Belfer Center Still Building New U.S.-Russia Bridges

Since the 1950s, scientists and scholars from Harvard University have been building bridges between the United States and Russia to help prevent nuclear catastrophe. The early years focused on slowing the nuclear arms race. The last two decades have targeted the risks of nuclear proliferation and terrorism.

Carrying forward this legacy, specialists from Harvard Kennedy School’s Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs have launched three ambitious U.S.-Russian partnerships, designed to intensify action against nuclear terrorism and to safeguard the next wave of global nuclear energy expansion.

The three projects fall under the Belfer Center’s U.S.-Russia Initiative to Prevent Nuclear Terrorism, directed by senior fellow William H. Tobey, a former senior official in the U.S. National Nuclear Security Administration and a Kennedy School alumnus.

One major new effort is to produce the first-ever joint U.S.-Russian threat assessment of nuclear terrorism. Belfer Center specialists, led by senior fellow Rolf Mowatt-Larssen, have teamed with the Russian Academy of Science’s Institute of USA and Canada to write the assessment, aiming to fill a gap that became apparent during preparations for the Nuclear Security Summit hosted by President Obama in April 2010. Tobey said the absence of an informed consensus on the dangers of nuclear terrorism hinders the development of work plans to address the threat.

continued on page 4

New Center Books Sharpen Global Debate on Critical Issues

Three new publications by Belfer Center scholars have emerged on the global stage this spring, contributing significantly to dynamic dialogue on critical issues: shifts in the nature and use of power, the resurgence of religion in politics, and how Africa can feed itself in a generation.

In her book, God’s Century: Resurgent Religion and Global Politics, Harvard Kennedy School Associate Professor Monica Duffy Toft and her co-authors show how and why religion’s influence on global politics is surging (see God’s Century, page 3).

Calestous Juma’s book The New Harvest has received worldwide attention for suggesting concrete ways Africa can transform its agriculture into a force for economic growth and feed itself in one generation (see New Harvest, page 3).

Joseph S. Nye writes in The Future of Power about the changes taking place in global power. In the future, Nye says, power “will come from the ability to navigate the information lanes of cyberspace and control the narrative that influences people” (see Future of Power, page 14).
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JFK’s inaugural challenge has inspired the people who make up Harvard’s Kennedy School since the School’s founding. As we celebrate the 50th anniversary of that inauguration, it is appropriate to pause and consider the hard questions that he put to us on January 20, 1961.

Perhaps we should consider how those who heard JFK’s 1961 call met the challenges they inherited from the “Greatest Generation.”

With the opportunities and the resources that constitute the Belfer Center, what are we doing for the security and freedom of our country and the world?

One contribution is clear: nowhere at Harvard University is the spirit of military service stronger than among the fellows and students associated with the Belfer Center. From 25 National Security Fellows (many of them colonels) to an even larger number of serving officers and recent veterans, our extended family includes more combat veterans, in fact, than in anyone’s recent memory.

It was with special satisfaction that we welcomed Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Mike Mullen to the Kennedy School in November—and applauded Harvard President Drew Faust’s declaration of intent to invite the Reserve Officers’ Training Corps back on campus after the repeal of the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” legislation. A change long past due, but nevertheless hugely welcome.

President Kennedy’s challenge sets a demanding standard that demands not only intent but impact.

We also hope that other contributions from the Center are making our world safer. Decades of work to build better relations with the former Soviet Union and the Russian government are documented on the front page of this newsletter. We are especially proud of the three new U.S.-Russia partnerships on nuclear security and energy that take forward this tradition, led by the Center’s William H. Tobey, Kevin Ryan, Matthew Bunn, and Rolf Mowatt-Larssen.

We also have extended our reach in trying to understand and improve the exercise of American power in the world. Joe Nye’s new book, The Future of Power, advances our thinking. Calestous Juma has made headlines around the world with his bold new book, The New Harvest, suggesting Africa can feed itself in a generation. And the new Belfer Center blog, called Power & Policy, gives us a new channel for online analysis of issues of power, driven by our team of scholars and specialists.

Belfer Center researchers are ranging far across the world to increase our impact on issues that matter. Monica Duffy Toft, who has earned wide recognition for her work assessing religion in conflicts around the world, is awaiting publication of her new book, God’s Century: Resurgent Religion and Global Politics. Dick Rosewarne, an adjunct professor and senior fellow in the International Security Program, is strengthening links between the Kennedy School and scholars in China.

On issues of energy and environment, we watched Belfer Center board member Rob Stavins help shape the debate at the U.N. climate change review conference in Cancun, and Henry Lee’s research team produced a series of high-impact studies on our energy and transportation systems. We congratulate Henry for his well-earned promotion to senior lecturer in the Kennedy School (see a Spotlight feature on Henry in this publication).

President Kennedy’s challenge sets a demanding standard that demands not only intent but impact. Halfway through this academic year, we are acutely aware of the gulf between our aspirations and our achievements.

Still, I hope that the members and supporters of the Center will take some satisfaction in the many ways that the people of the Belfer Center are doing good work for their country and their world.

Belfer Center Launches Virtual Forum: Power & Policy

On February 1, the Belfer Center launched the blog Power & Policy with a post by Harvard Distinguished University Professor Joseph S. Nye titled “Power and Policy in an Information Age” and a follow-up post by Center Director Graham Allison headlined “Disagreeing with Joe Nye.” These posts from top Harvard scholars set in motion what the Center hopes will be a dynamic forum for new ideas and lively point-counterpoint discussions.

Power & Policy is a virtual forum for debating the exercise of American power in the world. The principal bloggers are Belfer Center scholars who have spent decades studying how power works. Many have been in positions of power, so they understand firsthand the realities and constraints. The blog invites submissions from guest bloggers, and encourages lively, civil discussion through comments.

Power & Policy’s inaugural blogging team includes: Graham Allison, Nicholas Burns, Richard Clarke, Steven E. Miller, Joseph S. Nye, Meghan O’Sullivan, Monica Duffy Toft, and Stephen M. Walt.

Hosted by Belfer Center Communications Director James Smith, Power & Policy can be accessed from the Belfer Center homepage at http://belfercenter.org/power/.

Marc Grossman Named to Succeed Holbrooke

Ambassador Marc Grossman, a retired senior diplomat and non-resident fellow with the Belfer Center’s Future of Diplomacy Project, has been named by Secretary of State Hillary Clinton to serve as special representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan. Grossman will succeed Richard Holbrooke, who died in December.
Toft: Why Religion Wields More Political Influence Today

Associate Professor of Public Policy Monica Duffy Toft, faculty director of the Belfer Center’s Initiative on Religion and International Affairs, discusses her most recent publication, God’s Century: Resurgent Religion and Global Politics.

