

ICAR News

A Publication of the Institute for
Conflict Analysis and Resolution

GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY

AfPak: Will the New U.S. Strategy Succeed?

By Saira Yamin, Ph.D. Candidate, ICAR Adjunct Professor, syamin1@gmu.edu

Writers describe the tribal region along the borders between Afghanistan and Pakistan as al-Qaeda Central. President Obama's strategy for rooting out international terrorism aligns with this view. The Obama administration is presently mulling over its exit from Iraq, and shifting its focus to Afghanistan and Pakistan. In addition to announcing an initial surge of 17,000 US troops, a request for 70,000 more is likely to be entertained in the coming months. South Asian analysts view the surge as a reinforcement of realpolitik embedded in the Bush Doctrine; however, President Obama's grand strategy acknowledges the importance of development and diplo-



The Future of Afghanistan. Award Winning Photo: Melanie Smith.

macy in dealing with the two South Asian states, both mired in intense political and economic instability. Development can transform a conflict environment. Diplomacy is equally critical and should be the benchmark of U.S. military and development intervention in the region.

President Obama calls his strategy AfPak. He

believes that the problem of terrorism flows from one country to the other, and that the solution lies in stabilizing both states. Stability is indeed key to addressing terrorism. In the conflict resolution lexicon, stability in Afghanistan and Pakistan would be understood as a "positive peace" whereby the cessation of direct physical violence is accompanied by transformation in structural and cultural sources of conflict. Strengthening governance structures and building the capacity of grassroots communities would be integral to the establishment of "positive peace" in the region.

AfPak has been welcomed by various quarters for incorporating a develop-

Continued on Page 7

Inside This Issue...

- 2 Network: New Center, CCT, Offers Courses at ICAR
- 3 Initiatives: A Return to ICAR's Roots
- 4 Events: 21st Annual Lynch Lecture and ICAR Hosts D.C. Student Consortium Conference
- 5 Press: ICAR Op-Eds, Letters to the Editor, and Photos
- 6 Spotlight: Two Legacies, One Vision: The Sargent Shriver-James H. Laue Connection. Also, ICAR Undergrad Named Carnegie Junior Fellow

CCT Offers Courses at ICAR

By Mark Thurston, Ph.D., Affiliate Professor, mthursto@gmu.edu

Initiated in January 2009, the Center for Consciousness and Transformation (CCT) is an interdisciplinary research and teaching center at George Mason University, whose mission is to understand the nature and effects of individual and group consciousness and their role in transformative learning and social change. Housed at New Century College on the Fairfax campus of Mason, the Center will be a resource for all of the University's academic units.

CCT was established through a generous gift from the de Laski Family Foundation. The \$10 million contribution is intended to support the first decade of development. At a formal event held March 31st, Mason President Alan Merten expressed appreciation for Don and Nancy de Laski's vision and generosity, noting that the Center would be in the business of both creative *thinking* and *doing*. For Nancy de Laski, CCT is "the culmination of all the study and dreams of a lifetime. We feel the timing is perfect. The world is changing so rapidly and old ways of operating are unraveling. Hopefully, by studying consciousness, students will attain more purpose-driven lives and ultimately affect the world's future in many fields."

The Center's activities will include research conducted by ICAR faculty, as well as academic courses for ICAR students. CCT is staffed by Dr. Lois Tetrick, Director; Dr. Mark Thurston, Senior Fellow; and Stacey Guenther, Program Manager. A seven-member faculty advisory committee includes Dr. Wallace Warfield from ICAR, who describes the potential interdisciplinary reach of the Center as "breathtaking."

A central premise of the Center is that human consciousness is a key variable in the process of transformative learning for individuals and can lead to transformational change on individual,



Mark Thurston with Don de Laski. Photo: CCT.

organizational, and societal levels. CCT's approach incorporates tradition and practice with modern scientific methods in its exploration of the vast worlds of consciousness and transformation.

Two CCT one-credit courses were offered at ICAR this spring. Conf 795, "Conflict Transformation from the Inside Out," dealt with transforming internal aspects of consciousness in order to become more effective practitioners, and will likely be offered again next spring. Conf 795, "Conflict Transformation: Leading from Your Spiritual Center," co-taught with Jamil Mahuad, former president of Ecuador, dealt with a multi-level approach to peacebuilding, including analytical, emotional, and spiritual dimensions, and issues relating to ethics, values, and intentionality. A new course entitled, "Practices for Re-Constellating Conflict, Inner and Outer," is being developed for Fall 2009.

