources and evaluate (or allow investors to easily evaluate) the consistency, reliability, and conditions of each source.

3. Develop project specific details: Each infrastructure project will have a unique scope, budget, risks, and procurement plan. The project scope should include level of service requirements, preliminary drawings/plans, specifications, and an expected budget. One of the key components of project delivery is the procurement plan (the division of work procedures). The procurement plan will outline the division of the work. For example, will the project design and construction phases be managed by separate entities? Will operations and maintenance be the responsibility of a public agency or private entity?

4. Partner with other local governments or private entities: A project may not be credit worthy because of its size (smaller projects will not have a large enough return on investment to warrant outside investment) or high risks associated with the delivery and operations of the system. If this is the case, the local government should consider partnering with
other local governments or private entities to increase investment diversity and reduce the project risks.

Each of these steps is meant to increase the credit worthiness of infrastructure development projects and help local governments attract investors. This process provides a very high level approach for attracting investors for infrastructure development. Therefore, if a locality has never gone through this process, it is usually common for community leaders to work with consultants, national agencies, and/or multi-lateral organizations (such as the World Bank) to customize each step.

Once the steps are completed, local governments should have a more solid foundation for approaching investors. Local governments should be consulting with potential investors throughout the process to help build relationships and understand investor capabilities. To attract investors, local governments should be addressing infrastructure development from a holistic perspective. To achieve a positive triple bottom line (social, economic, and environmental) impact, proper planning, design, construction, operations, and maintenance of these systems must be ensured. Throughout the planning process and through addressing the steps above, local governments have a chance to increase quality of life in a variety of ways.

Conclusion

Even though individuals interact with local infrastructure on a more frequent basis, these projects usually come second to larger national or regional projects. The increasing problems of urbanization will start to shift attention to these smaller projects. But, in the meantime, local governments must put forward plans to address local infrastructure needs and in-
crease triple bottom line impact. Understanding the relationship between providing infrastructure and creating economic return at a local, regional, and national scale is key for providing new and improved services. To highlight this concern, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) reported average annual investment for infrastructure development is 4.2% of GDP, and the World Bank has stressed a need for global annual infrastructure expenditures to be $1.1 trillion to increase quality of life by providing water and sanitation, transportation, and energy upgrades. And, even though reports continue to state the importance of local level infrastructure finance, focus has been on large scale projects exceeding $30 million. Several institutions such as the Japanese government and United Nations have recognized this unmet need and have created initiatives to address small scale, local infrastructure development projects. Understanding the role of innovative financing is crucial to supporting the future of local infrastructure projects around the world.


An Evaluation of Decision-Making Frameworks in the Stalin, Khrushchev, and Brezhnev Administrations

By Sarah Noel Manney

There is perhaps no greater archetype of a totalitarian dictatorship—centralized, efficient, all-consuming power—than the Soviet Union. In the eyes of Western leaders, constrained by a myriad of checks and balances in a democratic government, the Kremlin’s thick red walls may at times appear enviable. It was no doubt this perception of strength that led analysts in the West to consider the USSR as a unitary, rational actor, and by consequence its foreign policy outputs as undiluted manifestations of its leaders’ wills. Yet newly declassified documents, alongside improved political science frameworks, notably Graham Allison’s Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis, cast doubt on this simplistic view of Soviet decision-making. Instead of a single commander at the helm of Soviet policy, there were at times intrusive elites and leaders asleep at the wheel. This paper argues that changing institutional structures and political environments inside the Soviet Union demand we adapt our conceptual lenses in analyzing its foreign policy. The nature of decision-making evolved considerably over the course of the Stalin, Khrushchev, and Brezhnev administrations, devolving from centralized author-
ity, to factional struggle, and ultimately to collective paralysis and policy drift. As the internal political dynamics of the USSR shifted, so Allison’s decision-making models gain selective salience.

Allison’s 1969 analysis of the Cuban Missile Crisis, which gave way to his seminal decision-making frameworks, sets out to challenge the prevailing assumption that foreign policy decision-making is characterized by unity, purpose, and rationality. Although policymaking systems, according to Allison, are comprised of “inputs, process, and outputs,” analysts tended to focus exclusively on the latter, substituting the former elements with a “logic of action” informed by their own personal experience.\(^2\) Erik Hoffman corroborates the resulting “motive-belief pattern” of analysis, which begins by postulating a country’s motives and then attempts to conform the action taken in pursuit of that goal.\(^3\) Allison challenges the implicit assertion behind such retrospective justifications that “monoliths perform large actions for large reasons.”\(^4\)
With little information about the other side’s internal policymaking systems, analysts in the Cold War tended to “personify” their opponent under the implicit assumption that “monoliths perform large actions for large reasons.” Observing only policy “outputs” in the international arena without reference to “intranational” inputs and processes, scholars inadvertently substituted “a higher degree of rationality than a skeptical mind might easily accept.” After analyzing the decision-making process behind several notable failures in Soviet foreign policy, contemporaneous efforts to trace a “logic of action” related to sweeping national motives appear almost laughable. The conception of states as unitary, homogenous benefit-maximizers in the international sphere constitutes Allison’s baseline model of decision-making analysis, which he terms “rational actor” for its tendency to rationalize behaviour ex post.

To attempt to capture what he sees as the true complexity of policymaking systems, Allison introduces two new models of analysis with increasing granularity: organizational process (institutional) and bureaucratic politics (individual.) Organizational process, referred to as ‘Model II’ takes into account the competencies, routines, and capacities of government institutions as they shape policy outputs. The important feature of this model is that policymakers do not start from a blank slate: the range of policy options available both practically and psychologically may be narrowed by a variety of institutional constraints. For the Soviet Union, the explanatory potential of this model is suggested by the salience of behavioural codes drawn from centuries of continuous Russian governance. One scholar, for instance, has identified a “Bolshevik Code” which can be traced through many generations of Soviet leadership. More broadly ever-devolving authority during our period of analysis enhanced the power of sub-governmental units and
thereby emphasized the influence of their distinctive internal capacities and traditions.