How did you become interested in writing God’s Century?

I am interested in what motivates people politically, especially what motivates religious actors politically. Essentially, I am interested in discerning whether religious actors behave differently than secular actors. This research stems from work on large-scale political violence. Religion is an element in half of all active civil wars today and in most terrorism.

God’s Century deals with religiously-motivated actors who use violence (terrorism, civil war)—and those who pursue agendas of human rights, peace settlements, and democratization. What accounts for such a difference?

The difference between those who use violence and those who do not is based on both the nature of the actors’ political theology and the degree and type of independence between religion and state.

Religious actors have a bad reputation—and some deserve it—but religious actors, including political parties, have also played a major role in most of the movements that successfully strove toward more open political systems over the past forty years. Religious actors enjoy a far greater level of independence from political authority in both their self-governance and pursuits than they have at any time in the past. This is one reason why they wield more influence today than they have for centuries.

What are your recommendations for U.S. foreign policy?

The United States will most likely succeed in its foreign policy by encouraging regimes that treat religion neither as a prisoner nor courtier, but as a respected citizen, and by supporting religious communities that struggle for such a regime. The U.S. should recognize that there is a strategic value in pursuing religious freedom.

Do you have concerns about the new role the Muslim Brotherhood might play in Egyptian government?

Although the Muslim Brotherhood (MB) has its roots in Islam, there is no need to reflexively fear it. Not only was it politically active against a repressive regime in Egypt, but over time, it has moderated both its stance and role in Egyptian society. In order to govern, it needed to broaden its support. If the trends over the past forty years provide any guidance, the MB may very well continue to adopt a more democratic orientation and represent the Egyptian polity more broadly.

—Susan Lynch

Juma: Africa Can Feed Itself in a Generation


Working outward from that center, the book tackles each of the main components necessary to produce a thriving agricultural sector. Infrastructure, education, leadership, entrepreneurship, and regional cooperation are all shown to be foundational components of productivity on the continent. As Juma puts it: “Agriculture is a system, not a single activity. If you don’t have the ability to transport goods, to provide energy for food processing, communicate to rural areas, or the ability to irrigate you will not have productive agriculture.”

In The New Harvest, Juma insists that this dramatic change can take place solely from African nations utilizing existing resources without having to seek large-scale aid from abroad. “A technological abundance exists in the world today, and while finance may be in short supply, knowledge is infinite,” he says. Africa must properly employ that knowledge through its existing institutions to produce agricultural productivity and economic growth.

Universities, for instance, must be refocused to become the basis around which knowledge can be turned into services and products. Services and products in turn must be brought to markets by reliable and efficient communication and roads systems. Barriers to trade must be removed by the regional cooperation of nations to produce larger and more robust markets.

All of this, the author insists, rests on strong and sustained leadership. “Experiences on the continent itself, such as those of Malawi and Rwanda, show that this is the first time we have seen African presidents take agriculture seriously,” Juma writes. The book itself features endorsements of four sitting presidents and was formally launched in Tanzania by five heads of state—Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, and Uganda—representing the East African Community.

Since its release, The New Harvest has received worldwide attention. Journalists from 47 countries writing in 13 languages have covered the messages of the book in hundreds of print, web, radio, and television features.

With the first edition selling out during the second month of its release, Juma and the staff of the AIA project are currently revising The New Harvest for its second edition and forthcoming translations. Juma insists that the message will remain the same: “When it comes to the role of innovation for development you have to take some risks. This book demonstrates what can come from people taking risks to do something new.”

—Greg Durham
To focus high-level expert attention on this threat and related security issues, the Belfer Center initiated a second project, bringing together U.S. and Russian senior retired officers with military and intelligence backgrounds. The project’s creator, retired Brigadier General and current Belfer Center Executive Director for Research Kevin Ryan, says: “The purpose of the ‘Elbe Group’ is to establish an open and continuous channel of communication on sensitive issues that is not hindered by the ups and downs of U.S.-Russian political relations.”

The first Elbe Group meeting took place in October 2010 in Istanbul to consider ways to improve cooperation and develop joint operational measures to track and combat nuclear terror. It was an unprecedented gathering of three- and four-star general officer veterans from secretive agencies with three-letter acronyms: FSB, GRU, CIA, DIA, and the Ministry of Defense, and Department of Defense. Among the five former officers on the U.S. side were Lt. Gen. Mike Maples, former director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, and Mowatt-Larsen, a retired senior CIA intelligence officer. The Russian side included General of the Army Anatoly S. Kulikov, a former interior minister, and General-Colonel Anatoly E. Safonov, former FSB deputy director.

The [Elbe] Group’s findings … included a call for closer cooperation between security and intelligence services.

Ryan said the group’s findings and recommendations, which were made available to officials in the U.S. and Russian governments, included a call for closer cooperation between security and intelligence services of the two countries. The “Elbe Group” will meet again in June to discuss ways to implement recommendations from the forthcoming Joint Threat Assessment.

In a third major initiative led by Associate Professor Matthew Bunn, one of the world’s leading nuclear proliferation experts, Belfer Center researchers from the Project on Managing the Atom and colleagues from the Russian Kurchatov Institute issued a joint report in December suggesting ways to encourage the safe growth of nuclear power around the world. Their innovative ideas include a consortium to build and manage small nuclear plants to generate power for countries that don’t want or need to run such plants themselves, thus reducing proliferation risks. They also make the case for expanded cooperation to strengthen safety, security, and proliferation resistance to allow nuclear power to grow enough to play a significant role in mitigating change.

Stavins Notes Successes of Cancun Climate Meetings

After two weeks of intense negotiations, the world’s governments quietly achieved consensus on a set of substantive steps forward at the Sixteenth Conference of the Parties (COP-16) of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in Cancun, Mexico, in December.

The Cancun Agreements are notable in that emissions mitigation targets were set for some 80 countries, including all the major economies, and the world’s largest emitters (among them China, the United States, the European Union, India, and Brazil) have signed up for targets and actions to reduce emissions by 2020.

“The acceptance of the Cancun Agreements suggests that the international diplomatic community may now recognize that incremental steps in the right direction are better than acrimonious debates over unachievable targets,” said Robert N. Stavins, Albert Pratt Professor of Business and Government and director of the Harvard Project on Climate Agreements.

The Belfer Center’s Russian-related work goes on in many long-term ways as well. In December, Russian generals joined a weeklong joint study program with American senior officers at the Kennedy School on security issues. Organized by retired Air Force Gen. Ted Oelstrom, director of the HKS National Security Program, this project has been meeting annually for 20 years, building knowledge and trust. This year, the officers worked together on a case study written by Simon Saradzhyan, a Belfer Center fellow with deep knowledge of U.S.-Russian security issues. The case challenged the officers to devise plans to respond to the imagined theft of a nuclear weapon by terrorists intent on smuggling it either to Russia or the United States.