Dr. Sara Cobb, a key part of conversations leading to the founding of the Center, feels it will be a "wonderful resource for Mason, and for the world, providing a space for both research and practice that addresses the important relationship between consciousness and conflict transformation." The Center's web site is <http://cct.gmu.edu>. ■

network

ICAR Hosts D.C. Student Consortium Conference

By Melanie Smith, ICAR M.S. Student, msmir@gmu.edu

On Saturday, April 25th, approximately 60 conflict resolution scholars, students, and practitioners descended upon the George Mason Arlington campus, as ICAR hosted the 3rd Annual Innovations in Student Leadership Conference, "Conflict Resolution and Governance Today." The conference is the main event for OneStudentry, a grassroots assembly of students from the Washington Consortium of Universities, aimed at enhancing and promoting collaboration in the conflict resolution field. Students from Catholic University, George Washington's Elliot School of International Affairs, American University, and St. John's College in Annapolis joined ICAR students for an afternoon of intervention simulations, panel discussions, and an address by keynote speaker Lorelei Kelly.

ICAR M.S. student Lane Salter facilitated a workshop featuring Dr. Cobb's Narrative Facilitation method. Salter guided participants through the narrative framework then practiced it in a role-play and followed with discussion. Afternoon sessions included three panel discussions which

Continued on page 8

A Return to ICAR's Roots: What Ever Happened to Problem Solving Workshops?

By Christopher R. Mitchell, Ph.D., Professor Emeritus, cmitchel@gmu.edu

Last summer, a subcommittee of the Point of View Academic Program Committee met following an April conference which addressed the state-of-the-art of problem solving workshops. The group consisted of Rice Professor Nadim Rouhana, Professor Ron Fisher from American University, Emeritus Professor Chris Mitchell, and ICAR Masters student Monica Flores. The focus of the subcommittee's discussion was how to press on with a "Program on Problem Solving" at Point of View—a program that would involve faculty and students from both universities and would help to revive both the understanding and practice of problem solving and dialogical interventions pioneered by scholar-practitioners such as Herb Kelman, Hal Saunders, and John Burton.

Underlying the enterprise was the recollection that the Center for Conflict Analysis and Resolution (now ICAR) was originally established at Mason precisely in order to undertake problem solving initiatives in protracted, intractable, and deep rooted conflicts—and that the last such initiative took place at ICAR in 1997!

By the end of June 2008, the group had a proposal for a "three strand" program at PoV. The program, which they plan to implement in 2009, involves a theory strand beginning with a series of symposia examining the current theories (basic human needs, small group dynamics, ripeness theory, complementarity) that underpin contemporary problem solving approaches; a training strand, aimed at developing a new generation of problem solving practitioners; and a practice strand,

“The program plans to merge the training and practice strands, so that a new generation of practitioners will receive hands-on experience...”

—CHRIS MITCHELL



Workshop Participants. Photo: Dr Betul Celik.

which will undertake analytical problem solving interventions into on-going, deep rooted conflicts, very much like the series of workshops organized in the early 1990s by Jim Laue, Chris Mitchell, and colleagues from the Center for Conflict Analysis at the University of Coleraine in Northern Ireland.

One early and unanticipated boost for the practice strand of the program was Susan Allen Nan's Georgian-Ossetian Workshop held at Point of View last December (see ICAR News, March 2009).

The training strand began on March 21st, with a two-day pilot workshop held at Point of View with Masters and ABD students from ICAR and AU. The training—intended as a trial run for future

workshops—was conducted by Professors Ron Fisher and Mohammed Abu Nimer from AU, and Susan Allen Nan and Chris Mitchell from ICAR.

For the participants, the workshop provided a fun learning experience and an opportunity for students from the two programs to work together and to get to know one another as potential partners in facilitation.

For the trainers, the experience was more than useful in preparing for future introductory skills development workshops, as well as an advanced skills workshop, slated to begin in Fall 2009.