Bureaucratic politics (Model III) reaches the highest level of granularity with its focus on individual politicians and elite power politics. This paradigm sees policymakers not as disinterested servants of the national interest, but rather competitive players seeking to advance bureaucratic agendas for personal prestige. In its application to the Soviet Union, this model fits with the tradition of “Kremlinology,” which seeks to understand policymaking not by asking “what will happen,” but rather “who will win?” Of particular relevance to applicability of the bureaucratic politics model to Soviet leadership is the Russian history of ‘kto-kogo’ (literally, who-whom) politics: “who is influencing whom, who is deferring to whom, who is an accomplice of whom, who is trying to eliminate whom?” Especially insofar as members of the Politburo—the Soviet Union’s elite decision-making body—derived personal influence from the bureaucracies which they led, Allison’s bureaucratic politics model appears relevant to many aspects of Soviet politics.

Overall, Allison’s decision-making frameworks have had a seminal impact in the field of foreign policy, equipping analysts with new tools for understanding state behaviour in the international arena. Yet ultimately, Allison’s ambivalence towards the primacy of any one model leaves the question largely up to personal preference. This paper will argue that Allison’s three decision-making models need not be applied at random, but rather vary in relevance according to real changes in the Soviet political landscape. In particular, Stalin’s centralized, personalist rule may have indeed justified a traditional ‘rational actor’ lens, yet Khrushchev’s weak individual voice in a divided cabinet is better encapsulated by the ‘bureaucratic pol-
itics’ model. Later, the Brezhnev administration’s ineffectual model of ‘collective leadership’ lends salience to the organizational momentum of Allison’s Model II. After charting the political landscape in each of these three distinct administrations, we will consider the implications of structural changes on our choice analytical framework. Finally, we will consider how these lessons apply to contemporary Kremlinology and the struggle to make sense of perplexing Russian actions in Ukraine and elsewhere.

Josef Stalin’s epitaph as an iron leader is well-deserved. As one high-ranking Soviet Marshal Georgy Zhukov recalls, “If Stalin came to meeting with his mind made up, then either no disagreement arose, or else ended quickly when he made his views known.” Historians therefore note a period of ‘High Stalinism’ extending for sixteen or seventeen years during which other leaders were “reduced to complete subservience.” Stalin’s high degree of elite control was both enforced and evinced by a widespread cult of personality, routine political purges, and an omnipotent political police force. One of Stalin’s greatest successes towards consolidation was in rendering the Politburo, for later administrations a crippling source of countervailing power, relatively impotent by dividing it into squabbling subcommittees and excluding members from attendance. The psychological, political, and physical environment Stalin manufactured afforded him autonomy and personal security that later leaders would come to envy.

The high degree of control Stalin exerted domestically extended likewise into foreign policy. In diplomatic negotiations with
the West, the impression given by Russian envoys was one of strict obedience, who did not “[dare] to modify the sacrosanct text which had been handed down to [them].” Even Stalin’s Foreign Minister Vyacheslav Molotov, was careful to follow the General Secretary’s orders “to the letter.”
a dispute eventually arose between the two figures, described in a 1949 diplomatic cable as “a very violent discussion,” the outcome was unquestionably in favour of the General Secretary. In this case, Molotov’s punishment was humiliation at a Kremlin state dinner where Stalin interrupted and explicitly contradicted his speech before senior American diplomats. Among those guests, Charles Bohlen recalls witnessing before him in the banquet hall “Stalin abruptly change Soviet policy without consulting his number two man.” Molotov, who was shortly removed from office, remarked that if “Stalin [had] lived one or two years longer, I would not have survived.” Especially after Stalin’s infamous political purges during the so-called “Great Terror” of the late 1930’s, it was well known that dissent could be fatal even within the leader’s closest circle of advisors.

The centralization of decision-making authority in Stalin’s administration suggests that analysts were largely justified in applying Allison’s first analytical lens—that of a ‘rational actor’—to the USSR. If we were instead to view foreign policy-making as a bargaining process between bureaucratic elites, we would be forced to note Stalin held the ultimate trump card: the physical elimination of his opponents and therefore control over the composition of the political elite. Any conception of Allison’s “pulling and hauling” between elites and the executive would be meaningless. If ever elites were to pull too far away from Stalin, he could cut them loose. Likewise, the organizational process model’s focus on routines, capabilities, and functions appears incongruent with the evolving, personalist leadership structure that characterized the Soviet Union’s formative years. To the contrary, the vast scope of Stalin’s executive power over all aspects of life and culture as well as the existence of a parallel personal secretariat which allowed Stalin to circumvent ordinary bureaucratic organs suggests that few
major decisions were executed without his explicit or implicit approval. The rational actor model thus presents an appropriate explanatory framework for Stalin’s regime. As Vernon Aspaturian concludes, the more dominant the role of a single personality in Soviet foreign policy, the more voluntarist the behaviour of the Soviet Union.”