These joint projects build on a tradition reaching back at least to 1957, when the Center’s founder, Paul Doty, took part in a meeting of Soviet and American scientists in a groundbreaking conference in Pugwash, Nova Scotia, that led to the founding of the Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs, winner of the 1995 Nobel Peace Prize. Doty went to Moscow the following year, the first of 40 such trips he made to foster U.S.-Soviet cooperation and reduce the risk of a nuclear war.

In the early 1990s, Ashton B. Carter, then the Center’s director, picked up the mantle with Steven E. Miller, Graham Allison, Kurt Campbell, and others, launching celebrated initiatives to tackle the sudden new risk of loose nuclear weapons and materials in the former Soviet Union. Carter helped Senators Sam Nunn and Richard Lugar draft their pioneering legislation; John P. Holdren, then chair of the National Academy of Sciences’ Committee on International Security and Arms Control, built a pivotal dialogue with senior Russian counterparts starting in the early 1980s.

Allison, the current Belfer Center director, has worked to shift the world’s attention to the growing nuclear terrorist threat, not least with his 2004 book, Nuclear Terrorism: The Ultimate Preventable Catastrophe.

Miller, director of the Center’s International Security Program, noted recently that the Belfer Center’s more than 500 alumni working on these and related initiatives form a “who’s who in the field of international security and arms control.”

—James Smith
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Preserving Past and Future: A Greenpeace balloon next to the Chichen Itza ruins in Mexico prior to the Cancun climate conference.
Workshop Aims to Hasten Transformation of Energy System

Energizing Innovation: Secretary of Energy Steven Chu answers questions following his dinner speech at the energy workshop.

What could, and should, the U.S. government do to hasten commercialization of advanced energy technologies? Senior representatives from government, industry, finance, and academia convened at the Harvard Kennedy School to discuss the question in an off-the-record workshop on energy technology demonstration in December. The workshop was organized and hosted by the Belfer Center’s Energy Technology Innovation Policy research group.

The diverse constituencies participating in the workshop, among them Secretary of Energy Steven Chu and Under Secretary Steve Koonin, director of DOE’s ARPA-E, Arun Majumdar, former Louisiana Senator Bennett Johnston, and executives from Goldman Sachs, DuPont, and General Electric, all agreed speed is of the essence. To meet the energy challenges facing the United States, U.S. government intervention in spurring technology demonstration and deployment is a vital step toward commercialization. Included among the speakers were Uma Chowdry (DuPont), Stephan Dolezalek (Vintage Point Venture Partners), Donald Paul (University of Southern California), Arati Prabhakar (US Venture Partners), and Gary Rahl (Booz Allen Hamilton).

Technology demonstrations ... are particularly important.

Many participants agreed that technology demonstrations—the critical phase between research and development and commercialization—are particularly important because: (a) they are a rate-limiting step to the commercialization; (b) they test new business models that provide critical knowledge to stakeholders; and (c) absent a clear price signal, the need to support innovative energy technologies becomes more urgent.

Workshop participants outlined several policy principles and recommendations, among them that the government should only support projects that can have direct impact on energy security, competitiveness and sustainability, and that the policies need to create a predictable, long-term investment environment.

Two policy initiatives currently being discussed by policy makers in Washington received broad, though not universal, support among participants in the workshop. These included (1) the Quadrennial Energy Review (QER), recently proposed by the President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) to overcome the current absence of predictable, transparent, consistent, and comprehensive energy policies for the United States; and (2) the Clean Energy Deployment Administration (CEDA), a bipartisan initiative aimed at creating an attractive investment environment for the development and deployment of new clean energy technologies.

The workshop organizers, all with the Center’s Science, Technology, and Public Policy (STPP) program, included: Venkatesh Narayanamurti, STPP director; Laura Diaz Anadon, STPP associate director and ETIP director; Erik Mielke, ETIP fellow; Karin Vander Schaaf, ETIP administrative coordinator; Henry Lee, ETIP co-principal investigator, and Matthew Bunn, co-principal investigator of ETIP’s ERD3 project. The workshop was supported by a grant from Booz Allen Hamilton.

—Joseph Leahy

U.S. and China Should Avoid “Thucydides Trap”

When China’s President Hu Jintao visited the United States in January, observers noted that the meetings between Hu and President Obama were treading carefully around what Belfer Center Director Graham Allison calls the “Thucydides Trap”—that deadly combination of calculation and emotion that, over the years, can turn healthy rivalry into antagonism or worse” (New York Times, Jan. 22, 2011).

In January, Allison and Belfer Center colleagues Richard Rosecrance and Joseph S. Nye met in Beijing with their counterparts in the China Development Research Foundation to continue the group’s discussion of U.S.-China relations and efforts to prevent conflict between the rising and traditional powers.

Rosecrance directs Harvard Kennedy School’s Project on U.S.-China Relations.

The rise in China’s power today inspires misunderstanding if not fear.” —Richard Rosecrance

At the conclusion of the three-day roundtable, Rosecrance said both sides conceded that China and the United States were on separate tracks and no full resolution of their competing positions was possible in the short run. Areas discussed included U.S. debt and depreciation of Chinese holdings of the U.S. dollar, U.S. arms sales to Taiwan, and China’s apparent belief that Taiwan falls within China’s defense perimeter.

“The rise in China’s power today inspires misunderstanding if not fear,” Rosecrance said, “and there is as yet no clear answer as to how the rest of the world will or should respond.”

Commenting on the growing interdependence between the China and U.S. economies, Allison said in the 2009 book Power and Restraint (Rosecrance and Gu Guoliang), that this situation could reach the point where “official capital flight or trade embargoes could be so damaging that they would no longer be economic options.” The acronym “MADE (mutual assured destruction of the economy),” he said, “could take its place in the lexicon with MAD (mutual assured destruction of the society).”

In a January (2011) BBC interview, Nye said, “[T]he [U.S.-China] relationship will remain difficult as long as the Chinese suffer from hubris based on a mistaken belief in American decline.”

—Sharon Wilke
Q &A  Rolf Mowatt-Larssen

After more than two decades in intelligence with the CIA and U.S. Department of Energy, Rolf Mowatt-Larssen is now a senior fellow at the Belfer Center focusing on nuclear terrorism, domestic security, and al Qaeda’s weapons of mass destruction (WMD) ambitions. He is completing a research report titled “Al Qaeda’s Religious Justification of Nuclear Terrorism,” a follow-up to his timeline of al Qaeda’s quest to acquire WMD. We asked Mowatt-Larssen to reflect on American life post-9/11, the future of global intelligence, and life in the CIA.

