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How to Use This Handbook

The purpose of this handbook is to engage citizens on the vital issue of security and, through them, to seek new and better ways to improve our democratic process and institutions, including the ones we export. In this civic engagement, we especially want to encourage women to step forward with their problem-solving skills and offer new ways of handling the considerable security issues that challenge our nation today.

Besides offering a new vision for US security, and important background, we will offer models for how these civic discussions might take place, specifically within the realm of a security paradigm that values the safety of people as much as the nation state. The topic we frame here is the role of the military in our democracy, and we have created a curriculum for citizen dialogue on this topic. The scripts come from our Rockefeller, Ford Foundation, The Annenberg Trust, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, The Libra Foundation, Hunt Alternatives, ConnectUS Fund, and the Nathan Cummings Foundation.

This handbook could have never been created without the creative energy and support of the White House Project, a women’s leadership organization—based in New York—that works to increase the influence of women in politics, media and culture. The idea for this book was incubated with the help of the staff—and in particular Marie Wilson, Erin Vilardi and Elizabeth Johnson. This organization is a national leader in building critical mass to renew American democracy and reinforce citizenship responsibilities where issues of national security and participation are concerned. We believe that the role of the military in democracy is an issue that should be discussed regularly in any healthy democracy, but is of vital concern today here in the United States because of the dramatic changes over the past decades. And we believe that women must lead the way.

We look forward to feedback from the users of this handbook. If you have any comments or ideas to share, please send them to:

afp-info@allianceforpeacebuilding.org
own learning at The Alliance for Peacebuilding, a nonpartisan institution whose goal is to build sustainable peace and security worldwide. You will also find sample agendas and a guide to other resources. In other words, this document is crafted as a manual for public discourse. It is a starting point and is not meant to be comprehensive. It cannot be comprehensive without the thinking of the women and men it seeks to bring into the process. In fact, if you want to go straight to the implementation—skip to the last chapter.

Ultimately, we as citizens need to reinvigorate our democracy by recognizing and discussing the true security needs of an evolved world. And none of this can be done without the unique contribution of women to that dialogue—a contribution that has been missing for far too long and whose full participation might help us finally feel secure.

Some Background

Welcome to war and peace in the 21st Century. But before we get there, let’s remember the century left behind and the conflicts that dominated it: two World Wars, the Korean War, the Vietnam War and the Cold War with the former Soviet Union (USSR).

We had barely entered this new century when, on September 11, 2001, four airplanes and 19 terrorists forever changed our sense of security.

In the 1900’s, security was synonymous with military, either through actual on-the-ground fighting or through the arms race. Our long-term strategy, as we sought to neutralize the U.S.S.R., was one of containment and a doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction: If one side dropped the bomb on the other side, it wouldn’t be long until a bigger bomb dropped on the aggressor.

Since 1991, the Soviet Union has been gone, and the threats we face now are far more complex. As the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have clearly shown, we cannot win through explosions of “shock and awe.” The “enemy” is not wearing a uniform and, quite frankly, the enemy isn’t always a person or a country—it can be a contagious ideology that thrives on repression as well as poverty and hunger and disease.

That is where a new paradigm of security policies comes into play. Issues of war and peace are the most important responsibilities of citizens and the leaders we elect, yet we continue to execute a strategy stuck firmly in another century, one incapable of addressing the true threats we face today.
It is time to leave behind these worn strategies and put forward new ways of dealing with threats to our security. Women’s voices are essential to this dialogue.

U.S. security lies at the intersection of two vital concerns: the needs of the nation-state and the needs of the individual. Traditional nation-state security is defined by borders and includes a strong military, a capable diplomatic corps, smart and timely intelligence, and communication that reinforces our image as a successful democracy, interested in cooperation and open for business. The needs of the individual, on the other hand, can be described by the term “human security:” personal safety, freedom from fear and violence, freedom from want. In other words, what the framers of our nation described as “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.”

These two concerns—the needs of the nation state and the needs of the individual—are inseparable and mutually reinforcing. Yet our government tends to treat them as tradeoffs with a clear bent toward the nation state. The purpose of this document is to show not only how and why these needs are part of one whole, but also why women’s voices are critical to helping our fellow citizens see security through this new lens.

At this critical juncture in world history, it seems fairly obvious that we are beyond the protection of the military alone. In fact, even military officers, in testimony to Congress, have pointed out the need for policy tools for strong civil action—integral to any successful democracy: a court system, police, a central bank, schools, etc. Our top warriors understand better than anyone that too many issues in today’s complicated world have no military solution. Achieving security requires a much broader concept, and this concept requires an extensive set of forward-thinking policy tools.

As you will see, those tools have traditionally been the tools of women.

**Security as a Women’s Issue**

Centuries of issues handed to women—and the solutions demanded of women—have now intersected with our nation’s foremost security concerns. Top among them is the safety of people. You will recognize these issues: basic human needs such as health care and clean water, economic justice, education and civic infrastructure. What were once considered “women’s issues” (read: not as important as guns and bombs) are now squarely in the middle of domestic and international debates on security. The US Army itself considers girls’ education a “Center of Gravity” for (or vital link to) our long-term security. Since our ideological enemies want to deny girls education, we must make sure that it is provided. Yet, despite the urgent need to address them, these issues continue to be shortchanged when it comes to international and
domestic funding, which often defaults to building military dominance through hardware and firepower.

Why is our government unable to break out of obsolete thinking on security? Quite simply, it is a lack of imagination—a lack of diverse, fresh and innovative perspectives. As any good business person knows, a diversity of perspectives at any decision-making table leads to more resilient and better long term consequences. We ignore this advice at our peril. Women are severely underrepresented in decision-making on national security in the U.S. government*, despite their obvious importance as a key agent in implementing security and their electoral demographic. Americans must come to realize that national security is not to be left to so-called “experts”—it is not just about rocket science anymore. Today, national security requires tools for influence and prevention that are obvious in their absence, but not yet priorities in policy making. It is therefore auspicious that we Americans are leading the way in a worldwide revolution in skills for participation. This change takes us far beyond physics. The internet is part of the forward movement, as is the ability to form networks, to communicate strategically in a timely way and to amplify personal relationships for power and influence. These participation skills will change the conversation, the military and other tools we use as well as the expectation of citizen responsibility regarding security. There has never been a better time for women to build networks, mobilize common principles and step into a leadership role on national security. The entire terrain of national security lies at our doorstep, requiring the same persuasive and collaborative leadership tools that women have wielded throughout history. This ability to form alliances, then use our first-hand and personal perspectives on what makes a society work, will be a vital key to filling a global need for a new vision of security. The first step is to equip and inform ourselves, and prepare to lead in this realm that women know so well.

**Focus On the Military**

If you had a treasure chest of human resources—well-trained with a “can do” spirit, both organized and equipped to help—why wouldn’t you use it to address your security challenges?

We do use it, of course. It’s called the American military. Together with the defense industry, it gets the vast majority of attention from the President and Congress and it is allocated most of the discretionary security dollars in the federal budget (over 54% in 2008). The military plays a vital role in any discussion of security, but its personnel, from generals to grunts, would be the first to tell you that they are ill-equipped for today’s security mission. We are not talking about

---

* Stats: The United States has never had a woman president, and today only 16% of the Senate and 14% of the House of Representatives are women.
missiles and tanks and armored vehicles. We are talking about an under-discussed part of every military mission today: Helping with infrastructure, rebuilding schools and hospitals, interacting with the community. Because they recognize the changed nature of security the military has now begun to train its troops to handle the issues that arise beyond the barrels of their weapons—to educate the men and women we send into harm’s way about culture and language, religions and foods, of the various places that our military is engaged. These soldiers have invaluable front-line experience—not just about combat, but about how to multi-task on foreign soil and to do more than kick down doors. Often, they end up fixing the very doors they destroyed.

In the past quarter century, our troops have been on many disparate missions, from reinforcing the government of Haiti to hurricane relief in Honduras to peace-keeping in the Balkans to outright combat in Iraq and Afghanistan. It has become increasingly obvious that nearly all of these missions require civilian agency counterparts and even civilian leadership. This evidence of change culminated in 2005, when the Defense Department issued a directive that declares civic-society support and rebuilding to be on par with combat in the military’s responsibility.

Yet in the budgeting process, innovative programs that would bolster international cooperation and human resources continue to be marginalized and underfunded. Congress continues to defer to a Cold War mindset—one that is more comfortable solving security challenges through Soviet-era weapons platforms and use of the military as an “international 911” corps than through well-trained personnel (civilian and military) or through international cooperation and preventive action.

In spite of this imbalance, the U.S. military, one of the most respected institutions in America, has in recent years devoted its resources, training and institutional support to inspire positive social change. The activities most frequently in the headlines are humanitarian response and governmental infrastructure, but the list of responsibilities and tasks is endless. Our soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines see what is needed for true security, and they fill the gap as best they can. But here at home, sustained conversation among civilians, including those with military experience, is essential for a healthy balance of information and solutions. The military, for better or worse, is now our front line on this new security—but they must be given the proper tools and a strong civilian counterpart to guarantee that their mission is truly accomplished. And, our elected leaders must have a thorough conversation about the division of labor in our government. We need a better balance between military and civilian tools.
In academic-speak, it’s called “civil-military relations,” this bond between the armed forces and the larger society—how we communicate, how we interact, how our relationship is ordered and regulated.

Any discussion of US security must, by nature, begin with a discussion of the armed forces and its intersection with ordinary Americans. As we suggested, the cornerstone of a healthy democracy is found in the relationship between civilian elected leaders and the military that serves them, but the public plays no less an important role. Surprisingly, there is little discussion of the military as an American institution; it simply tends to be accepted and respected, mostly as a war machine. But its role in our security goes far beyond its ability to succeed in combat. Today’s American warriors are our front-line diplomats; in many cases, and they are often the negotiators and the peacekeepers, the road builders and the infrastructure assessors.
It is important to understand the “rules of the road” regarding civilian control over the military, as enshrined in U.S. law and tradition:

- A democratic military serves its nation rather than leads it
- Military personnel are the neutral servants of the state, and the guardians of society
- Military leaders advise the elected leaders and carry out their decisions
- Only those who are elected by the people have the authority and the responsibility to decide the fate of a nation

These values are reflected in the military oath of enlistment:

"I, _____, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; and that I will obey the orders of the President of the United States and the orders of the officers appointed over me, according to regulations and the Uniform Code of Military Justice. So help me God."