The application of the rational actor model to Stalin’s foreign policy nonetheless raises an important question about our definition of ‘rationality.’ Several decisions taken during Stalin’s tenure, notably the alliance with Nazi Germany in 1939 and support for Kim Il Sung’s invasion of Korea, have been criticized distinctly for their irrationality, whether on account of personal idiosyncrasy or ideological zealotry. Indeed, one of Stalin’s most memorable characteristics was paranoia—by definition an irrational condition. Can an irrational leader still be viewed as a rational state actor? The definition of rationality is indeed elusive in international relations, risking bias from one’s own normative vision of the national interest. Yet the question the rational actor model seeks to answer is not whether a state’s foreign policy was good, desirable, or even successful, but whether it was purposeful. Allison therefore gives the following criteria for ‘rational’ action: “(1) designed and executed, in effect, by a single individual; (2) designed carefully to influence their nation; (3) designed with a world view like their own; and (4) designed without regard to the domestic and bureaucratic environment.” The emphasis on individuality and purposefulness precludes the need for broad normative judgements and instead focus purely on internal decision-making structures. Stalin’s particular brand of zealous, paranoid internationalism therefore may not have been traditional, but nevertheless the fact that we can to trace this idiosyncrasies in the USSR’s behaviour suggests that his personal influence was immense.
Perhaps nowhere was the supreme nature of Stalin’s rule more evident than in the size of the power vacuum left after his death. Although Nikita Khrushchev eventually claimed victory following a two-year power struggle, he was unable to consolidate power which compromised the decision-making structure of his administration. Unlike his predecessor, Khrushchev’s personal policymaking influence was rivaled by elites and dominated by a strong cabinet representing diverse bureaucratic interests. Policy reversals and discontinuities became so pronounced they betrayed conflict within the Kremlin’s impenetrable walls. The unconsolidated, factional nature of Soviet policymaking under Khrushchev lends itself to Allison’s model of bureaucratic political struggle, though aspects of organizational capacity are also present.

Whereas Stalin exuded revolutionary legitimacy at the centre of a nascent Soviet nation, his eventual successor Nikita Khrushchev rose to power only through a protracted and “permanently incomplete” power struggle,\(^22\) which would brand him unshakeably as “a rebel in the prime minister’s seat.”\(^23\) Coincident with a decline in personal prestige sub-governmental units such as the Presidium, the Secretariat, the Council of Ministers, and various entrenched bureaucratic interests
increased in prestige, making checks on power “more powerful, more autonomous, and more articulate.” The conditions were ripe for political maneuvering and power jockeying of the kind Allison elucidates with his “bureaucratic politics” model.

The outwards manifestations of internal Kremlin politics under Khrushchev are most evident during the Cuban Missile Crisis. This failure of Soviet policy resulted in large part due to the factional nature of decision-making. It comes as little surprise that Allison chose this crisis through which expound his decision-making frameworks. A traditional rational actor model, he argues, fails to explain several puzzling elements of Soviet behaviour, such as the excessive size of the arsenal deployed to Cuba, the failure to camouflage the missiles, and the haphazard timeline of deployment. While Allison focuses on implementation failures at the organizational level, specifically the challenge of transplanting Moscow-made policies to a small tropical island, these difficulties fail to exonerate the Soviet leadership for its responsibility in the crisis. There is ample evidence that political infighting undermined policies from the start, as enterprising factions used the opportunity to compromise Khrushchev’s leadership.

Immediately following the American discovery of the missiles, the Soviet leader sent a relatively moderate letter to Kennedy that “contain[ed] the germ of a reasonable settlement” over the question of the Cuban missiles. Yet the following day, the Soviet tone shifted dramatically and unexpectedly as the Krem-
Leonid Brezhnev, Khrushchev’s eventual successor, proved to have scarcely more success in consolidating the Kremlin leadership structure, finding himself merely “the presiding officer of an oligarchy.”

Hammer concludes the incoherent shifts in Soviet stance reflect the fact that “no individual leader, least of all Khrushchev, was able to impose his views on the others.” Even compared with traditionally more constrained democratic executives, Khrushchev’s impotence was striking. As Michael Tatu concludes, “Kennedy had the last word in any American decision; Khrushchev did not.” If Khrushchev’s executive power was eroded by the Cuban affair in 1962, after the crisis it fully entered an era of ‘collective leadership.’ Where Soviet government communications had previously framed official state events with reference to the Premier—for example, a “Luncheon given by N. S. Khrushchev”—after October 23rd they named only general government bodies in titles, subordinat-
Devel-

ing Khrushchev’s name to a list in alphabetical order. \textsuperscript{33} Develop-

opments inside the Kremlin during the Cuban Missile Crisis demonstrate the effect of both institutional weakness and internal politics of Soviet decision-making.

Leonid Brezhnev, Khrushchev’s eventual successor, proved to have scarcely more success in consolidating the Kremlin leadership structure, finding himself merely “the presiding officer of an oligarchy.” \textsuperscript{34} The continuing devolution of not only lead-
ership, but also responsibility had deleterious effects on the rationality Soviet policy. In place of the determinate, unitary authority epitomized by Stalin and exerted intermittently by Khrushchev, collective indecision would thereafter paralyze the Kremlin, amounting to a Leviathan that was altogether “headless.”

Examining two major foreign policy decisions during Brezhnev’s tenure, we will trace the devolution of policymaking authority from bureaucratic struggle (Model II) in the Czechoslovakian intervention to organizational momentum (Model III) in the invasion of Afghanistan ten years later.

The 1968 Prague Spring, a crisis of Soviet authority in Czechoslovakia after the election of liberal reformer Alexander Dubček, provides a first opportunity to examine the distribution of authority in the Brezhnev cabinet. While the Soviet intervention into Prague can be viewed as a rational effort to halt the liberalizing reforms jeopardizing Soviet influence in the satellite state, numerous elements of the controversy betray the effect of organizational process and policy drift. To begin with, several departments within the Soviet government maintained overlapping jurisdictions: a textbook formula for bureaucratic confrontation. Sharing responsibility for the intervention were the International Department (ID), administering the activities of non-ruling Communist powers; the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), which liaised with ruling Communist parties as well as First World major powers; and the KGB, which conducted covert operations all around the world.