Ultimately, the program plans to merge the training and practice strands, so that a *next generation* of practitioners will receive hands-on experience as part of a facilitation team in the real world of third party intervention into deep rooted conflicts, for which simulations provide limited preparation. ■



Lunch break at Point of View. Photo: Dr Betul Celik.

initiatives

21st Annual Lynch Lecture: Ambassador Eliasson Urges New Priorities for U.S./E.U. Alliance

By Sandra Cheldelin, Ph.D., ICAR Faculty, scheldel@gmu.edu

EVENTS



Ambassador Eliasson, Sandra Cheldelin, Kareem Terrell, Kim Orsulek, and Ross Gearllach. Photo: ICAR.

ICAR's 21st Annual Lynch Lecture was held April 9th at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., with the Honorable H. E. Jan Eliasson treating the audience to a provocative and reflective evening—challenging them to envision a new agenda for the alliance between the United States and Europe. While serving as Sweden's Ambassador to the U.S. in 2005, Eliasson was elected President of the United Nations' 60th General Assembly. In 2006, he was assigned by the U.N. as Special Envoy to Darfur, to deal with spiraling humanitarian and security crises and to facilitate negotiations between rebel groups and the Khartoum government in Sudan. Drawing on four decades of experience in relief services and mediation, including work in Somalia, Mozambique, the Balkans, Burma, Iran, Iraq, Armenia, and Azerbaijan, Eliasson offered a compelling rationale for his vision.

Following an introduction by ICAR Ph.D. Candidate Michael Shank, Ambassador Eliasson began with reflections on the current global economic crisis, considering it developmentally. The first stage, he said, grabbed international attention with the financial subprime ("sub-crime") situation. The second stage, which we are currently in, involves economic recession, rising unemployment, and a "reduction of production." The third stage will be coping with potential economic, social, and political

costs. Ambassador Eliasson wondered, with so much energy focused on managing the crisis, if we would be able to learn the important lessons that could lead to necessary change.

Eliasson addressed the long-term relationship between the U.S. and Europe and the challenges that interdependence and globalization inevitably present. He stated that, "the welfare of the other parts of the world is good for us," and proposed that there is no contradiction between good internationalism and working for one's own country.

The Ambassador presented three potential global scenarios: developing effective multilaterals; allowing the G20 to develop the rules of the game for the rest of the world, and—his "horror" scenario—of a fortified world. He insisted that the best scenario is clearly the development of effective multilaterals, because it has the most strength. U.S. and European security and economic cooperation are already strong, with nearly \$1.2 billion crossing the pond daily. If those economic forces are combined, a transatlantic agenda could be developed to address global threats, environmental degradation, climate change, and issues of poverty reduction—with the understanding that this would positively impact our own security. To this end, Eliasson challenged us to re-order our priorities saying, "We should do this because it is the right thing to do and out of enlightened self interest."

As a first priority, the Ambassador wondered, considering the \$700 billion earmarked to stimulate our economy, if we could "use \$100 billion of that to bring clean water to every human being on this earth." A second priority, he suggested, was literacy education for girls, pointing out that when women learn to read and write, 98% of them will teach their children to do so (compared to 45-50% of males). In just a generation or two, world literacy issues, along with myriad social problems that hinge on education could be addressed.

Another high priority for the U.S./European alliance should be to take on organized crime syndicates and related illegal activities, which Eliasson claims are some of the "most serious dangers in the world today." The numbers he presented are staggering: \$300 billion in drug trade, *Continued on page 5*

Upcoming ICAR Community Events

Wednesday, May 13, 2009

**Africa Working Group Panel
Discussion**

*The Roots & Future Prospect of
Militant Islam in Somalia*
6:30 pm - 8:30 pm, Truland Building,
555

Saturday, May 16, 2009

ICAR Convocation Ceremony

4:30 pm - 6:00 pm, Fairfax Campus,
Johnson Center, Dewberry Hall

<http://icar.gmu.edu/events.htm>

Lynch Lecture

Continued from page 4



Ambassador Eliasson. Photo: ICAR.

\$150 billion in illegal arms trade, \$150 billion in prostitution, and the trafficking of 1.2 million women and children, annually. While the public sector is taxed, none of the syndicates' money is taxed, and governments can offer little incentive to customs and border officials compared to those offered by organized crime.

A fourth priority should be research aimed at solving global health problems. Curing tropical diseases, such as tuberculosis, malaria, and worm-based illnesses, should be as important as curing our own ills—diabetes, obesity, and heart disease.