(Title 10, US Code; Act of 5 May 1960 replacing the wording first adopted in 1789, with amendment effective 5 October 1962).

It’s an oath that our nation’s warriors take very seriously.

Civil-military Relations

America is seen as a model of civil-military relations. In fact, we dedicate untold resources to helping other nations create militaries that respect and obey civilian-elected leaders and the rule of law. A concise ideal for the military in a democracy is as follows: To protect the nation and the freedoms of its people. The military should not represent or support any political viewpoint, or ethnic and social group. Its loyalty should always be to the larger ideals of the nation, to the rule of law, and to the principle of democracy itself.

As we have discussed, when called upon by elected leaders, military men and women are expected to offer sound, unbiased advice and to speak truth to power. Military culture creates expectations that such advice will be given in private. Once a policy is set, the military is required to carry it out, demonstrating optimistic loyalty to the policy and the civilian authorities behind it.
These rules, however straightforward, have nonetheless created sticky wickets for the armed forces, who must take their guidance from people who often do not know an in-country situation first-hand. For example: Many of the new security tasks of the military have been done out of necessity without much discussion or “rules of engagement”. In many ways, they are far ahead of our elected leaders in understanding and using an alternative set of tools for security. They, more than anyone, understand the need for relationship-building, international cooperation and civil society support.

West Point professor Lt. Col. Ike Wilson remarks: “We as a nation need to revisit our tradition of civil-military relations, hold the hard and uncomfortable discussions over what is allowed, what is required (demanded; essential) and what is prohibited when it comes to when, how, and under what conditions our military is allowed—and obligated—to engage political debates over war policy and strategy.”

It’s a fine line to walk in a democracy, but a dialogue must open with our military experts in matters of security. There are many reasons why these conversations tend to be uncomfortable, and they are the very reasons why we need them. Here are a few of those reasons, gathered from literature and experience:

- People with military backgrounds come from a professional culture that forbids political advocacy, or even expressing political opinions. Some individuals adhere to this value so closely they do not even vote. Uniformed military (active duty) are forbidden by law from publicly engaging in political activities.

- Veterans often feel obligated to uphold the cultural value of political neutrality and non-involvement and so don’t seek out opportunities for public discussion, even though they are permitted to do so.

- Veterans, especially from the Vietnam era, do not feel valued by society.

- Individuals with military experience are wary of being “used” for political ends, anathema to their public service ethic.

- Veterans often feel that civilians don’t or can’t understand their war experience, and so they are reluctant to discuss it.

- Veterans often perceive that civilians see them as a monolithic entity, i.e., they do not distinguish between the armed services or public service and the commercial interests of the defense industry.
• Many veterans don’t feel that their service is a “big deal” except to themselves, which diminishes their incentive to share their pride and knowledge of civic service.

• Civilians often feel ignorant about the military. They don’t know anyone on active duty, or even any veterans, and so they do not feel qualified to participate in any discussion. Since many have never served in the military, they often feel diminished when asked to talk about security or public service in the presence of veterans.

• Many citizens are unaware that civilian control of the military is a foundational element in American democracy, giving them both the right and the obligation to engage in critical discussion.

• Many civilians think that members of the military are automatically “pro-war,” and that the “military-industrial complex” (commercial interests that make huge profits from defense spending and a revolving door between the military and industry) includes anyone affiliated with the military.

• Military service and knowledge about “defense” is a highly charged political issue, subject to labels, name-calling and diminishment of the issue in a public arena.

• Civilians seem to get their knowledge about the military from television and movies, and so have a high-tech vision of war—one that does not reflect accurately the “boots on the ground.”

• Critical dialogue about the military often degenerates into simplistic categories from a previous era, i.e., hawks v. doves or guns v. butter.

• Many civilians—especially progressives—see the military as hopelessly conservative and too attached to the Republican Party.

• Civilians sometimes give the impression that they think the military is the underclass or peopled by those whose motives are suspicious—either too poor to have other options or who enjoy war. In fact, many people choose to enter, or to remain, in the military out of patriotism, a desire to serve others, and a wish to make the world a better place—the same reasons others enter public service or nonprofit organizations.

• Some civilians feel shame about their inability to talk to or about military power, or about violence and war, and therefore remain silent.

Somehow, these reservations on both sides must be allayed and breached. In our form of government, with its ban on political discussions and opinions by the military, civilians must be the ones who step up and initiate the conversation. Uniformed military and veterans have an on-the-ground
story to tell, with all of its policy implications and recommendations and national strategies. Women leaders have the opportunity today to create the appropriate space for this dialogue to happen.

During the pilot portion of this handbook, we paired a civilian with a military person. Done in this way, the civilian can provide background, set the policy stage, make recommendations or advocate for change, while the veteran can offer expert knowledge, experience and details. A reminder: Though members of the military may participate fully and equally in our country’s political life, they may only do so as voters. To do more, they must first retire from service. Soldiering and politics are never to mix.

“As a veteran, what I hear in the news is this: on the left its all the atrocities and on the right its all the heroism. In reality, it is neither”

Participant, security dialogue, New England 07

Military 101: The Department of Defense and Beyond

All Department of Defense employees who wear a uniform are public servants, but every four or eight years, when a new president is elected, new civilian leadership is appointed. The Secretary of Defense, for example, is a political appointee, as are the Secretaries of the Army, Navy and Air Force. The Chiefs of Staff of each branch are career military officers. Again, the most important point to remember is that civilians are always in charge of defense policy making. Military personnel only offer professional advice, and only when asked. The President is responsible to the American people for big-picture strategy while the military is responsible for what it calls “unity of effort” (that is, the planning, coordinating and carrying out of a mission). The U.S. Congress is responsible both for policy priorities and funding.

The Department of Defense (DOD) was created shortly after World War II by the National Security Act of 1947. This act established three separate military departments, the Army, the Navy (which includes the Marine Corps) and the Air Force (which previously existed inside the Army) under a civilian political appointee, the Secretary of Defense. As mentioned above, each department has a civilian Secretary appointed by the President, and a military Chief of Staff. The National Security Council, which consists mostly of the President’s cabinet and primarily helps the Secretaries of State and Defense coordinate efforts, was also created at this time.
As a result of the Goldwater-Nichols Act, in 1986, the DOD went through a major re-organization. Through this Act, Congress mandated that the armed forces be structured to work together more effectively. The Joint Chiefs of Staff (comprised of a Chief of Staff from each of the three service branches, plus the Marine Corps) were given a more prominent role as advisors, and a global group of geographically-situated unified commanders was established. These commanders are in charge of the forces in the field (for example, there is a unified commander who handles both Iraq and Afghanistan based out of Tampa, Fl.).

The chain of command for decision making was updated in 1986. Now called the National Command Authority, its top decision-makers are two civilians: the President, advised by the Secretary of Defense. The Chair of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is the primary military advisor in this chain of command. It is important to note that the JCS chair may not exercise any power over the armed services. He (and someday, perhaps she) only advises the civilian leaders.

**Duty, Honor, Country**

For the armed services, it’s all about values. Here are the seven official ones of the U.S. Army—these values are the ideological bedrock of many who serve in every branch of the military.

- **Loyalty**—Bear true faith and allegiance to the U.S. Constitution, the Army, your unit, and other soldiers.

- **Duty**—Fulfill your obligations.

- **Respect**—Treat people as they should be treated.

- **Selfless Service**—Put the welfare of the nation, the Army, and your subordinates before your own.

- **Honor**—Live up to all the Army values.

- **Integrity**—Do what’s right, legally and morally.

- **Personal Courage**—Face fear, danger, and adversity (physical or moral).

There is also an unofficial (but deeply felt) value set known to all as “The Warrior Ethos:”
• Decisiveness—Military actions require innumerable split-second decisions under stressful conditions; waiting to act or until one has all the facts can cost lives.

• Pride and honor—Cultivated by the military to keep troops focused on their missions, even if they are impacted by heavy losses or combat stress.

• Moral certainty—Provides inner strength, comfort, and acceptance of the possibility of taking life or losing life.

• Community—This unparalleled sense of “family” means that service members are more comfortable with other service members—even when out of uniform.

• Commitment to winning—The can-do attitude instilled in the military includes a commitment to getting the job done no matter what. This attitude sometimes leads to anger at what is seen as “defeatism” by those who declare wars as “un-winnable.”

• Traditionalism—Time-honored and battle-tested routines carry great meaning. They also make the military more naturally conservative.

**Military Demographics**

About 2.5 million members serve in all branches of the armed services, including active-duty, active reserve and inactive reserve personnel. Of that number, about 1.4 million serve on active duty, 1.1 million serve in the active reserves (those who drill on weekends and throughout the year), and an additional 500,000 to 1 million serve in the inactive reserves (those who do not drill, but may be called up.)

Today’s military is well educated. Officers, who comprise about 15% of the armed forces, are educated in ROTC (Reserve Officers’ Training Corps) programs, service academies such as West Point, or Officer Candidate Schools. Nearly all hold undergraduate degrees while some even hold masters degrees and PhD’s. Ninety-eight percent of all enlisted recruits who enter the military have an education level of high school graduate or higher, compared to the national average of 75%. (These numbers have changed significantly during the drive to recruit for the Iraq war, however with many critics lamenting, the lowering personnel standards of the Army, in particular)

The forces on active duty are 85% male, while the reserve force is 81% male. The largest racial categories for active-duty personnel are white (64%), African-American (17%), Latino (9%) and Asian-American (5%). 7% are foreign born and 2% are non-citizens. The reserves have a similar percentage split, though there is a slightly higher representation of whites among this group.
Our current Congress, with its power to wage war, has seen very little actual military service. In 1968, 70% of its members were veterans. By 2004, that number had shrunk to 25%. However, a surge of veterans ran for office on national security platforms in 2006. This percentage of Member/veterans will likely increase as the numbers of veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan choose to run for public office. Their service experience will doubtless raise the quality and quantity of debate over new security challenges in our legislature.