Q Nearly a decade after the 9/11 attacks, it feels like the American people are less worried about another major terrorist attack. However, you recently published a working paper titled “Islam and the Bomb: Religious Justification For and Against Nuclear Weapons,” in which you warn of a heightened risk of another al Qaeda attack on the United States, possibly with weapons of mass destruction. What has led you to this ominous warning—and have we been letting our guard down?

I am convinced al Qaeda is planning another large-scale attack against the U.S.

— Rolf Mowatt-Larssen

I think the American people have to accept the reality that the threat of terrorism is here to stay, and that we will one day again suffer a terrorist attack on U.S. soil. We must get beyond living in fear to come to accept that terrorism is a condition of the world in which we live. It is true that we are safer than we were on 9/11/2001. It is true that the government has done much to destroy al Qaeda as an organization. However, I am convinced al Qaeda is planning another large-scale attack against the U.S. Hopefully, we can thwart any such threat, but we must recognize that the group’s senior leadership has not abandoned their interest in staging another spectacular attack that in their minds might swing this conflict back in their favor. The group’s deputy, Ayman Zawahiri, has written a book called Exoneration that meticulously explains the al Qaeda’s rationale for trying to kill up to 10 million Americans.

Q In a January Christian Science Monitor article, you suggest developing a sort of global CIA, to collectively address major conflicts facing the world, including dealing with WMD and terrorism. How would this kind of organization help prevent an al Qaeda attack—and in its absence, what are the main steps the U.S. government should take?

My promotion of a global intelligence capacity is intended to get people thinking: what are the limitations of “intelligence” as that term was defined and evolved throughout the Cold War years? How has the nature of threats evolved since the end of the Cold War, and as this new century unfolds? Greater intelligence collaboration and information sharing between states will be required in order to address increasingly shared vulnerabilities and threats. States must recognize their collective security interests will converge to a greater extent with the passage of time. These common threats include nuclear and biological weapons proliferation, organized crime, radicalization and extremism, and the implications of energy and environmental security, among others. In essence, it is no longer possible for states to solve such problems by strictly working alone. A new spirit of global citizenship should be nurtured.

Q In your call for an international intelligence organization, you suggest a serious need for “rapid information sharing; far less secrecy; a devaluation of the role of espionage in favor of confidential sources who see themselves helping the world, not working against individual countries.” Do the WikiLeaks serve this function?

I have made it a policy not to comment on WikiLeaks, because I am opposed in principle to the practice of encouraging criminal activity—the theft of government property—purportedly to achieve “noble ends.” On the contrary, the promotion of confidence and trust between governments and their citizens should be promoted by a greater degree of transparency and information sharing and less emphasis on secrecy. In this open, interconnected world, citizens are rightly demanding more participation in governing their own affairs. Intelligence organizations, in particular, need to make a distinction between secrecy that is necessary to effectively carry out the mission and secrecy that serves no purpose but to facilitate mindless, bureaucratic control. I am suggesting that many of today’s intelligence problems cannot be effectively addressed with yesterday’s methodologies for collecting, analyzing, and disseminating information.

Q During the Cold War, you were a CIA officer working in various locations, including Russia. What role should intelligence play in today’s U.S.-Russia relationship?

The reality is that both countries continue to spy on one another because our respective policymakers value the decision advantage that they feel that this intelligence affords. This will continue to be the case as long as the U.S. and Russia are strategic rivals that do not fully trust one another on many levels. This mistrust is especially salient when one considers the long and bloody history of confrontation between the CIA and KGB. That said, I am convinced there is much more that unites us than divides us in this post–Cold War era. A robust liaison partnership is clearly in the interest of both countries. The U.S. and Russia must cooperate closely in efforts to counter terrorism. We must be leaders in efforts to denuclearize the world and eliminate the threat of nuclear proliferation. There is more that we can do together to solve regional conflicts. As this century unfolds, our common interests will become increasingly obvious and serve to improve intelligence cooperation.

Q What’s next at the Belfer Center?

Reading, writing, listening. I hope I am able to impart to others some of what I have learned as a practitioner and public servant for 36 years. Selfishly speaking, I am trying to absorb as much information and knowledge as possible. The Belfer Center reminds me how little I know and how much there is yet to learn.
Few Americans can have the spirit of public service embedded more deeply in their DNA than the Belfer Center’s Henry Lee. And few have been as single-minded in putting that spirit to work.

When Lee was not quite a year old, his parents took him to Harvard Yard for Secretary of State George Marshall’s famous speech in June 1947, announcing what would become the Marshall Plan to rebuild Europe after World War II. Lee’s father was then a Harvard sophomore and went on to become a career diplomat and one of Boston’s civic leaders.

The family’s neighbor in Washington in the late 1950s was a young U.S. senator from Massachusetts who gave Lee, then 11 or 12 years old, passes to the U.S. Senate gallery.

It doesn’t seem like coincidence that Henry Lee has spent the past 31 years in the Harvard graduate school bearing the name of that senator and soon-to-be president, John F. Kennedy.

Lee recalls that he was in the Boston Public Garden in November 1960, the night before the election, for JFK’s final campaign speech.

“He was six hours late. There were 20,000 people waiting, and when he finally arrived, it was the loudest roar I had ever heard in my life,” Lee said. “It got me hooked on government.”

In prep school in North Andover, Mass., Lee became president of the school’s Young Democrats and campaigned for gubernatorial candidates. In 1970, the recent Harvard College graduate went to work for Republican Governor Francis Sargent for a three-month internship, unpaid—except for some tickets to the Boston Patriots football team.

At 24, he was put in charge of the small state office handling environment and natural resources issues.

Lee took a break to become one of the youngest mid-career graduate students at the Kennedy School, earning an MPA in June 1974. Sargent then named him director of the state’s energy office. When Democrat Michael Dukakis was elected later that year, Lee figured his short career was over. But Dukakis kept him on after reading a prescient policy paper Lee had written. They worked together for the next four years amid successive energy crises, and Lee’s staff grew to about 100.

“I enjoyed state government,” Lee said of his nine years of state service. “You could pull together a coalition of four or five people and get something done.” After Dukakis was defeated in a bitter primary, Lee joined the Kennedy School in 1979 for a one-year fellowship that he never imagined would turn into a lifetime of academic service. He soon was named executive director of the Energy and Environmental Policy Program. In 1991, he became a lecturer. And he found that he enjoyed teaching.

If you want to have an influence in your field, the ability to stimulate interest and provide knowledge to 25-year-olds who may spend 30 years in the field seems to me to be a unique opportunity.