Finally, Ambassador Eliasson spoke to an essential transatlantic alliance in conflict zones, pointing out that in Afghanistan and Pakistan there needs to be policies on peacekeeping and policies that fight drug trade—strategies for civil society and strategies to limit corruption. There must also be a holistic approach to Iran. He wished that we could work together on the most intractable conflict—Israel/Palestine—but emphasized that U.S. policies must offer decisive action, especially with regard to outside actors.

The Ambassador concluded his formal remarks with a challenge for the US/European alliance to reorder its agenda in order to improve conditions globally. "What a message to convey." Use the financial crises to bring new energy and new ways of thinking with "an attitude that is a combination of passion and compassion—passion so that something happens, compassion so the right things happen."

Following Ambassador Eliasson's remarks, ICAR students Kim Orsulek, Ross Gearllach, and Kareem Terrell, launched a lively discussion which included questions from the audience. ■

New Book

Surrendering to Utopia

Stanford University Press
Mark Goodale,
ICAR Professor



"*Surrendering to Utopia* is a critical and wide-ranging study of anthropology's contributions to human rights. Providing a unique window into the underlying political and intellectual currents that have shaped human rights

in the postwar period, this ambitious work opens up new opportunities for research, analysis, and political action. At the book's core, the author describes a "well-tempered human rights"—an orientation to human rights in the twenty-first century that is shaped by a sense of humility, an appreciation for the disorienting fact of multiplicity, and a willingness to make the mundaneness of social practice a source of ethical inspiration."

—Stanford University Press

"At a time of contrasting narratives about human rights, from irresponsible triumphalism to cynical pessimism, here is a book that masterfully guides us into the complexities of contextualized practices of human rights across cultures and national boundaries. It does this by powerfully engaging anthropology, a discipline that has been marginalized by human rights' conventional scholarship to the latter's greater loss. Thanks to Goodale's very persuasive argument the record is finally being set right."

—Boaventura de Sousa Santos, Universities of Coimbra, Warwick, and Wisconsin-Madison

Recent ICAR Articles, Op-Eds, Letters to the Editor, and Photos

Madrassas: Resources for Peacemaking

By Rebecca Cataldi, ICAR M.S. Student
Voices: Tomorrow's Leaders, Today's Issues, 4/09

Responsible Journalism Series: Media as Critical Reflective Practice

By Mohammed Cherkaoui, ICAR Ph.D. Student
Common Ground News Service, 4/16/09

Lieberman and the Peace Process

By Rawhi Afaghani, ICAR Ph.D. Candidate
Common Ground News Service, 4/16/09

The Future of Afghanistan

By Melanie Smith, ICAR M.S. Student
The International Foundation for Electoral Systems Photo Contest, Winner, Public Category 2



press

Two Legacies, One Vision: The Sargent Shriver-James H. Laue Connection

By Joan Coolidge, Ph.D., ICAR Adjunct Professor, jcoolidg@gmu.edu

icar spotlight

ICAR recently had the privilege of competing with top universities to secure an endowment from the Sargent Shriver Peace Institute. Months of work by ICAR Director, Sara Cobb, in collaboration with faculty and ICAR's broader affiliates, produced an impressive thirty-two page proposal and video. The proposal draws on ICAR's 30-year history as a leader in the field of conflict resolution, advancing a future vision of positive social change amidst the urgency of the present demand for justice and an end to violence.

In proposing that ICAR become the Sargent Shriver School for the Analysis and Resolution of Conflict, we considered the life and work of Sargent Shriver. Renowned for decades of service, he built national programs like the Peace Corps and Head Start, as well as programs to eradicate poverty, racial injustice, and social inequity. As reflective practitioners, we revisited our own history, recalling its early voices—including the late James Laue, a beloved colleague who helped to shape ICAR's early institutional vision and programming.

Laue's 1960s sit-in research initiated his friendships with Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Andrew Young, and other civil rights leaders and his lifetime pursuit of justice through peacemaking. In his early public life at the Department of Justice's Community Relations Service (CRS), at a time when racial unrest raged in the South and across urban America, Laue and his colleagues broke new ground in racial conflict intervention work.