The ID’s mission of inciting worldwide revolution would predispose it towards action in the event of jeopardized satellite leadership, whereas the MFA’s emphasis on promoting a peaceful image of Soviet foreign policy would seem to do the opposite. Most vociferously hawkish was the KGB, whose concern for maintaining discipline in the Warsaw Pact pushed it towards intervention. Meanwhile, the leaders of the ID, Boris Ponomarev
and Mikhail Suslov, were concerned with reviving ties with China, a strategy they believed would be jeopardized by a brutal display of Soviet force against a ruling Communist party. Tossed between these polarized camps, Brezhnev eventually adopted a hardline stance not necessarily for its military merits but rather “for use against his Politburo opponents,” who would pounce at any display of leniency. The final decision to intervene was not a calculated tactical manoeuvre, but rather an incidental policy resulting from competing individuals and groups—a classic example of Graham Allison’s bureaucratic politics model.

The decision to invade Afghanistan a decade later was perhaps similarly incidental, yet this time with greater emphasis on the momentum of organizational routines (Model III). Even more than in the Czechoslovakian decision, an ailing Brezhnev was tugged back and forth between various organizational interests. Again, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Defence, and the KGB—represented by Andrei Gromyko, Dmitry Ustinov, and Yuri Andropov, respectively—led the charge towards intervention, reinforcing their institutional missions of inciting intervention and suppressing dissent at home. Andropov’s KGB held a distinct stake in the issue as potential Muslim unrest in the southern socialist republics was perceived to upset stability and provoke wider turmoil from Muslim communities throughout the Union. The troika of interests not only controlled the Politburo, where they were able to generate internal consensus and shut out the dissent of the several military generals (who foresaw many of the problems which would later doom the expedition) but also Brezhnev himself.

Brezhnev’s subordinate position is suggested in the record of Politburo meetings from that year, which show the leader
was absent from several important meetings. For instance, a meeting on March 17, 1979, where Ustinov’s Defence Ministry received authorization to send two divisions to the Afghan border, was conducted outside of Brezhnev’s presence. The transcript contains only fleeting mention of “attempt[ing] to inform Leonid Ilych [Brezhnev]” of the decisions reached. While the ailing Secretary General’s approval was still a prerequisite for action, major political decisions started and ended with the bureaucratic chiefs. Even when Brezhnev was called to rule on whether or not to invade Afghanistan, the information at his disposal had already been filtered by his political associates. In particular, the military generals, who opposed the operation for all the reasons it would eventually fail, were prevented from voicing their concerns with the Soviet chief executive. When the hawkish triumvirate learned of the generals’ intention to speak with Brezhnev, they called one of the commanders into a private meeting for a reprimand: “Are you going to teach the Politburo? Your duty is to carry out the orders...” It is unlikely Brezhnev was ever warned of the social and military risks of invading Afghanistan, before his army became embroiled there two years later. The evident conduct of foreign policy on the basis of internal power politics, rather than a straightforward evaluation of national interest, indicates that Allison’s “bureaucratic domination” framework is appropriate for understanding foreign policy decision making during the Brezhnev era.

Organizational influence at the sub-governmental level shaped policy not only through high-level bargaining, but also an abstract body of operational routines that narrowed the scope of decision-making. With regards to the Afghan question, a streak of successful interventions in Czechoslovakia, Vietnam, Angola, and Ethiopia over the previous decade had generated powerful organizational momentum towards intervention, not
just out of procedural habit but also in the form of a physical stockpile of weaponry.\textsuperscript{45} This organizational momentum was exacerbated by a diffusion of responsibility among the collective leadership structure that precluded one man from analyzing the consequences of his actions in full. Aspaturian describes the risk of “continuity policy” that occurs when a government falls prey to factional discord, bureaucratic momentum, or dominant operational frameworks. The result is often a “condition of drift” without specific intent or rationale: “collective leadership may turn out to be collective irresponsibility.”\textsuperscript{46} Besides Afghanistan, Michael Tatu argues the tendency towards ‘group think’ was also a factor in the decision to support Gamal Abdel Nasser’s invasion of Israel ten years earlier. Instead of assessing the risks and merits of the intervention, especially as it might jeopardize the ongoing policy of détente with the West, Tatu argues Soviet leaders followed habit of supporting ‘progressive leaders’ in the Third World. Comparing the decision-making process around the Six Day War with that of Cuban Missile Crisis, Tatu writes: “In 1962, Khrushchev miscalculated; in 1967, it would be more accurate to say that no one calculated at all.”\textsuperscript{47} While the Khrushchev government’s policy zig-zags betray a struggle in the cockpit, subsequent decades suggest something more analogous to drivers asleep at the wheel, drifting on organizational autopilot with “unpredictable, dangerous” and irrational results.\textsuperscript{48}

In sum, the three Soviet administrations reflect vastly different leadership structures both in the power of the leader and the role of bureaucracies. In Stalin’s administration, the power to alter the composition of policymaking bodies, suppress dissent, and circumvent the mainstream policy process with a parallel personal staff suggest a high degree of unitary decision-making authority and the applicability of the rational actor model. Khrushchev, alternatively, found himself perpetually under-
mined by opportunistic opponents and unable to consolidate unitary authority. In the Cuban Missile Crisis, internal discord manifested in a cacophonous negotiating style that led American onlookers to doubt for the first time the cohesion of their adversary. Brezhnev’s still greater political weakness expanded the influence of enterprising bureaucrats as well as the momentum of organizational procedures in times of gridlock.