A Breakdown of the Military Services and What They Do

**Army Mission:** To prepare U.S. land forces to fight and win our country’s wars. Not all Army activities involve violent conflict. Stability and Support Operations (SASO) occupy increasing amounts of time and attention, including humanitarian relief, assisting civilian communities, disaster relief, etc. In the Pentagon, the Secretary of the Army, a presidential appointee, leads a military staff headed by the Army Chief of Staff.

**Navy Mission:** Its five roles are to project power from sea to land, to control the sea through maritime supremacy, to maintain a strategic deterrent against threats to the USA and our allies, to provide sealift (deliver troops and equipment), and to maintain a forward naval presence (“forward” meaning far from the continental U.S.). The Navy includes both the Marine Corps (which we’ll discuss separately) and the Coast Guard (in times of war and crisis). Most of the time, the Coast Guard is a law enforcement organization within the Department of Homeland Security.

**Marine Corps Mission:** Amphibious assault, which is an attack launched from the sea against a hostile shore. Marines also train for land combat, which often occurs in tandem with amphibious assault. They are also responsible for guard duty at the White House, at embassies, and other U.S. facilities. They are led by the Secretary of the Navy, even though they operate as a separate military service with specific roles and missions. The Marines are famous for being ready to deploy immediately anywhere, and have been sent to numerous small conflicts such as Haiti and Sierra Leone.

**Air Force Mission:** To fly and fight in air, space and cyberspace, to project power globally through fighters and munitions, to provide airlift and tanker transport support, to provide intelligence and an accurate picture of the battle space in war, and to provide combat support that enables the joint defense team. Not all military aircraft belong to the Air Force; each service has its own pilots and aircraft, including helicopters.
Coast Guard: The United States Coast Guard (USCG) is a military branch of the United States which re-located to the newly created Department of Homeland Security (DHS) in 2003. Depending on the circumstance (peacetime or wartime) it serves under the DHS or the Navy. The Coast Guard is unique among all the military services due to its distinctive blend of military, humanitarian, and civilian law-enforcement capabilities. It is involved in maritime law, mariner assistance, and search and rescue, among other duties. It is the smallest armed service of the United States. Its stated mission is to protect the public, the environment, and US economic and security interests in any maritime region in which those interests may be at risk, including international waters and America’s coasts, ports, and inland waterways.

Privatization of the Military

This highly contentious topic was not often discussed for much of the 1990’s, when the trend began to accelerate. The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have seen record numbers of privately contracted individuals on the battlefield; in fact, there are between 129,000 and 180,000 contractors in Iraq today, providing both armed protection and logistics or reconstruction support. Dozens of private contractors have been killed in both of these wars.

Private actors in war zones occupy a legal gray area, where accountability for transgressions or the use of lethal force is only randomly enforced. Accountability is inadequate or missing altogether. International efforts exist to discuss and regulate this trend, which has some efficiency benefits, but many worrisome consequences.

A major duty of today’s American elected leaders is to have the long-overdue public conversation about private military contracting so that we, as a nation, may determine the boundaries of public service vs. privatization and the implications of commercial interests in warfighting, regulations of private actors, and essential needs for military missions and other national security tasks.

Some Other Important Civilian-military Intersections

National Guard and Armed Forces Reserves: The National Guard is a joint reserve component of the United States Army and the United States Air Force. The National Guard comprises the Army National Guard (ARNG) from the Army and the Air Force’s Air National Guard (AFNG). The National Guard is operated under the National Guard Bureau, which is a semi-independent subdivision and managing office under the Department of Defense. The National Guard is headed by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau who is a four-star General in the Army or Air Force.
The definition of the term “reserve” varies depending on the context. It is important to be precise in this regard when talking about military roles, missions, responsibilities and who controls them. Military reserves exist for every branch of the US military...hence the word can apply to all seven of the branch components including the Guard. In another context, it applies to only the five reserve components directly associated with the five active duty military services but not to the Army National Guard nor the Air National Guard.

In most respects, the Army National Guard and Air National Guard are very similar to the Army Reserve and Air Force Reserve, respectively. The primary difference lies in the level of government to which they are subordinated. The Army Reserve and Air Force Reserve are subordinated to the federal government while the National Guards are subordinated to the various state governments, except when called into federal service by the President of the United States or as provided for by law. For example, the Kansas Army National Guard and Kansas Air National Guard are subordinated to the state of Kansas and report to the governor of Kansas as their commander-in-chief.

Since the start of this new century, their nickname of “weekend warriors” misses the mark. Prior to 9/11, the Guard and Reserve were considered a “strategic reserve”—to be called upon only in time of major national emergency. Since 9/11, and the subsequent wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, the Guard and Reserve have increasingly become an “operational reserve” for the U.S. military, meaning that they are now regularly called upon to augment the active-duty force. Instead of waiting for “the big one,” reservists can now expect to deploy one out of every five years or more. These citizen soldiers’ primary mission is to guard the nation. During peacetime, state governors command their guards, calling them into action during local and statewide emergencies (an average of six times a year, per state). The Guard has been called to clear streets after tornados, evacuate residents before hurricanes, rescue victims in the wake of floods, provide security at large events, quell riots, and restore order. These duties still exist in addition to the president’s requirement to participate in federal missions—guard units from across the country have been deployed in Kosovo, Iraq, and Afghanistan.

“People thank you all the time when they find you’re in the military. I always reply with gratitude—but I wish I could respond in a way that ensured that they would do service themselves. Do they vote, for example?”

author’s friend, A Marine Corps Reservist, email from Iraq 2008
**Posse Comitatus Act:** This is a US law that regulates activities of the military in domestic situations. The general intent of this law is to prevent uniformed military from performing police duties. This Act includes a handful of exceptions—mostly in cases of emergency or extreme violence. Since 9/11 and the onset of many “homeland security” concerns, Posse Comitatus is in need of review and modernization. This is a task that our elected leaders in the House and Senate must undertake.

**Defense Budget:** Each year, the defense budget is allocated by Congress, along with funding for all other federal government agencies that are paid for by what is called the “discretionary budget”. The defense portion of the discretionary budget this year is 54%. When automatic payments—medicare and social security—are included, the defense portion of the budget makes up 22%. The remainder of the budget goes to safety net programs (9%) interest on the debt (almost 9%) federal employee benefits, including vets (6%) scientific and medical research (3%) transportation and infrastructure (2%) education (2%) international affairs (1%) and all other (3%) ([www.cbpp.org](http://www.cbpp.org)). The cost of defense also varies by the extra amount of money spent on war. This extra money is mostly provided through “supplemental” appropriations, and has run into the hundreds of billions over the past 5 years.

The imbalance between defense spending and the rest of the federal budget has caused many to advocate for a more holistic budget—one that recognizes that defense is just one part of “national security”; one that acknowledges that our President and Congress need to reassess and realign our priorities so that we stop paying for an obsolete “Cold War” toolbox and begin to allocate resources to prevent and defeat modern day threats.

**Directive 3000.05:** This Defense Department directive was issued in November, 2005. It makes civil-society support (reconstruction) equal to combat in the military’s mission priorities. Whether or not this directive has an impact depends on elected leaders’ reform initiatives.

**Army Corps of Engineers**

The United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is a federal agency and a major Army command made up of some 34,600 civilian and 650 military men and women. It is the world’s largest public engineering, design and construction management agency. The Corps is usually associated with dams, canals and flood protection in the United States, and is involved in a wide range of public works support to the nation and to Department of Defense throughout the world.
Officer and Enlisted

All services have commissioned officers who have graduated from a college or university prior to being accepted as an officer’s candidate in their service of choice. Others attend ROTC or a military institution such as the Citadel, Quantico, the Air Force Academy, West Point, or the Naval Academy in Annapolis. Officer candidate school is an option for those already serving.

Enlisted ranks are usually filled by young men and women fresh out of high school. The enlisted ranks are the workhorses of the military, and the NCO’s (non-commissioned officers) are their teachers and supervisors. Many people in the enlisted ranks carry a formal education with them, into the military. They choose to be enlisted rather than commissioned. Others are able to go to school while still in the service, and earn an undergraduate degree in their field of choice. Many go on to graduate school.

There are direct appointments for people with specialties such as Dentist, Doctor, Veterinarian and Lawyers.

Progressives and the Military

During and since the Vietnam War, those to the left of the American political spectrum have had an uneasy relationship, at best, with the U.S. military. The other side of the spectrum—

the right—took up the slack and, as a result, our largest public service skews Republican. This is caused by a lack of balanced discussion in our society, allowing a far-right philosophy to dominate the public conversation on the military and corresponding issues, namely national security and defense. These right-wing ideas have created a highly effective echo chamber, painting political opponents as indecisive and “weak” on defense, not sufficiently patriotic or even traitorous. This public discussion is an unhealthy imbalance and a cynical manipulation of American loyalty and patriotism.

Progressives must not latch onto stereotypes of the military by aligning it with conservative philosophy and a one-sided view of it as a war machine. Let us remember that the military does so much more, including:

*International human rights law: No matter how you feel about Guantanamo, U.S. military lawyers are human rights champions for its prisoners and for the Geneva Conventions.*

*International treaties: The military recognizes the importance of international law. The U.S. Navy is one of the strongest advocates for the Law of the Sea. They are also against torture.*

*Nuclear arms control: Don’t go thinking the military can’t wait to explode a thermonuclear weapon. In fact, many in our armed forces find them unusable, and they contribute staff and resources to arms control efforts.*
Conflict resolution: The Air Force has a prize-winning office of dispute resolution.

Renewable energy: The U.S. military is the largest energy consumer in the country, and also on the cutting edge of conservation and renewable efforts.

AIDS prevention: The Defense Department has an extensive program to help foreign governments prevent this disease.

International community: The West Point model United Nations team has won the world championships four times in a row and consistently places in the top ranks of this elite competition.

Disaster Relief: The US military responded immediately to the 2004 Asian Tsunami as well as the 2005 Pakistan earthquake. These two help missions are emblematic of the type of rapid response logistics, life saving, medical and personnel support that the military can bring to bear. In Pakistan, more than 1,200 personnel and 25 helicopters provided vital transport, logistics, and medical and engineering support in the affected areas.

