MODULE 3
CONFLICT DIAGNOSIS: THE CONFLICT EQUATION

Session Outline

This session provides a brief explanation of the components of the conflict equation. A two-page conflict scenario on Bolivia gives participants an opportunity to practice using the conflict equation. This session sets the stage for Conflict Diagnosis: A Case Study, where participants will engage in a group activity with a more complex real-world country case study.

Session Duration: 1 hour and 30 minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Presentation/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POWER POINT PRESENTATION</td>
<td>20 MINS</td>
<td>Present the conflict equation via PPT slides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXERCISE: CONFLICT SCENARIO</td>
<td>25 MINS</td>
<td>Small groups prepare a conflict diagnosis applying all elements of the conflict equation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXERCISE REPORT OUT</td>
<td>25 MINS</td>
<td>Each group reports out on one element of the conflict equation from their group work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWERPOINT PRESENTATION</td>
<td>15 MINS</td>
<td>Present slides on context and mitigation factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCLUSION</td>
<td>5 MINS</td>
<td>Participants now have a basic grasp of conflict diagnosis that links to fundamental CAF concepts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Checklist: Items Needed for This Module

- Laptop and projector
- Flip charts, tape and markers for each group
- Module 3 PPT loaded to laptop
- Review background pieces on Bolivia for participant exercise
- Posters: Conflict equation, complex conflict equation, motives

Objective

Conduct a basic conflict diagnosis using the various elements of the conflict equation.
This module moves from the more general discussion of trends into an introduction of the conflict equation – a tool that dissects the complex forces at work in conflict and helps us better understand conflict dynamics. Conflict is a complex phenomenon and it is difficult to understand it without systematic analysis. Think, for example, of the complexity of conflicts such as the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the struggle to end apartheid in South Africa, conflicts today in Iraq and Afghanistan and, of course, the conflict in Sri Lanka that you read about in your case study.

This session starts with a brief presentation introducing the key concepts and then moves into a quick exercise for participants to apply the various components of the conflict diagnosis (equation) tool to a real scenario. Understanding these concepts will be critical to the remainder of the course, so encourage participants to ask questions.
Before delving into the theory of the conflict equation, what is needed to start a fire besides wood?

Answer: accelerant and something to ignite it. All three elements are needed — they are additive. Fuel and accelerant without a spark will not result in a fire.

The metaphor of starting a fire is perfect for describing conflict. To reorient this equation to conflict, the metaphor can be rephrased using motives, means and opportunity. This language is borrowed from the field of criminal justice and not necessarily a USAID-specific patented tool. It is based on a body of academic work and field experience, and it draws on other disciplines.

Analogy/Example: Imagine going to the doctor for an illness. The doctor could focus on one of your symptoms to make a diagnosis (e.g., you have a fever; therefore you have the flu). But more likely, the doctor will conduct a series of tests to get to the root of the problem (e.g., fever + redness of throat + deep cough + shortness of breath = bronchitis or respiratory infection.)

Similarly, to diagnose drivers of a conflict, one must look at the collective actions and forces that shape hostilities.
1st Click: Motives and wood title appears.

What might be some motives to start or to join a conflict? Possible answers: Sense of inequality, perceived or real grievance, a deep feeling of dissatisfaction. Let participants know that we will come back to grievances shortly, but to keep these defining factors in mind.

CMM tries to take the same approach regarding conflict and peace.

Could this also be a formula for peace? YES.

2nd Click: Institutions diagram appears.

The ways that institutions and people (identity groups) interact over time form social patterns. When analyzing conflict, it is important to consider how institutions interact with groups of people based on their identity. When, over time, people from certain identity groups feel that these interactions create a threat — to their beliefs, values and dignity or their aspirations, security or livelihoods — patterns of grievance can emerge from this continued sense of threat to one’s/group’s identity. These are powerful motives for mobilization of conflict. During analysis continuously ask:

- Is the institution perceived effective and trustworthy by the identity group?
- Does the institution think the identity/group is legitimate?
- What aspects of identity are being threatened? How?

Alternately, these interactions can lead to a sense of protection or defused threat (a resiliency), when institutions are attentive to the needs of a group. In these cases, the patterns may defuse conflict by countering motives for mobilization. This is the foundation for how CMM understands conflict and will be covered more in depth later in this module.
The relationship depicted in the slide reflects CMM’s broader understanding of the sources of fragility (the extent to which interactions between state and society produce outcomes that lack legitimacy or effectiveness). Fragility can be thought of as an enabling condition that can contribute to a higher likelihood of armed conflict.