—Henry Lee

He also found that he enjoyed putting research teams together, and he proved adept at raising research funds and running projects. He pursued a series of related subjects, ranging from national parks policy to energy security. As the student body became more international, Lee began to travel more himself, researching and consulting in Brazil on infrastructure and then working across Latin America, the Middle East, and Asia.

“I’ve been to 35 countries,” he said. “I’ve been involved in 10 to 12 policy areas since I’ve been here. So I’ve had 10 or 12 jobs over that period.”

In January, Lee was promoted to senior lecturer in public policy at Harvard Kennedy School.

Lee said he was especially gratified to work with HKS fellow Doug Ahlers on the Broadmoor Project, helping to rebuild that neighborhood in New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina. Carolyn Wood, the assistant academic dean, worked closely with Ahlers and Lee throughout the Broadmoor Project. She said Lee’s commitment was typical of his career at the Kennedy School.

“He is a citizen of the school in the classic sense,” she said. “Whatever the school needs done, he will do. When we asked him to take on the principal investigator role for Broadmoor, for him it was the right thing to do—it was an ethical decision.”

Inspiring Innovation: Henry Lee speaks at an award ceremony for Harvard Kennedy School’s Roy Family Environmental Award, coordinated biennially by Lee’s Environment and Natural Resources Program. Lee himself was honored in February for his promotion to senior lecturer in public policy at Harvard Kennedy School.

Inspiring Innovation: Henry Lee

He has served in the thankless job of admissions committee member. He is one of the busiest faculty members, teaching two classes totaling about 160 students, and also has taught many executive courses. He started a pioneering executive training program on Infrastructure in a Market Economy with colleague Tony Gomez-Ibanez that has been taught in many countries.

Lee has led dozens of research projects and written studies on topics ranging from the dangers of asbestos (in 1989) to the nation’s decaying transportation infrastructure (September 2010). He is co-principal investigator for the high-impact Energy Technology Innovation Project in the Belfer Center. And he produces many teaching case studies, which add to the Kennedy School’s global footprint.

Lee also volunteers for about a day a month to serve as chairman of the Massachusetts Stewardship Council, overseeing the state’s Department of Conservation and Recreation. He worries that the financial crisis will lead to state park closures.

Professor William Clark, the faculty chair of the Environment and Natural Resources Program, has worked and taught with Lee for 20 years.

“The key reason we are more than the sum of the parts is Henry Lee,” Clark said. “More than anyone I know, Henry has just worked ceaselessly not to build up his own little empire but to build the connections—among the faculty, from faculty to potential sources of support, from the work we do to the world of policy and practice, and to our students. He gets us working together.”

—James Smith
For her dissertation, Jacqueline (Jill) Hazleton, a research fellow with the Belfer Center's International Security Program, compares two models of success in counterinsurgency (COIN): the conventional wisdom influencing U.S. foreign policy today, which focuses on building representative, responsive, distributive states and limiting the use of force to gain broad popular allegiance, versus a model of what actually works in COIN and under what conditions.

The conventional prescription for COIN success—state-building—has never been applied, Hazleton argues. Instead, successful counterinsurgents have relied heavily on the use of force, including, unfortunately, the use of force against civilians, while providing few or no political and economic reforms.

“Empirically, what has succeeded in counterinsurgency is a lot of fighting, not necessarily a lot of killing, but a lot of fighting, and a little bit of political accommodation of political entrepreneurs,” she says. “We have two very different models. One is visionary, and ambitious, and optimistic, and one is not at all pretty—it’s very, very ugly.”

The appeal of COIN as state building, Hazleton says, is its reflection of U.S. ideals about how states should treat their citizens, and how citizens want to be treated by their states.

To set attainable goals, and reach them, the United States must recognize the costs of succeeding in COIN and recognize that attempting to build states in order to defeat insurgencies is likely to hinder COIN success.

Hazelton’s research focuses on six cases: Dhofar, Oman; El Salvador; and Vietnam in the advisory period, 1956–1965; plus Turkey-PKK, France-Algeria, and the Philippines-Huks. In her three core cases, the British-backed Dhofar campaign was a decisive military victory, while the U.S.-backed El Salvador campaign ended with negotiations. Vietnam was a loss because U.S. and South Vietnamese goals did not closely align, and the United States did not focus on the narrow band of shared interests.

Hazelton’s approach to her research draws on her previous studies in English literature and her work as a journalist. Her experience in journalism instilled a respect for all perspectives and an understanding that many forces are at play.

“There is a multiplicity of actors, with a multiplicity of perspectives, and none of them necessarily has the edge in accuracy,” she says.

In studying literature as an undergrad and for an MA, Hazleton learned to separate causes from effects from camouflage and to examine them critically. “Teasing apart the strands, seeing how they fit together . . . that’s exactly what you need to do in political science and journalism also.”

See http://belfercenter.org/Hazleton/

—Maria Costigan

DIANA BUTTU explores dynamics of Palestinian life under occupation

“Nothing in my Canadian upbringing had prepared me for a life under occupation. As much as I had read about it, I still did not know what it was like not to be free,” said Diana Buttu, research fellow with the Belfer Center Dubai Initiative, of her experience living on the West Bank. Buttu’s extensive education and experiences, combined with her dedication to the Palestinian cause, led her to become a legal advisor to the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) in its negotiations with Israel from 2000–2005, followed by her appointment as a legal and communications advisor to Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas.

A Canadian-Palestinian, she immersed herself in the Palestinian cause when she was 16 years old. Her activism stayed with her through university and law school, and she spent her summers working for human rights organizations in Palestine.

Buttu learned firsthand of the insecurities that Palestinians face every day. “I had never experienced checkpoints. I had never experienced bombings or military campaigns. I had never experienced this great disconnect between peoples living on this one small piece of land.” This reality of Palestinian life allowed her to greater represent the Palestinian people and brought her to the attention of President Abbas.

Her work as an advisor to the PLO and President Abbas offered Buttu important insight into the Israeli-Palestinian peace process. “The problem with international law,” she said, “is that there is no way of actually ending an occupation. So in comes the peace process.” The peace process is not working because the “two sides are negotiating in two very different ways.” Palestine is insistent upon the application of international law, while Israel focuses on power negotiations. Buttu believes that without a third party, the peace process is going to fail entirely.

The Belfer Center’s Dubai Initiative is now home to Buttu’s research. The Dubai Initiative, she says, “is unique in that it brings together academics and practitioners, people from a wide array of practices and fields, which allows for a fantastic exchange of ideas.” During her stay at the Belfer Center, she is researching the dynamics of the Palestinian-Israeli negotiations through her research project, “Negotiating in the Absence of the Law: Palestine’s Refugees and the Palestinian-Israeli Negotiations, 1993–2007.”