Military-to-military support: The American military is dedicated to helping developing nations execute their own transformative programs for defense reform. Civil-military relations and civilian control over the military is the centerpiece of this assistance. Many Americans advocate for the creation of similar programs to support vital civilian institutions in new democracies—the reason being that we don’t want to create lop-sided democracies where the only truly functioning institution is the military. These programs are politically controversial: some American trained military personnel have been involved in atrocities or human rights violations.

An important corollary to this debate, however, is how to bring human rights more fully into American security policy—something that the military is working on but that will ultimately require civilian leadership.

Humanitarian assistance: Beyond immediate disaster relief, the military helps with medical readiness, training exercises and engineering projects—many in remote locations. Among the most famous, the 1991 Gulf War, Operation Provide Comfort aided hundreds of thousands of starving and freezing ethnic Kurds in northern Iraq who had fled their homes after an abortive uprising against Saddam Hussein’s army.

Peacekeeping: Although the US does not contribute many troops to UN peacekeeping, the American military is deeply involved in helping train peacekeeping troops, developing doctrine and supporting the United Nations at the New York headquarters and in the field.
Interestingly, despite the dominance of conservatives on the civilian side of the civil-military discussion, the military itself is undergoing a progressive transformation, understanding from experience that weapons are frequently not the answer to today’s complex global issues. The armed forces, in fact, see an imbalance in what it calls our “national instruments of power” (diplomatic, informational, military and economic), and they want a shift from military into other realms. We find ourselves today relying heavily on soldiers to accomplish tasks with little preparation and resources. In 2007, 20% of the US economic development budget was paid out through the Pentagon. These trends put our already stretched military in a difficult position, not only in practice, but in policymaking.

**Tips for Progressives Who Want to Shift the Dialogue**

Progressives must not allow conservatives to continually define the civil-military debate. We must jump in and redefine it, and here are a few ways to do that:

- Acknowledge the lack of communication in civil-military relations in America and the progressives’ part in making it so.

- Show that you know the cardinal rule of civil-military relations: Civilians are in charge of policy. The more we can help to make this clear to the public, the more we are seen to stand up for their service and to align with core military principles.

- Interrupt the conservative narrative. Turn the tables on national security by flipping their strong suit against them (they see themselves as “supporting” the troops, and we should, too). But there is a difference between supporting war policy and supporting our troops, which is a fundamentally flawed connection made by conservatives. Standing against war policy can actually mean standing up for the troops. But conservatives have been very successful at putting anti-war policy speakers on the defensive.

- Don’t let someone call you “weak on defense” because you criticize military priorities and defense spending. Conservatives often attempt to remove the military from legitimate criticism by putting a personal, soldierly face on it, thus shutting down debate. It is easy, when engaged in discussions of civil-military relations, to allow conservatives to paint you as picking a fight with the military, or being anti-military. The irony in this argument is that liberals and progressives are traditionally the strongest public voices on all public service needs. Today, progressives are putting forward a security vision based on an honest assessment of change.

- It is vitally important to remind people that we are spending more and more on defense, but we’re getting less and less security for it. We need reform across the board.
• Don’t equate Afghanistan with Iraq. These are two completely separate wars, fought for different reasons. Make sure you know what you’re talking about if you want to discuss these conflicts. Separating them, in fact, is the best way to interrupt the misnamed “Global War on Terror” framework used by conservatives because, in fact, 9/11 originated in Afghanistan, not Iraq.

• Don’t equate war spending with defense spending. Separating them gives you much more leverage with tradeoff arguments. Besides, how defense spending is allocated is its own vital debate. (Example: Will it support people or weapons platforms? New ideas or entrenched commercial interests?)

• If you’re a veteran, or from a family of veterans, say so. If you have friends or relatives who are deployed, or in the service, say so. You can then talk about what you know of their experience.

• Instead of saying “cut the military budget,” talk about reform of national security. This is not about trading the safety of our troops (body armor, equipment) for some amorphous security issues. It is about creating policies that work given the threats revealed since the end of the Cold War in 1991—and we must remind people that since the meaning of security has changed, so must our national priorities.

• Remind others that our current policies endanger us. Certainly it can be argued that we have empowered a whole new generation of terrorists, and it is due to our crisis in national security leadership.

Rhetoric to Avoid

• Don’t confuse commercial defense interests with public servants in the military. Lockheed Martin, for instance, is not the Air Force, no matter how hard they try to blur the lines. Be specific, say “Commercial defense interests”

• Don’t assume that the military is a monolith. Do basic research on salutations, titles and service branches, missions fought, composition of the force, etc. An exhaustive list of details can be found in the military section of www.globalsecurity.org or even more user-friendly, search the service (US Army, US Air Force or US Navy) on www.wikipedia.org. Best of all, if you know a veteran, just ask your question about the size of a battalion versus a division! Most of them know vast amounts about every service.

• Focus on the need for civilian leadership instead of saying “militarization,” say “over-reliance on the military.” The fact that the military has taken on so many of our foreign policy needs amounts to a civilian leadership failure, not the usurping of power by the military. Congress completely missed the opportunity to discuss this in the 1990’s when our troops were involved
in non-traditional peacekeeping missions. The military understands that we need to move toward persuasion and away from coercion as our guiding principle. But they can’t become the public advocates of it. That is our job.

The military thinks in terms of strategy, operations and tactics. When these three work smoothly together, the armed forces get what they call “unity of effort.” This is a good communication frame for progressives of all stripes who want to jump-start the civil-military discussion. It is not enough to simply open our mouths and speak. We must first understand—Only then can we move toward a new definition of security.

Recommended Reading list from each of the armed services:

Marines
www.mcu.usmc.mil/ProDev/ProfReadingPgm.htm

Army
www.history.army.mil/reference/csalist/csalist.htm

Air Force
www.af.mil/library/csareading/

Navy
www.navy.mil/search/display.asp?story_id=25800

Coast Guard
www.uscg.mil/leadership/reading/

Other links:

Peacekeeping and the United Nations:
www.globalpolicy.org/

Website and Online Newsletter:
www.effectivepeacekeeping.org

Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute, US Army:
https://pksoi.army.mil/

Veterans Information:
www.veteransforamerica.org

Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America:
www.iava.org

A Good Daily News Roundup:
www.justforeignpolicy.org

9/11 Commission Report:
www.9-11commission.gov/

Combatting Terrorism Center at West Point:
www.ctc.usma.edu/

A Popular Military Blog:
www.blackfive.net

And Former Soldier Blog:
http://blog.washingtonpost.com/inteldump/

Perspective from Great Britain:
http://kingsofwar.wordpress.com/

And from Switzerland:
www.gcsp.ch/e/index.htm

And from Africa:
www.kaiptc.org/home/default.asp

DC Policy Commentary:
www.warandpiece.com/
www.democracyarsenal.org
www.thewashingtonnote.com
American security is currently defined in military terms. It is vitally important that we shift both the popular and policy discussions on security to include a broader set of nonmilitary options such as preventative diplomatic action or early warning communication systems—helpful in both natural disasters or for preventing mass atrocities. Women are uniquely able to promote and lead this shift because of our community experience with inclusion and consensus building. You don’t have to be a United States Senator to feel equipped for this discussion of new security paradigms. You probably know more than you think you do, and you can always read what you do not know. The focus of this handbook is not to prepare you for high-level congressional discussions. Rather, it is community focused, and that is where we urge you to begin.
First, Some Basics

Our Constitution divides foreign policy power between the President and Congress. This power is subject to situation and interpretation, and always hotly debated. Obviously, the most extreme example is the ability to wage war: the President is Commander in Chief, but only the Congress can declare war.

The President and Congress are co-equal branches of government. They compete for influence over security policy. Some scholars argue that congressional influence in security policymaking is not beneficial to the interests of the United States because it interferes with the ability of the President to act as Commander in Chief; others insist that Congress must be an equal partner to check unbridled executive power. This struggle has become especially contentious since September 11, 2001, when many of our traditional notions of security (and our ideas of who should have decisive power) were rocked to the core. Since then, arguments have ensued between these two branches of government about ultimate power.

Generally, here is what a president can do:

- **Propose legislation**: Legislation must be proposed prior to any funding by Congress. Example: the Marshall Plan, which assisted European recovery from WWII.

- **Negotiate international agreements**: Treaties are agreements between sovereign states that bind the signatories to commonly agreed upon legal frameworks. Though most treaties require Senate ratification, some are taken to the entire Congress. Others are initiated in the Executive Branch alone as Executive Agreements. Regardless, the President is a key player in each process. Examples include arms control treaties and the North America Free Trade Agreement, or NAFTA. The Vietnam peace agreement was in the sole domain of the President. Another more current example is the Bush Administration negotiating security assurances and commitments to Iraq while not intending to submit the deal to Congress.

- **Appoint ambassadors and other policy makers**: These, too, are subject to Senate approval, but tradition dictates that the president usually gets the nod.

- **Issue policy statements**: These broad descriptions of U.S. goals and objectives often occur in speeches, like the State of the Union, which opens the new Congress each January.

- **Implement policy**: When Congress establishes policy through legislation, the executive branch can shape it through interpretation and application. Example: Though arms sales are monitored by Congress, the President decides what weapons to sell to whom. When a President disagrees with legislation, a normal course of action is the presidential veto. An alternative is found in President
George W. Bush’s adding over 125 “signing statements” to legislation—which lays out his own interpretation to the constitutionality of the legislation and signal his intentions as opposed to those of the Congress.

• **Take independent action:** The president can initiate a sudden and dramatic action without telling Congress—thus creating a dilemma for Congress about whether to appear supportive. Examples: Invasion of Grenada in 1983, the bailout of the Mexican peso in 1994. Keep in mind “independent action” is constantly debated, especially when it entails the use of military force. The ability of the president to commit troops without a formal declaration of war by Congress is dependent on many factors: the level of fear in the populace, the ability of presidential lawyers to interpret the law to justify actions, ideological coherence and the inability of Congress to demand shared power. The ongoing US commitment in Iraq is an example of an undeclared “war”—part of the failure of Congress to spell out the division of war powers in the post 9/11 era.