Those familiar with how “fragile states” are defined may recognize the language used in this slide: legitimacy and effectiveness. When talking about whether governance is working or not, these two indices are often used to look at institutional performance.

- **Legitimacy**: Interactions between institutions (both formal and informal) and society are basically just and consistent with social norms. Governance is perceived as illegitimate when it threatens these norms or is viewed as unjust.

- **Effectiveness**: Interactions between institutions and society produce outcomes that are acceptable in terms of quality and quantity. For example, availability of food, education and health care meet society’s expectations. Institutions are viewed as ineffective when the goods and services provided do not meet the quality and quantity you expect.

A society’s ability to resolve conflict through peaceful means depends heavily on people’s perceptions of the effectiveness and legitimacy of both formal and informal governance institutions. Motives, or grievances, come from these patterns of interaction.

Perceptions are important when talking about legitimacy and effectiveness. For example, data from Nepal shows an improvement in health and education in the country’s mountainous areas during the last 10 years. However, many people perceived during the Maoist conflict that they were still marginalized.

This is the foundation of how CMM understands conflict.

An example is a Somalia Youth Leadership Initiative led by Mercy Corps. The program gave 150,000 young people throughout Somalia access to education, skills training and civic opportunities in an effort to reduce political violence and lead to a positive engagement with society. The program found that “the relationship between perceived discrimination and participation in and endorsement of political violence was quite strong.” The important word here is perceived. As such, the program recommended that it was not enough to provide economic stability or civic engagement; real and perceived discriminations needed to be reduced. “Therefore, perceptions are really important.”
Emphasize the idea of patterns — a sense of continuing recurrence. Thinking back to the earlier example, doctors don’t just check boxes on a list of symptoms. They look at patterns and how things are related to try to find the root cause of all the symptoms before providing a diagnosis.

USAID research, carried out as a part of the Fragile States efforts, revealed that the five most frequent patterns of grievance are:

In describing, be sure to link to identities and focus on how this would impact your daily life if you were a member of a particular identity group; these patterns are at the society level, but at the core you are still talking about identities. Try to help participants to think about how they would feel if they were in this situation and their identity was threatened in such a way.

Elicit examples from participants on one of the easier principles, such as exclusion.

1. **Elitism** — Elite groups try to hold onto power. This is a contest between “haves” and “have-nots.” (Examples: feudal system, French Revolution, caste systems in Nepal and India, royal families in Arab countries such as Saudi Arabia and Morocco). Based on patterns of identity, castes or royalty/nobility are described as “God’s ordained pattern” and used to justify a difference in status. In all of these cases, the position in the social hierarchy determines access to power and resources, rather than factors like education or ability.

2. **Exclusion** — A rupture between groups develops in society. One group is completely dismissed and unable to access typical resources, public jobs and educational opportunities. Examples: Rwanda: When Tutsis ran the bulk of the state in 1998, it was hard for Hutus to go to school, harder for them to go to university and nearly impossible to get into business. South Africa: In apartheid South Africa, well-educated black Africans had far less access to power and resources than poorly educated white Africans. (Other examples are Sri Lanka, Bosnia and U.S. race relations). Ask participants to share additional examples.
3. **Chronic capacity deficits** — This can look very different from country to country, but the bottom line is the perception that the country is no longer able to provide the goods that are expected of it. This failure could affect everything in the society: no state-provided health or education services, no rule of law, etc. (Example: Guinea). It could also be that the state is not able to provide something specific that its population expects — rule of law, education, elections, etc.

In some cases, people are more focused on the management of strategic resources (oil in Nigeria or water in the Middle East, land in Kenya or diamonds in Sierra Leone). The key questions in the case of strategic resources are: Who has access to it? Who benefits? Where is it? The legitimacy of the government in these cases hinges on the state’s ability to manage it.

In some countries, no representation of government exists in certain areas. That neglect becomes an issue that allows conflict to erupt or to spill over (examples: Mali, Mauritania).