After leaving CRS, Laue continued devel-



James H. Laue. Photo: ICAR

oping intervention theory and techniques at Harvard University Medical, at Washington University, and at the University of Missouri at St. Louis. In St. Louis, he headed up the Center for Metropolitan Studies, investigating conflicts like inmate

grievance procedures, school desegregation, and urban development. Laue's pragmatic approach focused on results that changed people's lives. Realizing the growing strain on communities, he leveraged academic knowledge and resources to address real world problems.

“...the far-reaching visions and pragmatic approaches of both Laue and Shriver hold the dignity of the person and the service of communities as their central purpose...”

—JOAN COOLIDGE

Laue's expertise in community conflict intervention earned him national recognition and he began to develop the field by strengthening and expanding conflict resolution networks such as the National Conference on Peacemaking and Conflict Resolution and

developing institutions to prosper the work. Laue and others envisioned the creation of a peace academy where the government would invest in, and support, the training of a cadre of skilled peacemaking scholar/practitioners. The nine-year grass-roots effort resulted in the establishment of the United States Institute for

Continued on page 8

ICAR Undergrad Named Carnegie Junior Fellow

By Lori-Ann Stephensen, M.S. Student, lstephea@gmu.edu



Danny Kaysi. Photo: Evan Cantwell.

Daniyal Kaysi transferred from the American University of Beirut, because ICAR's undergraduate program “is one of the pioneers and most renowned conflict analysis programs in the country.” Kaysi, who majored in CAR and minored in Business Administration, will be graduating this month with more than just his Bachelors degree—he has been named George Mason's first Junior Fellow at the Carnegie Foundation for International Peace and will begin a one-year fellowship in Carnegie's Middle East program in August. Kaysi has been working as an undergraduate apprentice, with faculty mentor Patricia Maulden, on the Political Youth Leadership and Conflict Management Project and as an intern with the Dialogue and Difference program. As part of his internship, he collaborated on the development of Conf 341, a one-credit course which introduces students to practical skills such as mediation, negotiation, and dialogue. Kaysi is also the course assistant. After the Carnegie fellowship, he hopes to earn a Masters in law and diplomacy. ■

AfPak Analysis

Continued from page 1



Saira Yamin is an Adjunct Professor at ICAR. Photo: ICAR.

ment approach with military security. Conflict analysts would concur that the denial of basic human needs often lies at the roots of an intractable conflict. In this light, AfPak proffers a sound formula. Troop deployment to enforce peace in the region shall be supplemented by development and reconstruction in Afghanistan and Pakistan's tribal districts: infrastructure would be built and jobs would be created, local industries and livelihood shall be revived, and access to education and health care shall be ensured. Socioeconomic and political uplift of local communities would prevent recruitment in al-Qaeda's rank and file. Al-Qaeda would no longer find sanctuary among the presently alienated indigenous communities. Could this work? Yes. And no.

While President Obama presents a relatively sound prescription for peace in the region, there are gaps in his intervention plan. The President may find it a challenge to mobilize resources required to build peace in Afghanistan. Practically, this would mean rebuilding a whole country. Similarly, Pakistan's border regions would require high levels of sustained funding. Assuming that President Obama is able to muster support on the scale of the Marshall Plan from the EU and the G-20, could AfPak succeed? Unlikely.

There are lacunae in AfPak that hinder its success. The plan must engage primary stakeholders

in planning, decision-making, and implementation. Close communication, coordination, and cooperation between government officials are essential ingredients missing from U.S. intervention in the region

Conflict resolution theory brings into sharp focus the need for intervention coordination. In this case, intervention coordination would entail confidence-building measures between governments to address the deficit of trust. US military strikes in Afghanistan and Pakistan are not generally planned in collaboration, and are often protested by governments in the two states. This contributes to conflict escalation as state sovereignty and legitimacy are undermined. Collateral damage and internal and external displacement generate resentment for the United States and sympathy for al-Qaeda.

The relationship between the Afghan and Pakistan governments is also marked by mutual suspicion. For effective intervention coordination, all sides would need to work together in sharing information, situational analysis, and planning and implementing military operations. Ultimately, the engagement of US-led NATO troops in the region should be phased out and replaced by U.N. peacekeepers with the right mandate.