**And here is what Congress can do:**

• **Introduce resolutions and policy statements:** These expressions of goals and objectives are often ignored by the president, but they are very important for launching new ideas or providing symbolic statements. Examples: Calling for a need to link environment with national security (1990) and approving the president’s deployment of troops to Kosovo with NATO peacekeepers (1999). In today’s Congress, the Congressional Progressive Caucus and the Congressional Black Caucus among others have put forward numerous alternative policy platforms on national security an budgeting, including a proposal to prevent war with Iran and a policy statement to bring government surveillance in line with the US Constitution.

• **Enact legislative restrictions and deny funding:** Congress has the “power of the purse” under the Constitution—which gives it significant power to limit the President’s freedom of action. Examples: Military action in Vietnam was halted when Congress cut off funding for combat activities (1973); Congress imposed sanctions on companies that conducted certain commercial activities with Libya and Iran (1996), who were said to harbor terrorists. Currently, the House and the Senate are locked in a battle to withhold funding for continuing the Iraq war. (2006---)
• **Initiate legislative directives:** Congress sometimes takes the lead in establishing new programs. Examples: Funding to dismantle Soviet nuclear weapons (1991) and combating religious persecution worldwide as part of U.S. foreign policy objectives (1998). In 2002, Congress set up the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks, also known as the “9/11 commission” in order to document a full accounting of the circumstances around the events of 9/11/2001.

• **Apply legislative pressure:** Congress can threaten to pass legislation in the face of inaction by the president. Example: Legislation to sanction South Africa for apartheid (1980s). In an attempt to prohibit torture, Senator Dianne Feinstein added language to a bill to make the Army Field Manual standard compliance for US personnel conducting interrogations. (2008)

• **Give informal advice:** Members of Congress can advise informally on prospective policy issues. Example: Senators persuaded President Reagan to consider US-Soviet nuclear risk reduction centers at a summit meeting which were eventually agreed upon (1987). Representative Dick Cheney was a significant ally to President Reagan on Central America issues during the 80’s—including during the Iran/Contra scandal.

• **Conduct policy oversight:** Hearings and investigations are the chief functions of the congressional committee system. These public deliberations allow Congress to subpoena witnesses, ask questions and influence policy. Examples: After the Nixon Watergate scandal, in 1975 and 1976, the Church Committee published fourteen reports on U.S. intelligence agencies, their operations, and the alleged abuses of law and of power that they had committed, together with recommendations for reform. Congress uncovered secret negotiations to sell arms to Iran to fund rebel forces in Nicaragua (1987); they also required the State Department to produce a human rights report annually covering every member of the United Nations (1979). In 2008, Congress, among other things, is investigating the privatization of national security functions and examining the roles and missions of the US military with the intent to realign them.

As you can see, issues of war and peace are woven throughout the relationship between the President and Congress. Both branches of government have opportunities to initiate and change policy. Keep in mind that organized citizens can also influence their elected leaders by running for office, by voting, or by writing to blogs, newspaper editors or to the Member of Congress. Indeed, everything from ending child labor to creating an corps of skilled diplomats has originated in the US Congress.

Citizens can also create public pressure, by coming up with alternative policies and sharing them, by creating supportive relationships between members of Congress and
knowledgeable individuals, or simply by showing up at public forums to express concern and ask questions. Individuals living in any congressional district have a hands down advantage over expensive Washington lobbyists. As a voter and as someone who is affected by the decisions of your representative, your voice is far more meaningful. We Americans have a choice: We can either influence the outcome or we can remain as observers. Remember that every elected leader knows that he or she is answerable to the people. Don’t let them forget it.

**Women’s Role in Security Policy**

As we have discussed, “national security” as a concept needs to be redefined for a post-Cold War, post-September 11th world. Issues like criminal networks, super-empowered individuals, disease, climate disruption and contagious ideology do not fit easily into old compartments or traditional rhetoric.

Think for a moment how far security activities have outpaced the original missions of our federal agencies. We’ve already discussed how the armed forces engage in many non-traditional tasks—everything from peacekeeping to construction work. The same holds true for other institutions, including intelligence, homeland security, commerce, agriculture, health and human services, and justice. These agencies had been U.S.-focused, but they must now be global, and each has extensive international relationships. Don’t forget all the non-governmental efforts involved with security issues, like the Red Cross and private sector groups like the Gates Foundation, to name just two. The notion of power is clearly evolving away from military force (“hard power”) and toward changing the intentions of potential enemies (“soft power”). Prevention, persuasion and example-setting on any given issue can involve countless organizations and individuals, each building international communication and relationships. They are all contributing to U.S. security, and their soft power initiatives are ideally suited to the way in which women operate and lead.

Women have blazed the trail in making a difference in matters of security. Here are some historical examples that have led to significant government action:

*The Freeze Movement:* The idea for a nuclear freeze began in April 1980 when a woman named Randall Forsberg proposed a “mutual freeze between the U.S. and the Soviet Union on the testing, production, and deployment of nuclear weapons and of missiles and new aircraft designed primarily to deliver nuclear weapons.” The Freeze was a grassroots confederation spanning the country. Forsberg, a policy researcher and advocate, was the central figure in the Freeze movement, and she enlisted the help of elected officials like
former Rep. Patricia Schroeder (D-CO) and Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-MA). The Freeze’s grassroots network pushed for nuclear reductions via ballot initiatives in towns and cities across the nation. Supported by 70 percent or more of the population, the Freeze was endorsed by 275 city governments, 12 state legislatures, and the voters of nine out of ten states where it was placed on the ballot in the fall of 1982. A Freeze resolution passed in the House of Representatives in the spring of 1983, and the Freeze became part of the Democratic party’s campaign platform in 1984. Some argue that the Freeze movement influenced Soviet leadership and even US military posture. What can’t be denied is that this momentus chorus of Americans created a critical mass of public opinion that shifted the domestic debate on the role of nuclear weapons in US policy. The Freeze movement consolidated and then dissipated during the 1990’s. But the issue has remained alive. Recently, a bipartisan group of former officials gathered at Stanford University to re-new the call for a nuclear policy based on ultimate elimination.

“Mother’s Day for Peace: ” Julia Ward Howe is most famous for her poem, “The Battle Hymn of the Republic.” Yet she was also a tireless advocate for peaceful conflict resolution, having seen the devastation and destruction of the American Civil War. In 1870, Howe was among the first to call for a Mother’s Day and began an advocacy campaign, declaring that peace was one of the two most important causes of the world (the other being equality). Her declaration called for women to rise up and oppose war. She wanted women to come together across national lines, to recognize what we hold in common above what divides us, and to commit to finding peaceful resolutions to conflicts. Although her declaration never became part of an official process, her efforts to recognize women as peacemakers gives a fresh perspective on the legacy of Mother’s Day.

The International Campaign to Ban Landmines: In 1991, several non-governmental organizations and individuals began coordinating initiatives and calling for a ban on antipersonnel landmines—buried leftovers from violent conflicts that continued to wreak devastation and death on communities. Jody Williams became the coordinator of a group of organizations that became formally known as the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL), which calls for bans on the use, production, stockpiling, and transfer of these mines, and for increased international resources for both mine clearance and victim assistance programs. Williams received the Nobel Prize in 1997 on behalf of the campaign. That same year, international negotiations produced the Ottawa treaty to ban the use of landmines. 158 countries are parties to it. The U.S. has not signed the treaty. Today, her network represents over 1,100 human rights, demining, humanitarian, children’s, veterans’, medical, development, arms control, religious, environmental, and women’s groups
in over 60 countries, all of whom work to ban antipersonnel landmines.

**Genocide Intervention Network:** In 2004, three students at Swarthmore College decided to do something about the atrocities in the Darfur region of the Sudan. They formed a non-profit organization called the Genocide Intervention Network, whose vision is “a world in which the global community is willing and able to protect civilians from genocide and mass atrocities. Its current mission is to empower individuals and communities with the tools to prevent and stop genocide.” Rwandan native Stephanie Nyombayire, who had lost many family members in the Rwandan genocide in 1994, became the group’s spokesperson. America’s anti-genocide movement is a relatively new mass action with tremendous potential to draw citizens into a discussion of security and national priorities. Lobbying by the movement led to the passage of the 2008 Genocide Accountability Act in Congress.

**Women pushing through barriers in government:** In 1973, Patricia Schroeder (D, CO) became the first woman to serve on the House Armed Services Committee:

Today’s women members:

- Loretta Sanchez (D, CA)
- Ellen Tauscher (D, CA)
- Susan Davis (D, CA)
- Madeleine Bordallo (Guam)
- Nancy Boyda (D, KS)
- Cathy M. Rodgers (R, WA)
- Carol Shea Porter (D, NH)
- Kirsten Gillibrand (D, NY)
- Gabrielle Giffords (D, AZ)
- Niki Tsongas (D, MA)
- Kathy Castor (D, FL)
- Candice Miller (R, MI)
- Thelma Drake (R, VA)

The first woman to serve on the Senate Armed Services Committee was Margaret Chase Smith, (R, ME) who served from 1953–1972. Today it includes four women:

- Hillary Rodham Clinton (D, NY)
- Susan Collins (R, ME)
- Claire McCaskill (D, MO)
- Elizabeth Dole (R, NC)

**Know Thy Politicians**

Part of your involvement in redefining security should include knowing the people you elect as your representative on these issues. One way to do that is to show up at public forums and pointedly question all of those running for office.
Here is a sampling of questions you might ask them:

• How have your personal experiences shaped your view of the U.S. role in the world?

• How would you define security for America, and what is your vision for making it a reality?

• Over the last decade, our global reputation has deteriorated. What reforms would you recommend in our security policies to help us restore our world standing?

• Do you plan to include women in your policy-making team on security, and how specifically would you do that?

• Do you have an opinion about U.S. budget priorities where security is concerned?

• Do nuclear weapons have any role in today’s security strategy — especially given that our main focus is terrorism prevention?

• What will you do to curb nuclear proliferation and the spread of dangerous materials?

• What criteria would you use to justify future deployments of American military force?

• What global issues do you think concern and affect most Americans? Which of these would be your top priorities?

• What is your view of current U.S. policy on detainees, particularly with regard to habeas corpus (a prisoner’s right to have legal counsel and to be seen by a judge)? Should we have a commitment to the Geneva Conventions?