These findings suggest certain generalities about the predictive power of analytical models that may benefit the analysis of future Kremlin regimes. For instance, we might posit abrupt policy shifts during a crisis are a symptom of internal bureaucratic struggle. Such was Sorensen’s intuition during the Cuban Missile Crisis, which proved ultimately correct. In the context of modern Kremlinology, could discordant responses to the downing of the MH-17 flight over Ukraine signal a similar discord in the leadership? Conversely, we might hypothesize that long periods of policy continuity are a signal of policy drift and therefore weak collective leadership? Perhaps the most important lesson is to not assume the Kremlin’s internal hierarchies are rigid and uncompromising as its fortress exterior would lead us to believe.
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This paper deals with questions of how Russian foreign policy was affected by nationalist movements in Russia from 2011 till 2016, on the one hand, and how the nationalist agenda was redesigned and adopted by the Kremlin in its foreign policy, on the other. The research will also consider the question of how Russian nationalism changed as a social construct in Russian society. The degree of influence of the nationalist agenda is taken into consideration as well. Furthermore, the paper will look at how the political situation changed in 2016 and what future developments are possible. The main argument of this paper is that there is a dichotomy in the relationship between the ideas of nationalists and Russian foreign policy. That is, nationalists do not affect the foreign policy line much, whereas the foreign policy has a great degree of influence over certain nationalist groups. Research in this paper will be based on qualitative analysis in the framework of the constructivism paradigm and its key element, the social construct. Several foreign policy cases will be studied to demonstrate that the theoretical assumptions made are relevant. These assumptions will be illustrated with academic references and the results of sociological surveys and information based on such relevant
sources as, for example, statements of Russian nationalist parties and movements.

The construct of Russian nationalism itself should firstly be defined, in order to conduct proper analysis. Keeping in mind the complexity of the term, this research will stick to the methodological orientation suggested by Marlene Laurelle. The empirical approach will be used in order to show that the construct of Russian nationalism consists of different sentiments such as ethnic nationalism, “imperial” nationalism, xenophobic sentiment in general and anti-Western sentiment in particular, national pride and some others (for example, Soviet nationalism). The changing balance between these constituent elements, as will be argued, may be caused by major shifts in Russia’s foreign policy.

New Wave of Nationalism in 2011-2013 Protests: Imperial or Ethnic?

In 2011-2013, both after elections to the State Duma in 2011 and Presidential elections in 2012, the Russian state was struck with large waves of protests in the capital and several other big cities. The activists in the streets were protesting against machinations in the elections and against the existing regime led by Vladimir Putin and Dmitry Medvedev. However, a large portion of the protestors were not just liberals and moderates, representing the Russian middle class - there were different groups of Russian nationalists as well. To go on further, one should have a clear understanding that in this paper the term “nationalists” will include different “nationalist circles” as defined by Laruelle for the purpose of case study. Laruelle argues that there are four main circles of Russian nationalist movements. The first one comprises official state
ЕСЛИ ЗДЕСЬ СВОБОДНЫЙ СТРОЙ, ЧТО Ж ТОГДА НАЗВАТЬ ТЮРЬМОЙ?
patriotism programs, while the second one includes systemic opposition—the Liberal Democratic Party of Russia (LDPR, right-wing nationalists) and Communist Party of the Russian Federation (CPRF, left-wing nationalists). The third circle is represented by non-parliament, radical right movements. The fourth, in this case, is marginal groups. The last two circles are normally called non-systemic opposition. The protest movement in 2011-2012 included the second, the third and the fourth circles.

The protest movement included many far-right organizations comprising different Russian nationalists from the third and fourth circles, who were notoriously known for their “Russian Marches.” The movement in 2011 and 2012 included three main nationalist groups. Those were the Russkie (Russians) movement, old organizations from 1990s (such as Russky Obochenarodny Soyuz) and national-democrats (such as the National Democratic Party and Novaya Sila [the New Force] party). Some of these groups favored the spreading of the “national patriotic” or “imperial” view that either the Russian Empire or the Soviet Union (in some cases both could be combined, like with Alexander Dugin) were “good” empires, and that Russia should follow their foreign policy pattern. These were “imperial” nationalists. Others were simply practicing traditional ethnic nationalism. Both nationalist trends were rather popular. Verkhovsky claims that the amount of people attracted to the events organized by nationalists was very large compared to what communists or liberals could gather. Such a clear public embrace

Social polls also clearly demonstrated a problem: growing ethnophobia and xenophobia in Russian society, which started increasing dramatically from 2011 to 2013
was a signal of trouble for the authorities. Shevtsova agrees with this statement and argues that the crisis became one of the reasons for the future conservative turn in Russian politics both at home and abroad.\textsuperscript{10} Indeed, the growing pressure was felt by the Kremlin and Russian elites, who had to deal with the issue. The main problem was that the Russian Federation, according to its constitution in 2012, is a multinational state comprised of 21 different national, autonomous republics.\textsuperscript{11} As such, the possibility of ethnic conflicts would be a complete disaster for the Russian authorities. Russia’s horrendous experience with wars in Chechnya was a clear proof of the risk.

Social polls also clearly demonstrated a problem: growing ethnophobia and xenophobia in Russian society, which started increasing dramatically from 2011 to 2013. Remarkably, xenophobia was not anti-Western in sentiment, but rather a discontent with migrants from Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) countries and with internal migrants within the Russian Federation itself. For example, in 2011 the number of people wanting to restrict the residency in Russia of citizens from the Caucasus was 39\%, in 2013 this had reached 54\%.\textsuperscript{12} One could observe the same situation regarding Central Asian migrants—the number increased from 26\% to 45\%.\textsuperscript{13} The nationalists simply felt the growing discontent in the society and tried to capitalize on it by criticizing existing politics of the leadership. These groups demanded that alleged oppression of the Russian nation be stopped, that more attention be paid to the Russian ethnic majority, and that radical solutions be implemented in the Northern Caucasus.\textsuperscript{14} Some also insisted on harshening restrictions on migration, endorsing creation of a foreign policy that “corresponds to the national interests of all Russians.” Not surprisingly, the issue of protests was solved quite easily via political repression and offering some insignificant concessions to the demonstrators, such as the “reform” of
electoral legislation. However, the Kremlin still faced a problem of ethnic nationalism and had to do address it. In order to solve the issue, the Russian authorities would implement some of the ideas that many “imperial” nationalists shared, in order to cause a split among nationalists and make them less dangerous. In the following cases, examples of how the ideas of Russian nationalism and Russian foreign policy have interacted throughout the period from 2011 to 2016 will be presented.