See http://belfercenter.org/Buttu/

—Brittany Card

Welcome to New Little Fellows

Congratulations to Tolu Odumosu (Science, Technology, and Public Policy) and his wife, Onyi, on the birth of baby Leke Paul.

Melissa Willard-Foster (International Security Program) and her husband, Doug, have welcomed their new addition, baby Evan Aaron Foster!
Michael Sechrist is a research fellow at the Belfer Center, where he studies the security and economic implications of the undersea communications industry. He also contributes to Project Minerva, a joint Department of Defense-funded initiative between Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University to study cyberspace.

Sechrist believes that the U.S. information networks are more secure than some experts argue. A government "kill switch" would have a negative impact on business and internet freedoms, says Sechrist.

"Cyber security is a serious challenge—something the nation should rally around as a significant security threat—but not something that I see that is going to have your microwave jumping off the counter at home."

Recent high-profile cyber attacks, however, against Google, the Department of Defense, and various financial networks in the U.S. have raised debate in Congress over giving the president the power to shut down the Internet during declared emergencies for as many as 30 days.

While Sechrist admits the importance of protecting American networks—especially as the nation's power grid is upgraded online—he believes that U.S. information networks are more secure than some experts argue. A government "kill switch" would have a negative impact on business and internet freedoms, says Sechrist.

"Cyber security is a serious challenge—something the nation should rally around as a significant security threat—but not something that I see that is going to have your microwave jumping off the counter at home."

A significant vulnerability to our information networks and cyberspace, says Sechrist, lies largely at the bottom of the ocean. An expert on undersea cable communications policy, Sechrist studies the security and economic implications surrounding the undersea communications cable industry. At the Belfer Center, he also contributes to Project Minerva, a joint Department of Defense-funded initiative between Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University to study cyberspace.

"Cyberspace," Sechrist says, "is an area of research that is not unlike the 1950s was for the nuclear industry."

See http://belfercenter.org/Sechrist/

—Joseph Leahy

**Fellows at Work and on the Move**

**Philipp Bleck** (Project on Managing the Atom (MTA)/International Security Program (ISP) 2009–10), has begun as assistant professor at the Monterey Institute of International Studies in California.

**Diana Buttu** (Dubai Initiative) was a guest at Columbia's School of International and Public Affairs in November with **Alvaro de Soto**, an international mediator. Their conversation, "Negotiating for Palestine," was part of a series engaging high-level figures in international politics.

**Caty Clément** (ISP/Inextricate Conflict Program 2004–05) is a faculty member at the Geneva Centre for Security Policy and heads its Conflict and Peacebuilding Program (COPE). COPE focuses on civilian and security aspects.


A study by ISP Senior Fellow **Chuck Freilich**, titled "The Armageddon Scenario: Israel and the Threat of Nuclear Terrorism," led to the establishment of an international team at the Institute for Counterterrorism at Israel's Herzlia Interdisciplinary Center.


**Assaf Moghadam** (Associate, ISP/Initiative on Religion in International Affairs (RIIA) 2009–10; fellow ISP/RHIA 2007–09, ISP 2004–06) is now senior lecturer and associate professor with the Lauder School of Government, Diplomacy and Strategy at the Interdisciplinary Center, Israel.

**Thomas Nichols** (ISP/MTA) spoke in Berlin on NATO nuclear weapons and missile defense to the Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, and to the Heinrich Boll Foundation.

**Study Finds Emerging Countries to be Large Players in Global Energy RD&D**

The Belfer Center’s Energy Technology Innovation Policy research group has found that the governments of six key developing countries—Brazil, Russia, India, Mexico, China, and South Africa—are spending more on energy technology research, development, and demonstration than the governments of the two dozen richest countries—combined. These countries should be included in global discussions around energy technology innovation, said co-authors **Laura Díaz Anadón** and **Ruud Kempener** (lead researcher). See the full report at http://belfercenter.org/emerging/.

—Joseph Leahy

See http://belfercenter.org/Sechrist/
Power in Peace and War: Michele Flournoy (left), under secretary of defense for policy and the highest ranking woman ever to serve in the Pentagon, comments during the JFK Jr. Forum “Women on War and Peace” in November. Flournoy, a former research fellow with the Belfer Center, was joined on the panel by Paula Dobriansky (center), adjunct senior fellow at the Center and former under secretary of state for democracy and global affairs, and Meghan O’Sullivan, Jeane Kirkpatrick Professor of International Affairs with the Belfer Center and former deputy national security advisor for Iraq and Afghanistan. The forum was moderated by Belfer Center Director Graham Allison.

EPA at 40: Lisa Jackson (left), director of the Environmental Protection Agency, at Harvard's 40th anniversary celebration of the EPA, with (left to right), John P. Holdren, assistant to President Obama for science and technology and member, on leave from the Belfer Center’s board of directors, Harvard Kennedy School Professor William Clark, a member of the Center’s board, and Henry Lee, director of the Belfer Center’s Environment and Natural Resources Program. The day-long event was sponsored by the Harvard University Center for the Environment, Harvard Kennedy School, Harvard Law School, and Harvard School of Public Health.

Clash of Civilizations? Fareed Zakaria (left), editor-at-large of Time Magazine, and Gideon Rose, editor of Foreign Affairs, discussed “The Legacy of Sam Huntington” at a JFK Jr. Forum in November. Panelists not shown included Francis Fukuyama, senior fellow at the Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies, and Eliot Cohen, director of the Philip Merrill Center for Strategic Studies at Johns Hopkins University’s School of Advanced International Studies. The event was moderated by the Belfer Center’s Graham Allison.

Welcoming Committee: Former Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice (center) speaks about foreign policy at Harvard Kennedy School’s New Congressional Members orientation in December 2010—along with HKS Professor Meghan O’Sullivan, who serves on the Center’s board of directors, and Belfer Center Director Graham Allison.


Homerun! Larry Lucchino, president/CEO of the Boston Red Sox, speaks to students and faculty during his presentation in December titled “A Conversation on Ballparks, Politics, and Public Policy.” Moderated by Belfer Center Director Graham Allison, Lucchino surprised the audience by tossing autographed baseballs to those asking questions.
Reinstituting Security: U.S. Senator Jeanne Shaheen of New Hampshire discusses the New START treaty and nuclear proliferation issues at a brainstorming session in December with Belfer Center faculty and fellows. Several Harvard students also took part in the event, which was hosted by Harvard Kennedy School’s Institute of Politics (IOP) and the Belfer Center. Shaheen is a former director of the IOP.