• What do you propose to do to help the United Nations better meet the challenges of the 21st century?

• I believe that the United States must take action to both prevent and stop mass killings like the atrocities in Darfur. What steps must be taken to end this violence against civilians?

• What is your view on U.S. energy policy and its relationship to climate change?

Of course, you may have your own questions based on personal experience and reading. Below are resources to improve your knowledge on the topics outlined above, including the workings of the government, and the federal budget. These are just starting points, and are mostly DC-based. Each site has numerous additional links for exploring.
The websites of the House and Senate are full of information. Remember to check out the committee sites and online testimony. You can also sign up for committee press releases to get late breaking news.

www.house.gov
www.senate.gov

Accountability in government
Sunlight Foundation
www.sunlightfoundation.com/resources
Corporwatch
www.corporwatch.org
The Project on Government Oversight
www.pogo.org
The Initiative for Inclusive Security:
www.huntalternatives.org/pages/7_the_initiative_for_inclusive_security.cfm
Center for American Women and Politics:
www.cawp.rutgers.edu
Women in International Security
www.wiis.georgetown.edu

Resources on national security and budgets (make sure to check out the associated blogs!)
Economists for Peace and Security
www.epsusa.org
Center on Arms Control and Non-proliferation
www.armscontrolcenter.org/
National Priorities Project:
www.nationalpriorities.org
A Unified Security Budget
www.fpi.org/fpiftxt/4175
Congressional Budget Office:
http://cboblog.cbo.gov/
OMB Watch:
www.ombwatch.org/budget
Center on Budget and Policy Priorities:
www.cbpp.org
Citizen Action resources for foreign policy and national security
Citizens for Global Solutions:
www.globalsolutions.org
ConnectUS:
http://connectuscommunity.org/

US in the World—Communicating a New Vision for US Foreign Policy:
www.usintheworld.org
The White House Project
www.thewhitehouseproject.org
Mothers Acting Up
www.mothersactingup.org
The American Assembly at Columbia University:
http://www.americanassembly.org/
Genocide Intervention Network:
www.genocideintervention.net
20/20 vision (especially for energy security):
www.2020vision.org
Friends Committee on National Legislation:
www.fcul.org
Resources for Legal issues
Cornell University Legal Information Institute:
www.law.cornell.edu
American University, Center for Human Rights and Humanitarian Law:
www.wcl.american.edu/humright/center/
Constitutional Law site at University of Missouri:
http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/conlaw/home.html
Carr Center for Human Rights Policy at Harvard:
http://www.hks.harvard.edu/cchrp/
Supreme Court information
www.oyez.org
For a thorough overview of the War Powers relationship between the Congress and the President with a case study of the Iraq war:
www.adaction.org/warcongress.pdf
The Constitution Project:
www.constitutionproject.org
The Center on Congress at Indiana University:
http://congress.indiana.edu/about/index.php
The American Presidency Project at UC Santa Barbara:
http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/index.php
American Bar Association Task Force on Signing Statements:
http://www.abanet.org/op/signingstatements/
Other sites

“Hoover Group” statement on a world free of nuclear weapons: media.hoover.org/documents/0817948429_3.pdf

Nuclear Threat Initiative: http://www.nti.org/

International Campaign to Ban Landmines http://www.icbl.org/

Some good places to start for security policy information

Center for American Progress: http://www.americanprogress.org/

Federation of American Scientists: http://www.fas.org/


Foreign Policy Magazine http://blog.foreignpolicy.com/

Global Security: www.globalsecurity.org

Center for Strategic and International Studies: www.csis.org

Center for a New American Security: www.cnas.org

Physicians for Social Responsibility: www.psr.org

Women's Action for New Direction: www.wand.org

Center for Global Development: www.cgdev.org

Partnership for a Secure America: www.psaonline.org

American Security Project: www.americansecurityproject.org

3D Security Initiative www.3security.org

The Henry L. Stimson Center: www.stimson.org

Council on Foreign Relations: www.cfr.org

Center for U.S. Global Engagement: www.usglobalengagement.org

Better World Campaign: www.betterworldcampaign.org

The Aspen Institute: www.aspeninstitute.org

National Security Network: www.nsnetwork.org

Foreign Policy in Focus: www.fpif.org

Truman National Security Project: www.trumanproject.org

The Ploughshares Fund: www.ploughshares.org

Center for Defense Information: www.cdi.org

Union of Concerned Scientists: www.ucsusa.org

Peace and Security Initiative: www.connectuscommunity.org

Arms and Security Initiative: www.newamerica.net

EVERY state has these resources and most are happy to link with the local community. Here are just a few examples:


Yale (CT): http://research.yale.edu/iss/index.php

Fletcher School at Tufts University (MA): http://fletcher.tufts.edu/issp/

University of Minnesota: http://www.bhh.umn.edu/policy_areas/index.html

Naval Post Graduate School (CA): www.nps.edu

Cornell University (NY): www.einaudi.cornell.edu/peaceprogram/

Stanford University (CA): http://cisac.stanford.edu/


Most colleges and universities have a political science department or an international studies section—things you can check out online and in person. Developing a local relationship with a knowledgeable source just might be your ticket to influencing American security policy.
Chapter 3:
What is Dialogue and How Do I Convene One?

*In conflict resolution, power isn’t about dominance, its about the ability to influence change.*

A Movement is Afoot

While some American democratic institutions (like our electoral system) have become frayed in recent years, there is no doubt that Americans are participating more than ever in creating positive social change. Independentsector.org found that since 2002 the number of Americans volunteering has increased from 59 million to more than 65 million. While democratic systems across the globe have struggled with the challenges of globalization—wealth gaps, extremism and environmental damage for example—certain forms of democratic participation have thrived at the individual level. In particular, the connectedness enabled by the internet has catalyzed innumerable paths to participation. Yet

“Americans respect the duty and service of today’s vets. In 1972, I took off my uniform at the San Francisco airport.”
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despite the advances in electronic forms of communication, nothing will ever replace the basic human need to sit down and talk. This handbook is curriculum for that sort of democratic deliberation. We believe that—in learning more about security issues—interested citizens have the opportunity to build upon what might be called the “conflict resolution” or “deliberative democracy” movement in the USA. Examples already exist. After the 9/11 Commission issued its report, the commissioners set off across the USA to talk about it. On a smaller scale, groups like Everyday Democracy provide community dialogue guides on numerous issues—from immigration to poverty.

Dialogue and participation skills are particularly important for education about security because they give us important insights for understanding today’s most urgent security challenge as a nation and, frankly, as a planet: how do we move from reaction to pro-action? How do we move from coercion to persuasion? How might we learn to value cooperation’s benefits more readily? Using intentional participatory skills, we can reap the benefits of connectedness and community inclusion. Creating incentives for participatory problem solving is beneficial at every level of human society. In a post 9/11 world, it can lessen the appeal of contagious fundamentalism and “us versus them” frameworks for viewing the world. This sort of conflict prevention is improved when people have a way to communicate about and influence decisions that impact their lives.

Multiple counterparts to this kind of influential participation exist in international affairs, particularly where women and security are concerned. Among nations, we have all sorts of conflict prevention tools from diplomacy to peacebuilding and from special envoys to preventive military deployments. Women’s contribution to security has not been well-documented, though that is beginning to change. Recent research results from 3 years of study by the Initiative for Inclusive Security about women’s leadership in Rwanda in its post-genocide era provide a window into the benefits of having more women in power. Rwanda is first in the world in numbers of women elected to the legislature (the USA is 71, Iraq is 33, Afghanistan 27). Rebuilding the country after a violent catastrophe has been the task—and the results so far are promising when held up next to the shifts needed for security strategies that rely on pro-action and persuasion rather than re-action and coercion. A few findings:

- Women legislators tend to enable and support participatory the process
- Women favor public consultations to build legitimacy and employ dialogue to sensitize and educate the public through culture, both with government initiatives and with fellow citizens
- Men and women working together are more effective overall, women frame issues as broad social problems rather than narrow concerns
Women working together enhance the legislature’s attention to social issues, good governance improves (less corruption, for example).

The study also determined that international support is indispensable in this process.

This research demonstrates how women contribute to the kinds of preventive activity that is built into institutions that, in turn, provide safety and stability for society. The three pillars of public security in democratic development, for example are courts, prisons and police. Another preventive measure for social improvement is education. We Americans take public education for granted. This stands in stark contrast to some countries, where allowing girls to go to school is a revolutionary notion. This is especially true where extreme poverty or rigid fundamentalism is prevalent.

The challenge for American citizens and their elected leaders today is how we will realign our institutions and our guiding principles as a nation in order to interact with the rest of the world in a way that takes intentional pro-active measures on behalf of participation. And, the best place to start putting these values into action is right here at home.

A Little Background

Participatory processes now exist that allow for numerous voices to be included in settings created for group communication. These settings have different names: “deliberative democracy,” “consensus building,” “conciliation” and “public participation” are just some of them. In the public sector, these activities deepen the relationship between leaders and the public so that citizens can have a tangible impact on the decisions that most affect their lives.

These skills developments are important because learning about the field of conflict resolution gives us an entire vocabulary to talk about our security priorities—like empowering women and acting preventively. Today’s security threats may pay no heed to borders—but then neither do the skills needed to help the situation.

So, while academics, politicians, and pundits wrangle over national issues, a growing number of civic organizations are putting power back into the hands of ordinary citizens. Ours is not the power to dominate, but the ability to influence change. We believe that our growing capacity to act collectively will lead the US in a new direction.
Tools for Facilitating Security Dialogues and Community Conversations

Taking Action

Here follows two basic choices for structuring a security dialogue: Small groups of citizens invited for that purpose and larger groups open to the public.

Tip: Your best resource for organizing a security dialogue might be right next door! Many people have skills and training in facilitation or group process... and he or she is likely tapped into an entire network. Start asking around!

Model One: Small Groups

These should include no more than a dozen people (12), among them influential community, grassroots, business and political women leaders, plus military veterans. The intent of this model is to prepare civilians (everybody who is not in the Armed Services) to talk with greater comfort about military service and national security issues. The inclusion of veterans and other military personnel is essential for both a balanced discussion and for civic education.