Foreign Policy and Nationalists: From Criticism to Support

In the 2011-2013 period, nationalism in general and ethnic nationalism in particular were among the greatest enemies of the Russian authorities. Both Dmitry Medvedev and, to a lesser extent, Vladimir Putin were harshly criticized by nationalist groups not only for their domestic, but also for their foreign policy in 2010-2013. As will be shown later, the first and the second “circles” were less active and more careful in criticizing the two key figures. One of the reasons for this criticism was that nationalist movement in Russia, as Leonova claims, has always included some anti-Western sentiments. Such history explains why all agreements with the West and any kind of cooperation would not be tolerated by most of the “nationalist circles”, except the first one controlled by the state. In order to illustrate this statement, this part of the paper will discuss two different cases that took place in Medvedev’s presidency—ratification of the New START Treaty and the Libyan crisis of 2011. In both cases, nationalists (sometimes even in the Parliament) would try to capitalize on the liberal image of President Medvedev, not hesitating to criticize many of his initiatives.

The New START Treaty signed by President Medvedev and President Obama received much criticism from various na-
tionalist parties and organizations. Reasons for the criticism were different (such as non-limitation of the American Missile Defense System or exclusion of US allies’ nuclear weapons from the Treaty), but not very important for our study. Communists refused to ratify the treaty, fiercely opposing it and calling all START Treaties a series “of dramatic mistakes.” LDPR refused to vote for it as well, with its leader, Vladimir Zhirinovsky, claiming that the treaty “puts Russia and the USA in an unequal position.” Non-parliament nationalist organizations opposed the ratification too. For example, Russian conservative periodical “Zolotoi Lev” (Golden Lion) called New START a “capitulation”, mentioning that all previous START Treaties were unfair as well. It is interesting that the United Russia party, which would later harshen its rhetoric on foreign policy in 2014-2016, was more moderate on the issue at that time—it voted in favor of the treaty and outvoted all other parties. Konstantin Kosachev, Head of the International Issues Committee in the State Duma, fought off communists in public debates, successfully defending the treaty. One remarkable point is that the criticisms from systemic and non-systemic opposition groups varied when it came to governmental actions, but was equally harsh on the United States.

Results of the Libyan crisis, in comparison to the START Treaty, caused an incredible explosion of fury and outrage among nationalists, who perceived it as treachery. These groups viewed the Libyan regime as one of the closest allies of Russia in the Maghrib. There was even a clear confrontation between Putin and Medvedev on the issue, with Putin more hawkish and highly critical of the UN Security Council Resolution on Libya. This latent conflict between the President and Prime-Minister caused a huge wave of criticism concerning actions taken by Medvedev personally. Nikolai Starikov, one of the key figures in Russian conservative and nationalist
thought, argued that Medvedev lost in Libya everything that Putin had been working for, calling it a “lost party...in a diplomatic game.” Moreover, he claimed, downfall of the Libyan regime should be a lesson for Russia, who must now fight for Syria relentlessly. Systemic opposition did not remain inactive—CPRF supported the Russian ambassador to Libya, who called Medvedev “a traitor” and was called back to Moscow. Vladimir Zhirinovsky, leader of the right-wing nationalist party LDPR, called the Libyan crisis an “international provocation” and indirectly criticized the actions of the Russian government. He, however, abstained from directly mentioning who is responsible for these improper actions. Moreover, the pattern of condemning actions of the West repeated itself. Nevertheless, one of the nationalist “circles” abstained from openly criticizing the actions of the leadership.

In summary, these two different cases show us that the Russian authorities had to find a way to solve the problem of nationalist criticism and ethnic tension inside the country. This goal was achieved by trying to change the construct of nationalism
in Russian society. Therefore, preference was given to increase the anti-Western sentiment of these ideologies. Nevertheless, one could still see that public opinion at the time was highly unfavorable of minority ethnic groups such as Chechens. That is easily deduced from the social surveys in 2011-2013 mentioned earlier. More interesting and, in principle, logical would be the usage of a new strategy by the Russian authorities several years later to change this fact.

After 2014, there was a dramatic shift in Russian foreign and domestic policy due to the Ukrainian crisis. As Myers rightfully claims, Putin had nothing to lose in Ukraine after the downfall of the Ukrainian President, Victor Yanukovich, in February, 2014.\(^25\) The Crimean crisis, erupting both in Donetsk and Luhansk, put Russia under intense diplomatic and economic pressure.\(^26\) On the other hand, these events and the triumphant Russian campaign in Syria were also a courtesy to the “hawkish” far right and left-wingers. This had enormous impact on “imperial” nationalists, who were disarmed for a while and became highly supportive of Kremlin policies. They completely stopped criticizing these policies, and more importantly, stopped opposing Russian President Vladimir Putin. On the contrary, “imperial” nationalists started demanding that more active measures be taken, as is evidenced by the case studies of Crimea and Syria.

The annexation of Crimea had very positive political effects for the Russian authorities, who gained approval of almost all existing nationalist movements. Not only did the systemic opposition support the action, but so did all other nationalist
“circles”. The United Russia party was undoubtedly highly supportive of the actions taken by the President because it was and is the main pro-Putin force in the Parliament. LDPR fully supported the annexation as well, stressing that it had always considered Crimea as an indispensable part of Russia.