AfPak must also consider the importance of empowering and re-integrating all ethnic groups in Afghanistan, including the Pashtuns, Tajiks, Uzbeks, Hazaras, and others. Working closely with moderate Taliban factions can mitigate the terrorist threat significantly. Initiating a dialogue with radical Taliban elements could be explored through bridge-builders similar to international goodwill ambassadors. Reconciliation and power-sharing should underpin the development of democratic institutions. *Shura* (consultation) by tribal councils, an indigenous dispute reso-

lution mechanism, offers opportunities for participatory development processes. Integrating tribal communities in Pakistan with the mainstream is equally important. In order for AfPak to succeed, close coordination and collaboration with the local civil society is imperative. Networking with NGOs (non-governmental organizations) and INGDOs (international non-governmental development organizations) would be helpful in this regard. Promoting linkages between the Afghan and Pakistan governments and the NGOs and INGDOs, to plan and implement development projects, is a role the US could play effectively. Supporting partnerships between CBOs (community-based organizations), NGOs, and government organizations would make the plan more cost-effective, facilitate participatory approaches, and increase the sustainability of development initiatives.

AfPak should also consider international trade opportunities for Afghanistan and Pakistan as a means of generating revenue for development. This would be a viable substitute for development aid. Lifting US trade barriers and advocating regional trade agreements can boost local industries and create jobs.

Economic cooperation with India, Russia, Iran, Central Asian Republics, and China would pave the way for better regional integration and would ultimately benefit all actors. Trade with Pakistan and Afghanistan would build economic stakes in the stability of the two states across the region. NGOs from neighboring states could also be involved in development projects in both Pakistan and Afghanistan, providing an added incentive to cooperate in building a peaceful environment.

AfPak's emphasis on development strategies is commendable; however, the greater challenge lies in the realization that development must come from within. In the final analysis, Washington's success will be gauged by a shift in South Asian narratives, whereby the U.S. is positioned as a mediator, a benefactor, and a harbinger of peace. ■

“In order for AfPak to succeed, close coordination and collaboration with the local civil society is imperative.”

—SAIRA YAMIN

Shriver/Laue Connection

Continued from page 6

Peace, which currently receives a multi-million dollar appropriation, and is constructing "Peacemakers Plaza" near the National Mall, which will draw an anticipated 400,000 visitors annually.

Laue also advanced the academic discipline of conflict resolution through theory-building (most notably his contribution to applied ethics) and innovative practice related to his work with the Conflict Clinic, Inc., which he helped bring to Mason. His greatest contribution was his ability to inspire others—through intellect, humor, compassion, and an unflinching moral compass—to strive for higher ground as individuals and as communities.

As we look to the past to imagine the future, it is apparent that the far-reaching visions and pragmatic approaches of both Laue and Shriver hold the dignity of the person and the service of communities as their central purpose, with the aim of advancing opportunities, particularly for those most marginalized. The consideration of these two iconic figures has inspired the proposal of new ICAR initiatives: The Sargent Shriver Legacy Initiative, the Media and Conflict Resolution Initiative, the Social Inequality and Collaborative Engagement Initiative, and the Spiritual Peacemakers Network, which reflect what Laue and Shriver clearly understood—that people come before programs and institutions.

ICAR's greatest strength is its character, conviction, and capacity to serve others through its expansive network. While the Shriver endowment is pending, we remain confident that ICAR will continue to lead the field of peacebuilding, through its accomplishments and through its abiding commitment to pursue justice and to labor for peace. ■



Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution

3401 N. Fairfax Drive, MS 4D3, Arlington, VA 22201

OneStudentry Conference

Continued from page 2

considered the use of communications and technology in conflict resolution, government's role in human rights, and new models for conflict resolution. Two ICAR Ph.D. candidates, Suliman Giddo and Miki Jacevic, served as panelists for the human rights discussion moderated by ICAR's Dr. Karina Korostelina. The panel, which also featured Nina Besser, Legislative Assistant for Congresswoman Jane Schokowsky (D-IL), elicited a rich, motivating discussion.

The conference concluded with an address by Lorelei Kelly, director of the National Security Program for the American Progressive Policy Caucus Foundation. Kelly spoke of the need to redefine security to reflect conflict resolution values, advocating a shift from containment policies to policies oriented toward legitimacy. Kelly also provided insight into how the intellectual firepower of the conflict resolution field is often not well suited for Capitol Hill, suggesting that more "user friendly" methods can be employed to impact policy. ■

Non-profit
Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Fairfax, VA
Permit No. 1532