You will want to make sure that your invitation list includes:

• Good listeners

• People who would not otherwise have a chance to meet and discuss this issue

• A diverse and lively cross-section of participants

It is obviously important that the tone of the conversation stay civil. An introductory letter (a sample of which is below) should explain the purpose of the gathering, including the fact that this is not about advocacy—rather, it is an attempt to provide a better understanding of civil-military relations and the new issues affecting our national security.

You might consider inviting any of the following:

• An elected official (local or state, not federal). The ideal person would have knowledge of state-level responsibilities for U.S. military personnel (like the National Guard) and an understanding of the local contribution to Iraq and Afghanistan, or to other wars. This person must be a good listener, not someone who holds political court.

• 1 or 2 students. Perhaps you could invite activists from local campuses, with a focus on those in international roles or in public affairs. This could be the head of a Save
Darfur group, a ROTC student, leader of an anti-war or fair trade group, or a student government representative.

- **1 or 2 members of the local non-governmental community.** For instance, a local activist or member of a national or state organization, NOT an “inside the Beltway” type or a member of a large lobbying group. Find out who is doing innovative local work with a national/global lens, like a church organization, a humanitarian group, a returned Peace Corps volunteer, someone involved in serving poor communities, etc.

- **Three or more veterans.** They should be people with both “big picture” and on-the-ground knowledge, able to relate their military experience to the policy choices facing our government.

- **An academic.** A “non-academic” academic is best—in other words, someone who can go beyond theories and apply ideas to real-life dilemmas like a practitioner academic.

- **A union member** who is an organizer or activist.

- **A high school educator** with civics or social studies experience.

- **A business person,** Rotary Club, Chamber of Commerce, or other member of the private sector.

- **A local journalist.** The key here is that any media person must understand that the venue is off the record and that he or she attends as a citizen. Any public discussion of the dialogue must be arranged with explicit permission.

Obviously, this suggested list is meant as a starting point; you should feel free to adapt it to your community and circumstances.

*Tip: If you find that your final group is missing an important voice, one way to include that missing perspective in the dialogue is through the “empty chair.” Participants then take turns (or one person volunteers) to be the voice by sitting in the chair. We did this with “active duty military” and “peace activist.” Make sure the volunteer gets the chance to return to his or her self, however.*

Once you have a guest list, you’ll need an invitation. Here is a sample. Don’t forget to include a map link if you send it via email.
Dear (   )

I am organizing a small group discussion on a topic that’s all over the news, yet rarely discussed among ourselves: real security and the role of the military in a democratic society. I am organizing this dialogue because I believe that continual contact and understanding between civilians and those with military service experience is a cornerstone of a healthy democracy.

This type of citizen communication has become especially important since the end of the Cold War in 1991. Since then, our military has participated in many non-traditional missions, from peacekeeping and political support to disease prevention and disaster relief. Who can forget the military helicopters finally coming to the rescue in New Orleans in 2005? Also, security has come to mean so much more than bombs and bullets—it is also about education and jobs, health care and the environment, elder care and the global economy. No group understands this better than our armed forces, as they are the ones working most intensely within this new “security” paradigm.

This meeting is not a debate or an occasion to persuade others of your viewpoint—it is an exchange of ideas through both structured and open discussion. All communication is off the record and will be kept confidential. Among the topics that might arise: What do security and public service mean to you? Have you participated in public service, such as the Peace Corps or the military and, if so, how has it changed your world view? How do you view the military’s role in world security?

Our facilitator will be (name and why they are facilitating). The model we’ll use for our dialogue was created by an organization called The White House Project, whose mission is to increase the leadership of women in politics, media and culture.

We will enforce a few basic ground rules to keep the conversation lively and civil:

- Speak personally, not as a representative of an organization or position.
- Ask questions of others questions, don’t state assumptions about them.
- Honor each person’s right to “pass” if he or she is not ready or willing to speak.
- Allow others to finish speaking before you speak.
- Share “air time,” doing your best to stay brief and on topic, and staying within time constraints as indicated by the facilitator.
• Express views reflectively and listen without judgment. The purpose of the gathering is to learn and share information.

• Respect all requests for confidentiality or anonymity. In conversations afterward, don’t attribute particular statements to particular individuals by name, or identify information without permission.

I hope that you will be able to join me on the (date) at (venue). (If you are having refreshments, or lunch or brunch, mention it). If you have any questions, or would like to discuss this event in advance, please feel free to call me at ( ).

Sincerely, etc.

Once the invitation is sent (and you should respond to each yes or no, so participants know you got their answer), you’ll need to lay some groundwork for the meeting itself. Below is a brief preparation checklist.

• Assign a scribe in advance so you have notes from the meeting.

• In a smaller group, you’ll probably do all the groundwork yourself (refreshments, venue, etc.) However, if it’s a public gathering, you will want a planning group to help with logistics. Find that group early and assign clear tasks: Refreshments, supplies, etc.

• Make sure the venue is comfortable and that everyone can see everyone else. You might want to consider assigned seating (another task you can give to a member of the planning group). This sounds like a no-brainer, but make sure there are enough places to sit.

• Make sure you have a plan for follow-up, like sharing the scribe’s notes from the conversation, and tell the group when they can expect to see it.

• Optional: A telephone call with each participant both to touch base and to talk about the ideas behind the dialogue and answer any questions.

Tip: Meet with your facilitator to get a clear understanding of roles. This will include a script outline—basically, what will happen when. Among the touch points: an opening statement by the facilitator and introductions of those present. (These can be brief or not. One successful White House Project security dialogue started with the question “Why did you choose to come here today?” and the result turned into a 3 hour dialogue.) You will also need to decide if you want to limit the conversation to a specific topic or open with a question, how you transition between segments, how you keep control of time limits, how you deal
with long-winded or disruptive individuals, whether there are web links and other info that could be shared in advance of the meeting, and how you will close the session.

Once the dialogue has begun, you might use this sample meeting itinerary:

FIRST: The facilitator will introduce himself/herself, re-read the rules and mention logistics (bathrooms, breaks, pens/pencils)

NEXT: Lay a sound, basic groundwork for the security talk and, if possible, tie it to the community.

NEXT: Participants introduce themselves. You could ask a first question to break the ice.

GO-ROUND NUMBER ONE: Using either a question or a topic, go around the circle, allowing each participant to talk and reflect for no more than 2 minutes each. It will be formal: No questions unless you can’t hear what someone said. There will be time to talk and reflect later. (Remember to pause frequently)

DISCUSSION TIME: Each go-round will be followed by about half an hour of less structured conversation in which participants discuss what they heard and share insights.

GO-ROUND NUMBER TWO and so on, until you reach your time limit.

PARTING WORDS: Wrap-up by the facilitator, including next steps.

Questions that might be asked in the beginning as icebreakers, or in the go-rounds: You are all busy people with lots to do, what brought you here today? What is your first memory of the military? How was the military present in your community or family when you were a child? Do you have connections to the military now? How would you define national security? What responsibilities, if any, do we as citizens have for our national security? Or, for veterans: What impact did your service have? Why did you choose to serve? Did your service change your vision of national security? Or is there an aspect of military service that the general public doesn’t seem to understand?

Model Two: Community Conversations

This facilitated discussion takes place in a large group, bringing together a cross-section of interested citizens with military veterans and/or other international public servants. The objective is to inspire a discussion that covers not only the current situation in Iraq and Afghanistan (without the usual acrimony), but also long-term strategic implications, such as
the U.S. relationship with the rest of the world. The goal is to showcase a security platform that places human security (the safety of people) on a par with traditional state security. This is a problem-solving venue—one that looks to the future and provides a group “brainstorm” to help empower citizens through context and policy recommendations. Discussion is the most important aspect, so you will want a roving microphone in the crowd and/or brief break-out sessions for viewpoint exchanges. The time you take for each of these activities is dependent on the crowd and the time limitations.

Here is an adaptation of the small-group letter to fit the community group scenario:

Dear (       )

Please join (organization) on (date) at (venue) for a community conversation on a topic that’s all over the news, yet rarely discussed among ourselves: real security and the role of the military in a democratic society. I am organizing this dialogue because I believe that continual contact and understanding between civilians and those with military service is a cornerstone of a healthy democracy.

This type of citizen communication has become especially important since the end of the Cold War in 1991. Since then, our military has participated in many non-traditional missions, from peacekeeping and political support to disease prevention and disaster relief. Who can forget the military helicopters finally coming to the rescue in New Orleans in 2005? Also, security has come to mean so much more than bombs and bullets—it is also about education, health care and the environment, and the global economy. No group understands this better than our armed forces, as they are the ones working most intensely within this new “security” paradigm.

This conversation will bring together a cross-section of individuals, including local leaders and other public-minded citizens, to discuss today’s security issues. Our panel will include (Name and Affiliation), and it will be moderated by (Name and Affiliation). After remarks from our panel, we will open the discussion to the audience. We intend to have a true conversation, and we hope you will participate.

The model we’ll use for our conversation was created by an organization called The White House Project, whose mission is to increase the leadership of women in politics, media and culture. In addition, here is an article that I think you will like to read in preparation for our event: (put article link here).
I hope that you can join us as we explore these questions together. And, if you know someone else that would like to attend, please forward their contact information to me.

I hope that you will be able to join me on the (date) at (venue). (If you are having refreshments, or lunch or brunch, mention it). If you have any questions, or would like to discuss this event in advance, please feel free to call me at ( ).

Sincerely, etc.

NOTE: This letter is for an invite-only event, but could easily be adapted for the general public. For public events, make sure to send the notice well in advance to your target audience, i.e., university bulletins, local newspaper, veterans halls, and so on. They will also want a one-line title, which you can craft according to the panel you’ve invited.

Don’t forget electronic resources; for instance, you can send the notice to local bloggers. Online networks are very powerful.

Below is an actual agenda from one of the White House Project’s pilot events.