Radical right-wingers, such as Drugaya Rossiya (Other Russia) led by Eduard Limonov, not only approved of these actions, but demanded a more aggressive policy toward Ukraine, that is, to occupy Kharkiv, for example. The use of anti-Western elements in foreign and domestic policies made Vladimir Putin extremely popular not only in the Russian society, but also among nationalists, especially “imperial” nationalists, which would be proved by polling.

The Crimean effect was very successful in political terms, but dealt a rather serious economic blow to Russia as sanctions overlapped with a period of low oil prices. However, another diplomatic victory that overshadowed the period of economic recession, at least for a while, was Syria. Many nationalists heavily supported this operation. LDPR, for example, claimed that Russia saved Syria from the United States, stopping the Americans. The Communists stressed that the continuation of operations in Syria is necessary even with military casualties. Alexander Dugin, a main conservative thinker in Russia, argued in favor of the venture, claiming that it would be essential for protecting the Central Asian region and the Northern Caucasus Federal District in the Russian Federation. In general, the operation was seen as a fight against American dominance and a unipolar world. The anti-Western sentiment of Russian nationalism was successfully used by the Russian authorities to eliminate possible threats.
The effect of Crimea, followed soon by the Syrian conflict, was in a sense a triumph for Vladimir Putin. Not only did his approval ratings jump, but Russian society became more united, as one can see from different polls. Russian Public Opinion Research Centre (WCIOM) claims that the Crimean crisis and events in the Eastern Ukraine increased the negative attitude of Russians toward all kinds of nationalism. As Pain fairly notes, such changes were caused by the Russian press covering the Revolution in Ukraine as “fascist” and “nationalistic.” The number of people thinking that Russia should be a multinational state increased after the Ukrainian conflict from 44% (in November 2013) to 57% (in June 2014). The percentage of the population, thinking that all ethnicities in Russia must have equal rights increased dramatically from 37% (in November 2013) to 57% (in June 2014). When taking Syrian events into consideration and extending our chronological scope to 2016, this was not a short-term trend. According to social polls, ethnic nationalism in 2014-2015 was slowly decreasing as well. Levada Centre claims that only 51% of Russians in 2015 supported the idea of “Russia for (ethnic) Russians” in comparison to 2013 with 66%. Other indexes showed clearly that negative attitudes toward Central Asian migrants decreased from 45% in 2013 to 29% in 2015.

The Kremlin had to be careful in exploiting the shift in the construct of Russian nationalism. The elites tried to make it less ethnic, but more patriotic, based on the concept of the Russian state. Thus, *patrioti* (patriots) and *gosudarsvenniki* (statists, proponents of a strong Russian state) are now very wide-spread movements in Russia. Many nationalist groups that took part in the 2011-2013 protests, or used to criticize the
Russian authorities for different reasons, including Russia’s stand on international issues, changed their minds. Because of the implementation of many “imperial” nationalist ideas, these groups are now highly supportive of Vladimir Putin’s foreign policy. It is also clear that ethnic nationalism became less popular in Russian society in 2014-2015, though it still remains strong. This trend can be seen from 2013-2016 social surveys. Therefore, the Kremlin succeeded in co-opting the agenda of many nationalist movements in its own way by the actions taken during the Crimean crisis or in Syria. Russia’s extremely inflexible foreign policy after 2014, as it is seen in the West, is now a reason for nationalists to support the Kremlin. Many “patriotic” organizations such as Antimaidan or NOD (Nationalnoe Osvoboditelnoe Dvizhenie, National Liberation Movement) not only became rather popular in Russia, but are also indirectly supported by the Russian authorities. Platforms of such movements, however, seem to be rather devious. NOD, led by one of the State Duma Deputies from United Russia, Evgeniy Fedorov, is a good example. Fedorov claims that the Russian constitution was drafted by Americans from the US Department of State, that Russia itself is a colony of the US, and that many Russian officials and even institutions (such as the Duma, where he works) are controlled directly from Washington.38

Putin’s triumph both in domestic and foreign policy in 2014-2015 had drawbacks as well. Russian nationalism became less ethnic and inner-oriented, but it became more xenophobic toward the West. This transformation happened due to the fact of a widely used anti-Western sentiment that started changing
the social construct of Russian nationalism in 2014. That is also clearly seen from the social polls conducted by Levada Centre throughout the whole period of 2011-2016. For the purpose of analysis, three examples will be provided to show how Russian nationalism became more xenophobic toward the West. These examples will include perception of the United States, the European Union and Ukraine by citizens of Russia.

After Putin’s return to power in May 2012, anti-Americanism became an essential part both of the Kremlin’s rhetoric and Russian public opinion. In January 2011, almost 65% of Russians viewed the United States favorably and only 23% unfavorably, but after 2012 the situation started changing dramatically. In September 2013, these numbers leveled off at 48% unfavorably, and in May 2014 (after the Crimean crisis) the scale changed completely. By that time, 81% of Russians were highly critical of the US and only 11% positive. For many Russians, the United States at the time became a manifestation of all existing problems in Russian society (as in the case of NOD mentioned before). The years following saw a slow but steady decrease throughout the end of 2015 and 2016, which is also the case in two other examples analyzed later.