Behavioral Bases? Chiara Ruffa, an International Security Program (ISP) research fellow who won a Fulbright Schuman Fellowship in 2010, presents at an ISP seminar on “Imagining War and Keeping Peace? Military Cultures and Peace Operation Effectiveness.” In her research, Ruffa asks why similar armies deployed in the same peace mission with a similar level of material resources behave differently and why they are effective in different ways. Her current project is aimed at understanding the propensity of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and armies to cooperate in complex humanitarian emergencies. She plans also to look at the theoretical and practical distinctions between peacekeeping and counterinsurgency.


Reducing the Risk: Former intelligence agent Valerie Plame Wilson with Graham Allison, director of the Belfer Center, during a JFK Jr. Forum panel discussion of the documentary Countdown to Zero. Plame Wilson and Allison, along with the Center’s Matthew Bunn and Rolf Mowatt-Larssen, were featured in the film about nuclear dangers and took part in the forum discussion.

Of Sufficient Danger: General John H. Tilelli Jr. (ret.) discusses “Korea: North/South Relations” at a Belfer Center Directors’ Lunch in February. A former commander of UN Command/U.S. Forces Korea, Tilelli co-chaired a Council on Foreign Relations independent task force that recently released a report concluding that the U.S. and its partners “must continue to press for denuclearization of North Korea.” Belfer Center Senior Fellow Ben Heineman (left) took part in the discussion.

Royal Interests: Her Majesty Queen Noor of Jordan (2nd from right) at the Belfer Center with Nicholas Burns (2nd from left), director of the Center’s Future of Diplomacy Project; Hilary Rantisi (left) and Ashraf Hegazy, director and executive director, respectively, of the Center’s Middle East Initiative and Dubai Initiative. Queen Noor and Center Director Graham Allison later took part in a discussion of nuclear disarmament at the Kennedy Library.
NEWSMAKERS

Views on Egypt: What’s Next?
Analysis and Comments from Belfer Center Affiliates

Graham Allison

“WHAT DO THE RECENT EVENTS IN EGYPT MEAN FOR THE U.S.? The answer is a lot more complicated than it might seem. Egypt is important to the U.S. for a number of reasons. Topping the list is oil, and the flow of oil, for which the Suez Canal is an important transit conduit. There is no reason to believe that a successor to the Mubarak government would interrupt the flow of oil, but you could imagine events in the area that could interrupt the flow, and we’re seeing this concern reflected in the markets.”


Nicholas Burns

“If the army is to be the steward of the coming transition, its greatest service will be to give the Egyptian people the space and freedom to build a civil society, new political parties and the time to prepare for a national conversation and debate. And, the army will need to reveal quickly its true intentions in this transition—will it permit Egyptians to begin an open and democratic debate about the future of their country? Or, will it quell the differing voices that have been stilled for so many decades in an attempt to maintain a militarily-dominant authoritarian state?”

“Five (early) lessons from the Egyptian revolution,” Power & Policy (Belfer Center blog) (Feb. 11, 2011)

Chuck Freilich

“At a minimum, the new Egypt is likely to be less friendly to the U.S. and less committed to peace with Israel, both of which are popularly associated with the Mubarak regime. As such, Egypt would be far less inclined to support American policies in the region, including counter-terrorism cooperation, and to play its traditional stabilizing role in the peace process and Mideast generally.”


Ashraf Hegazy

“PEOPLE HAVE BEEN VERY FRUSTRATED, FOR DECADES NOW.”

Hegazy said that while older generations have become apathetic to the corruption, today’s protests are being led by what he called the “youth bulge,” the demographic of 18- to 30-year-olds who make up a significant portion of the country’s population and hold few of the jobs . . .

“All they do is talk about how terrible the situation is,” Hegazy said. “That’s why, immediately after Tunisia overthrew its government, you’re starting to see these other protests against Arab countries that are really unprecedented in the older generation.”

“From afar, Egyptians watch with fear, pride,” Boston Globe (Jan. 29, 2011)

Rami Khouri

“[It’s] cosmic. This is extraordinary, in what it means in terms of the Arab world. After the Tunisian precedent, then leading to Egypt, we now have a clear break in the modern Arab security state that has ruled this region the last two and a half, three generations.”

“After Egypt’s ‘Cosmic’ day, will army usher in democratic, civilian government?” PBS NewsHour (Feb. 11, 2011)

“Two of the most interesting things going on these days around the crisis in Egypt are happening outside Egypt. In the Middle East, leaders throughout the Arab world are anticipating demands for changes in their countries and are responding with pre-emptive measures that they expect will gain them enough time to remain in power and make sufficient adjustments to deflect popular discontent.”

“The Arab Military Is Not the Solution,” Agence Global (Feb. 4, 2011)
Tarek Masoud

“The question is, what kind of guarantees can the military provide that they are actually going to midwife a kind of democratic process (with) civilian oversight of the military? . . . That’s a very tall order in this part of the world. And so we’re not yet sure that we have actually gotten a regime change.”

“After Egypt’s ‘Cosmic’ day, will Army usher in democratic, civilian government?”
PBS NewsHour (Feb. 11, 2011)

David Sanger

“Young Egyptian and Tunisian activists brainstormed on the use of technology to evade surveillance, commiserated about torture and traded practical tips on how to stand up to rubber bullets and organize barricades. They fused their secular expertise in social networks with a discipline culled from religious movements and combined the energy of soccer fans with the sophistication of surgeons.”


Monica Duffy Toft

“If the MB comes to power in Egypt or even becomes a major player, what will its position be on the transformation of the political system in Egypt? Is it a force for democracy or a force for authoritarianism? In essence, will the MB foster a conservative Islamic vision for Egypt? The evidence is mixed, but on balance I predict the MB will be a force for democratic change. What is my evidence? I have two sorts. The first regards the MB itself and the second is the role of religious actors in politics more generally.”

“Religious actors can be democratizers,” Power & Policy (Belfer Center blog) (Feb. 11, 2011)

Stephen M. Walt

“A post-Mubarak government is unlikely to abrogate the peace treaty with Israel, because doing so would immediately put it at odds with the United States and Europe and bring Cairo few tangible benefits. Nor would Israel be imperiled if the treaty were eventually to lapse, because Egypt’s military is no match for the Israeli armed forces. . . . Post-Mubarak Egypt is likely to resemble contemporary Turkey: neither hostile nor subservient, and increasingly seeking to chart its own course.”


(To read op-eds in full, see Publications on the Belfer Center website: www.belfercenter.org)
Compiled by Traci Farrell and Brittany Card
Jihadi ideologues mobilize Muslims, especially young Muslims, through an individualist, centered Islam. Appealing to a classical defense doctrine, they argue that the mandates of jihad are the individual duty of every Muslim and therefore transcend and undermine both the authority of the state and the power of parental control.