**Agenda National Security at a Crossroads:**
*Community Conversation 7:30-9:00 p.m.*
*Loudermilk Center, Downtown Atlanta*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:15 p.m.</td>
<td>Arrive at venue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set-up begins. Signage for event, sign-in sheets, A/V needs and test,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>microphones, lighting, stage and chairs, question/comment cards on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>chairs, feedback forms, organizational information, nametags, articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on tables for participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:25 p.m.</td>
<td>People begin to arrive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>(Optional: a person from the host organization gives welcome)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lorelei Kelly, Policy Director of the Real Security Initiative at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the White House Project, will present a “big picture” platform for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. national security that addresses the end of the Cold War is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>over and also takes into consideration the threats revealed by 9/11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dana Eyre, a 30-year military professional and Army Reservist who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is currently working in Iraq as an advisor, will give an “on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ground” soldier’s perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erin Vilardi, national program director of the White House Project,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>will be moderate. She will start by sharing information about the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:35 or so</td>
<td>Moderator: Erin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Why we’re here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Why the WHP is the convenor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discuss goal for tonight: To have a conversation about America’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>current global interests and responsibilities, and how a new, more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comprehensive approach to U.S. security would look.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here are questions your moderator might put to the panel and audience:

- National security used to refer to the Cold War between the Soviet Union and the United States. Since this is no longer true, what does it mean today?

- Power once meant the ability to dominate with force; now it more accurately means the ability to influence outcomes. As a nation, are we maximizing that ability? How might we do so?

- What should the military’s role be in today’s world? In American Society?

How to Frame the Discussion

Put forward ideas in the context of comprehensive change. It is far too easy to get tripped up by specific rhetoric when calling for policy or budget tradeoffs, which usually devolves into a debate about who is “strong” or “weak” on defense. This is not a useful discussion.

It’s all about set-up, which will allow you to pivot back to the big picture, and that set-up should concentrate on the concept of crossroads, based on the world situation today.

A great resource for translating the language of security policy can be found online as part of the www.usintheworld.org Communications Guide. Another great resource is at www.connectusfund.org.
Avoid stereotypical language with broad generalizations i.e. “the Pentagon” or “Pentagon spending” or language that may polarize your audience, such as hawks and doves, guns and butter. Stress the cooperation and teamwork aspects of the new security paradigm. You can easily alienate members of the military by talking about what you could do at home with the money we spend in Iraq, especially when our soldiers lack body armor, language training, etc. The goal is to help people think comprehensively about the need for reform across the board and to understand the power relationships in our government that determine use of force.

“Peace” is better when coupled with “security.”

**Pre Dialogue Phone Interview Script:**
(Suggested language and tips)

Hi, how are you, is this still a good time? Do you have 30 minutes?

Thank you for agreeing to participate. Are you still planning and able to participate?

This is a chance to talk a litttler more about the dialogue event, you can ask any questions of me, we can go over a few things about you, the experience and the project.

YOU: Ask about them.

Then tell a little bit about you.

Briefly go over goals of project. Here is an example:

“What we have observed is that since draft ended…..the military is separate from most American lives. Before the early 70s, whether you agreed with the politics or not, men of draft age had to serve or tried very hard not to. Many more families had served in earlier times and felt there was a duty to serve. The policies affected every community and every decision-maker. Now the military is not present in most people’s lives. Today there is a disconnect between people who are sacrificing and our elected leadership, between most communities and soldiers, and between voters and policymakers.”

Next, point out how you are going to use the information:

This phone conversation is not for attribution but we do use this information in designing the event, and we do learn from each Dialogue going forward in our work. Most important, we want to use this brief conversation to get a better sense of who you are.
Following are a few questions that seem to help stimulate some thinking and will help us know a little about you:

- What does public service mean to you?
- Do you participate in any kind of public service?
- Why did you agree to participate?
- Have you thought at all about what you hope might happen?
- Do you have any concerns about participating?

We hope for great transparency of process. Please let us know what you would like to know, or be in touch with us about...as project continues.

Important that the group agrees to some ground rules about the discussion. Keeps everyone on the same page. We’ll go over these when we meet as well, wanted to talk with you about them individually too.

Explain your role as facilitators, to enforce agreements, hear participants. Not to be an expert, not to answer questions necessarily or resolve conflicts.

Any other questions or concerns you have? Please feel free to contact us.

We will be sending out some information….best mailing address for you?

Thank you again, looking forward to meeting you in person on DATE

**HANDOUTS:**

**Here’s what we put in the handout folders:**

1) invitation letter

2) one pagers about the sponsors of the dialogue—this is where you can give a little bit of background on the intentions behind the project.

3) Participation Agreements (see following)

4) handout on Dialogue v. Debate—
Participation Agreement

It is best to read through this agreement with the participant on the phone and also include it in the handout folder at the dialogue itself. It is similar to the ground rules in the intro letter.

The organizers of this dialogue request that all participants keep in mind the following communications agreement:

1. We each speak only for ourselves and from our own experience, and assume that the other participants will do likewise
2. We will express different viewpoints in a reflective manner and listen without judgement, keeping in mind the goals of learning and perspective sharing.
3. We will not try to persuade other participants.
4. We will listen and not interrupt except to indicate that we cannot hear
5. We will “pass” if we are not ready or willing to respond to a question. No explanation is required.

“In the 60’s we were part of the anti authority deconstruction of culture....but we have never recreated anything to replace it”
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The Difference between Debate and Dialogue

Debate:
Is moderated and Participants:
Have little or no preparatory communication between participants
Are often known and recognized;
Use carefully crafted “talking points” and hew closely to a position
Speak as a representative of a group
Speak “to” his or her side and “at” the other participants
Minimize differences within their “side” on an issue are rigidly persistent about point of view
Listen in order to refute other “side”
Questions are often disguised statements
Issue statements offer little new information or insight
Measure success by scoring “points” against the other participants

Dialogue:
Is facilitated and participants:
Prepare and communicate beforehand
Are not necessarily known or outspoken on the topic
Speak as individuals and speak to each other
Listen to understand and gain knowledge and insight
Question out of curiosity
Are willing to explore complexities and deal with subtlety
Are encouraged to question to dominant “framework” of the topic i.e. the typical language and framing that is obvious in society
Here are just a few of the many civic participation and conflict resolution resources available online. These organizations offer advice, covering models large and small, and can often point you in the direction of local expertise.

Public Conversations Project: www.publicconversations.org

Nonprofit Congress: www.nonprofitcongress.org

Frameworks Institute: www.frameworksinstitute.org

National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation: www.thataway.org

Let’s Talk America: www.letstalkamerica.org

Americaspeaks: www.americaspeaks.org

The Fetzer Institute: www.fetzer.org

The Kettering Foundation: www.kettering.org

Program on Negotiation (PON): www.pon.harvard.edu/

Hewlett Foundation (the funder that created the field): www.hewlett.org/Archives/ConflictResolution/

Another Ongoing Veterans Dialogue Initiative: www.vets4vets.us

Alliance for Peacebuilding: www.allianceforpeacebuilding.org

Alliance Linking Leaders in Education and the Services: http://www.tuftsgloballeadership.org/programs/allies.html

United States Institute of Peace: www.usip.org

The Carter Center: www.cartercenter.org

Here is a list of preventive options for policymakers seen through a conflict resolution lens.

http://www.caii.com/CAIIStaff/Dashboard_GIRO
AdminCAIIStaff/Dashboard_CAIIAdminDatabase/resources/ghai/toolbox.htm

Post Conflict Reconstruction Project at Center for Strategic and International Studies: http://forums.csis.org/pcrproject/

3Dsecurity Initiative: www.3dsecurity.org/

Institute for Multi Track Diplomacy: www.imtd.org

Knowledge Database of the University of Colorado Conflict Information Consortium: www.beyondintractability.org


Resources on women and security:

Women and Global Security "Call to Action": www.womenandglobalsecurity.org

A Collaborative Effort of Women's Organizations: www.onesharedworld.org

Initiative for Inclusive Security: www.huntalternatives.org

United Nations Development Fund for Women: www.unifem.org

Blog Her: www.blogher.com

Realizing Rights: The Ethical Globalization Initiative: www.realizingrights.org

Effective States Institute: http://www.effectivestates.org/index.htm

Center for Global Development: www.cgdev.org

Global Peace Index: www.visionofhumanity.com

Groups that help organize locally:

Americans for Informed Democracy: www.aidendemocracy.org

Our Voices Together: www.ourvoicestogether.org

Everyday Democracy: www.everyday-democracy.org
What constitutes security in today’s world? Nearly two decades past the Cold War and years past September 11th, what tools are necessary to address today’s threats? Nobody has all the answers, but we are convinced that women must help lead the change. From the local advocate to your Member of Congress, women must educate communities, work through networks and tap every avenue of influence available in order to advance a new vision for America’s security.

America is at a crossroads. Today, the safety of people within borders remains important, but the safety of people across borders is equally so. These needs are complimentary and important simultaneously. They are not tradeoffs. Old frameworks of hawks vs. doves, guns vs. butter and “strong” or “weak” on defense are dated and obsolete. Today’s world defies such simplistic explanations. We are convinced that security must be broadly defined in order to address the complex, diffuse and interrelated challenges we face.
Americans are good at taking on challenges and talking things out. Although we don’t have all the data gathered yet, everyone reading this book knows a woman who is a great networker, a relationship builder, a convenor, who persuades and cooperates to influence a collectively beneficial outcome. These are exactly the sorts of skills that we need to bring into national security decision making. We must also work to make sure that these characteristics are embodied in our national security policies themselves.

Civil-military dialogue is a good place to bring focus to dense and distant national security policies. Indeed, we must bring policy decisions by our elected leadership closer to local communities in order for these decisions to be participatory. Talking to veterans about the role of the military in democracy, but more specifically about national service—is a great way to bring these abstract ideas closer to an actual experience in citizenship. After all, public deliberation and creative problem solving have served this nation well for over two hundred years. We believe that our democracy will be renewed and strengthened by a vigorous dose of exactly this kind of critical dialogue today.

Ultimately, however, a new direction rests on the willingness of women like you, who believe your voice should be part of the chorus urging—and leading—positive steps forward. It is our hope that this handbook provides you with the minimum tools and resources you need to learn the basics and to begin the discussion close to home—the place it will have the most meaning and, if enough of us initiate it—the most power to influence change.

“Citizen oversight is the most important part of national security and taking initiative as citizens is our most important public service”

Security Dialogue participant 07