![Figure 1. Social survey results (1990-2016) with the question “What is your attitude now toward the United States of America?" (gray indicates “favorable”, red indicates “unfavorable”)](image)
The situation with the European Union was different. Russians always viewed it rather favorably up until November 2013, when the Ukrainian crisis unfolded. Due to the confrontation on major geopolitical issues between Russia and the West, Russian public opinion radically changed. In January 2015, the negative attitude of Russians toward the EU reached its peak of 70%, with only 20% viewing the EU favorably. Since then, one also sees a very slow, but steady decrease in negative attitude of Russians toward the EU. Nevertheless, this number of Russians with negative attitudes toward the EU remains being remarkably high (52%) in November 2016 in comparison to the period of 2003-2013. The diagram below illustrates the results of surveys on the issue of US perception by Russians conducted by Levada Centre from 2003.

![Graph showing attitudes towards the European Union](image)

Figure 2. Social survey results (2003-2016) with the question "What is your attitude now toward the European Union?" (gray indicates “favorable”, red indicates “unfavorable”)

Finally, if one takes a look at the graph showing perceptions of Ukraine by Russian society, one would see a pattern similar to views on the US and the EU. Russian public opinion was highly in favor of Ukraine throughout the presidency of Victor Yanukovich from 2010 up until 2014. The average rate of positive attitude was 70%. Nevertheless, it plummeted in May
2014 with the geopolitical confrontation between Russia and the West. In 2014 and 2015 the number of people having a negative attitude toward Ukraine reached its historical maximum (63%) three times in a row. Only starting from May 2016 do polls document a declining trend. This trend, as with the cases of the EU and the US, may be explained by the growing fatigue of the Russian population with all geopolitical topics. Due to a long period of recession and low oil prices, economic problems became more relevant for Russians at that time.

In summary, one sees that there was a restructuring process inside the xenophobic movements, one of the several main components of Russian nationalism. The xenophobic sentiment started changing due to successful Russian foreign policy, becoming more and more anti-Western in 2014 and 2015. General perception of normally marginal social groups such as the Central Asian migrants or people from the Northern Caucasus became less negative. On the other hand, the rate of general disapproval of the West skyrocketed. Criticizing the West and blaming the United States for every problem became a kind of political mainstream line in Russia, especially
when it came to such organizations as NOD, Antimaidan, and far-right parties, all of whom claim to be fighting for the Russian national interest. Thus, for many Russians, being anti-Western in their political views became a synonym for being a patriot. As Laurelle rightfully claims, the Kremlin supports the spreading patriotism movement, which is considered to be a factor of social consensus. Making the definition of “nationalism” as vague as possible contributes to that as well.

2016 and Further: Foreign Policy as a Non-Sufficient Remedy

Because of the lasting economic crisis in Russia—caused in large part by endogenous conditions—such a trend of restructured nationalism cannot be long term. Some parts of the population have started to think about their own income first, and for them geopolitical issues stopped playing a major role. As has been mentioned, the general anti-Western mood in Russia started weakening in 2016. According to the 2016 sociological survey by Levada Centre, 71% of Russians are in favor of reestablishing contacts with the West. On the other hand, by the end of 2016 a wave of internal ethnic tensions inside Russia started rising slowly once more. For example, the number of people wanting to restrict residency of Russians from the Caucasus increased from 29% to 34%, whereas the number of people thinking that there should be no restrictions on any nationalities decreased from 25% to 20%. This might be a sign for nationalists in the future - if the question of rights of the Russian majority comes up again, they may once again try to capitalize on it. Indeed, the Kremlin managed to apply the idea of protecting Russians abroad for a while. Another question is whether it can protect Russians at home. That may soon become an issue for discussion.
This means that a rather successful (or as some would also add “neo-imperial”) foreign policy line of Russia may stop influencing the situation and marginalizing the far-right groups. No special initiatives like the Crimea or Syrian campaigns, which would reassert the image of the Russian leadership in the eyes of nationalists, can be seen in the nearest future. Some nationalists, however, still demand a more aggressive foreign policy, claiming that what was done is not enough. As Shevtsova rightfully notices, there is a growing frustration among them.\textsuperscript{45} Eduard Limonov and his party Drugaya Rossiya, as mentioned, claim that the annexation of Southern Ukraine and a military intervention in Ukraine are necessary. Igor Strelkov, who was very popular in Russia in 2014-2015, became highly critical of Putin recently as well, claiming that the Russian President had no will to defend Russia’s national interests in eastern Ukraine.\textsuperscript{46} Such actions, however, are already irrelevant for Russia, considering the economic crisis and a rather strained diplomatic climate. That is why both imperial and ethnic nationalists could start posing a threat to the existing Russian leadership in the near future. Such a figure like Igor Strelkov could possibly head a movement of “imperial” nationalists that would oppose Vladimir Putin.

In conclusion, one witnesses an existing dichotomy in Russia when it comes to the relationship between foreign policy and ideas of nationalist movements. Nationalism does not affect the foreign policy line much under the current leadership. Russian actions both in Crimea and Syria, often mentioned as examples of Putin’s “neo-imperialism”, were more or less pragmatic and had military logic in their reasoning rather than simply following the ideas of nationalism. Nevertheless, it is blindingly clear that foreign policy may also be a tool for the Russian authorities to tackle the issue of ethnic nationalism and possible ethnic conflicts inside the country. Foreign policy
changes the construct of nationalism, increasing its anti-Western sentiment. On the one hand, Russian leadership may also redesign and implement some of the nationalist ideas that can be relevant for practical purposes. Thus, it may change the construct of nationalism and gain temporary allies in “imperial” nationalists. On the other hand, Russian authorities marginalize the most radical nationalists with repressive measures to ensure the stability of the political system. This pattern does not seem to be feasible in the long-term, because of the increasing demands of the “imperial nationalists”, who are easily frustrated when realizing that Putin does not really want to subjugate other nations or wants to reestablish ties with Western countries. Therefore, if there are no higher stakes in Russian foreign policy that would satisfy the “imperial” right-wingers, a new revolt against the regime could be possible.
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