Yet emphasizing the duty and right of individually initiated jihad is just one side of do-it-yourself Islam. The other involves protecting the purity of doctrinal beliefs against deviation, even by fellow jihadis. The pursuit of doctrinal purity has led some jihadis to resort to takfir, a pronouncement that declares fellow Muslims unbelievers and makes it legal to shed their blood. Set against the background of the Kharijites, Islam's first counter-establishment movement, this book explores the religious philosophy underlying jihadism. The Kharijites's idealistic and individualistic ideology forces members to deploy takfir against one another, thus hastening their extinction as a group.

“...[W]ritten with verve and insight, skillfully integrating past and present, and primary and secondary sources. It offers marvelous insight into the jihadi mindset...”

“The Jihadis' Path to Self-Destruction is written with verve and insight, skillfully integrating past and present, and primary and secondary sources. It offers marvelous insight into the jihadi mindset—its devastating simplicity and the complexities and contradictions out of which it has evolved and which may also lead to the movement's self-destruction.”

—A. H. Johns, College of Asia and the Pacific, Australian National University

Cyber War: The Next Threat to National Security and What to Do About It
By Richard A. Clarke, Faculty Affiliate, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs and Robert K. Knake
Ecco/HarperCollins
April 2010

“...[A] harrowing—and persuasive—picture of the cyberthreat the United States faces today.”

“In these pages Mr. Clarke uses his insider’s knowledge of national security policy to create a harrowing—and persuasive—picture of the cyberthreat the United States faces today.”

—Michiko Kakutani, New York Times

Recent Events Call Attention to Nye’s New Book: The Future of Power

“As authoritarian Arab regimes struggle with Twitter and Al Jazeera-inflamed demonstrations, Iran tries to cope with the cyber sabotage of its nuclear enrichment program, and American diplomats try to understand the impact of WikiLeaks, it is clear that smart policy in an information age will need a more sophisticated understanding of power in world politics,” Joseph S. Nye wrote in his inaugural post to the Belfer Center’s new blog “Power and Policy” in early February.


“Power transition from one dominant state to another is a familiar historical event,” Nye argues, “but power diffusion is a more novel process. The problem for all states in today's global information age is that more things are happening outside the control of even the most powerful states.”

In The Future of Power, Nye notes that previous markers of power—such as numbers of nuclear missiles, industrial capacity, and the line-up of tanks—are now obsolete. These changes in power require long-established power relationships to be remapped.

For all the fashionable predictions of China, India, or Brazil surpassing the United States... the greater threats may come from modern barbarians and non-state actors.

—Joseph S. Nye

While a number of analysts are decrying a decline in American power worldwide—and comparing it to the fall of Rome—Nye points out that Rome remained dominant “for more than three centuries after the apogee of Roman power, and even then, it did not succumb to the rise of another state, but died a death of a thousand cuts inflicted by various barbarian tribes.”

“For all the fashionable predictions of China, India, or Brazil surpassing the United States in the next decades,” he writes, “the greater threats may come from modern barbarians and non-state actors. In an information-based world of cyber insecurity, power diffusion may be a greater threat than power transition.”

Former U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright praises his contribution: “If your goal is to understand world affairs in the twenty-first century, there could be no better guide than The Future of Power.”

—Sharon Wilke
The Belfer Center’s Middle East Initiative (MEI) celebrated the tenth anniversary of its partnership with the Kuwait Foundation for the Advancement of Sciences (KFAS) in Kuwait in December. The celebration began with a dinner in the home of the Kuwaiti Foreign Minister HE Dr. Mohammed Al-Sabah, with more than 250 alumni of the program in attendance along with nine Harvard faculty and representatives of MEI and KFAS. The dinner was followed by a two-day conference that highlighted the participation of faculty from Harvard in MEI’s programs and provided an opportunity for research funded through the Kuwait Program at Harvard to be presented in Kuwait.

In January 2001, the Harvard Kennedy School and the Kuwait Foundation for the Advancement of Sciences launched the Kuwait Program at Harvard, a program of engagement, partnership, and intellectual exchange aimed at building bridges, opening and furthering dialogue, advancing scholarship and informed research, training leaders, and developing relationships between Harvard University and Kuwait. The program included customized executive education programs, sponsored research addressing public policy issues in Kuwait and the Gulf, fellowships for Executive Education participants from Kuwait, and a visiting professorship at HKS.

The program has since met many of its goals. According to Middle East Initiative Director Hilary Rantisi, it has customized 13 executive education training programs for Kuwaitis covering topics ranging from management to trade and diplomacy issues. These programs have graduated more than 339 Kuwaitis, including several who are now government ministers. Two of the first four women to be elected to parliament are alumni of these programs. In addition, 27 research projects in Kuwait and the Gulf have been completed. Gregory Gause served as the Kuwait visiting professor (2008–2010) and Rima Khalaf as a visiting scholar (2010). Throughout the program, has increased scholarship on the Middle East at Harvard and has trained many experienced leaders from Kuwait in leadership, governance, and management skills.

“We are pleased with the significant impact the Middle East Initiative’s Kuwait programs have had on Kuwait and on Harvard,” Rantisi said. 🌟
Advancing Diplomatic Dialogue in India

The Belfer Center was well-represented at the 15th gathering of the Aspen Institute U.S.-India Strategic Dialogue in New Delhi in January. Included in the U.S. delegation were Nicholas Burns (at right in photo), director of the Belfer Center’s Future of Diplomacy Project who also heads Aspen Strategy Group (ASG), Joseph S. Nye, co-chair of ASG with Brent Scowcroft, Center Director Graham Allison, and New York Times reporter David Sanger, adjacent senior fellow with the Center. Ronen Sen (left in photo), former Indian ambassador to the U.S., was part of the Indian delegation. “This long-standing dialogue among Indian and American leaders is enormously beneficial,” Burns said. “This year’s meeting gave us unique insights into India’s impressive economic growth and its view of how to handle the Afghan War, problems with Pakistan, and the challenges of a rising China.”

History of Weapons Acquisition

Roy E. Larsen Professor of Public Policy and Management F. M. Scherer, a Belfer Center associate, is a member of a panel advising Armed Services historians on an ambitious multi-volume history of weapons acquisition policy. Historical policies from the end of World War II to 1960 and during the McNamara years are underway.

Media’s Role in Clean Energy


20 Years at Harvard

The Belfer Center’s Lovita Strain (right) was honored with Harvard’s “20 Year Award” in December by Harvard Kennedy School Dean David Ellwood. In addition to her most recent contributions to Harvard Kennedy School as financial associate for the Belfer Center, her service to Harvard extends to the Finance Office of Harvard Law School and the Accounting/Payroll Office of Harvard University Health Services.