4. **Transitional Moment** — Often in a post-conflict period, people have high expectations but may not experience any real change. They get frustrated by these unmet expectations and the result can be a backlash of violence. Example: In East Timor, people became frustrated with ineffective government after independence. This can apply equally to any kind of transition (it’s not always post-conflict; it can also be as a result of a political transition which doesn’t produce the expected benefits). Other examples: Iraq, Afghanistan, Sudan.

5. **Corruption** — Do leaders go out of the way to benefit themselves? Although corruption is central to many conflicts, no examples exist of conflict driven solely by corruption. This seems to be more of a concurrent issue in most conflict situations.

Motives are not mutually exclusive. The more motives that are present in a scenario, the worse the situation can become. More motives mean more fractures along common fault lines (Huntington). Returning to our medical metaphor, HIV patients die of TB. People with malaria are much more likely to contract typhoid. When a person’s immune system is compromised by one illness, vulnerability to other ailments rises. Similarly, when multiple grievances from these core patterns are present, violent conflict is more likely to erupt.

We can also think about how different groups of people, even within the same ethnic group, have different experiences and vulnerabilities. For example, women and men may experience the impacts of elitism, exclusion, and chronic capacity deficits in different ways. They may also interpret messaging from key actors differently, and respond to different trigger events. For example, women who see firsthand how an inability to access basic needs for security, food, health or clean water impacts families may encourage male family members to protest or take up arms, or may join in conflict themselves, while sometimes events become triggers for men specifically, because they interpret them as threatening their honor as men.
Are motives alone enough to start a violent conflict?

No, just as wood on its own will not result in fire. Every society has motives that might lead to violence, but that is not enough. Looking solely at motives will result in a laundry list of issues. The USG does not have the resources to address every possible motive for violence in the world; thus, the emphasis is on patterns that support the key drivers.

To narrow our focus, we must look at motives along with means and opportunity. This equation helps us to sift through the many potential causes of conflict and zero in on those most likely to lead to violence in a particular context.

What else do we need to look for to complete our analysis/diagnosis?

Answer: Means
“Means” translates into key actors — individuals or organizations — who have the necessary resources to start and sustain a violent conflict.

Note that the range of aims for mobilizing can be for positive or negative aspirations. For example Martin Luther King and Gandhi protested non-violently for social justice.

Questions to ask during analysis include:
Who has or supports the grievance? What is their aim? Are they organized? Do they have the resources needed to mobilize?

What type of skills do key actors have? What resources are needed?

Leadership:
Entrepreneurship (Charles Taylor in Liberia)
Ideology (Al Qaeda, Al Shabaab, Lenin/Stalin, Castro)
Religious doctrine (Pope, Khameni, Supreme leader of Iran)

Organizational Capacities:
Technical skills (military, informational, etc.)
Pool of recruits (disaffected youth)
Informational capabilities (text messages, radio, Internet)

Financing:
Access to funding flows: Liberia sales of timber funded conflict, Somalia in the 90s - food aid added to the conflict economy; Diasporas: IRA funding from the US, LTTE European sources.

Ability to buy weapons, equipment and resources: Paying for recruits; ability to buy military services (training or mercenaries).
Unrestricted Operating Space:
Ability to operate without fear of reprisal. Often we think of this as a safe haven, either across a border or internal to the country. Increasingly, we see groups operating under the radar in urban areas like slums that are ungoverned or undergoverned.

While often we assume that key actors will be powerful men, it is important to remember that women may also have extraordinary influence over conflict dynamics. They may be community leaders, or they may operate outside the public domain to exert influence on frontline actors, for example, by working behind the scenes for peaceful conflict resolution or by supporting sons and husbands to fight. We should always make sure to look for key actors of both sexes in the formal and informal spheres.

For example, in September 2014, at the height of the Ebola crisis in Guinea, a group of women chanting “they are coming to kill you” encouraged men to arm themselves and slaughter visiting health educators, provoking a military backlash against the village that left thousands displaced (See Washington Post, February 28, 2015, “The Fear of Ebola Led to Slayings – And a Whole Village Was Punished.”)
As noted, motives and means together are not enough to lead to violence. These two aspects of the conflict equation being in place together primes the motives, perhaps pushed by a leader who has an interest in mobilizing people for a certain cause.

Fuel has been added to the wood; it is primed to catch fire. People are primed to carry out violence, but the spark is still missing. That spark is referred to as trigger.
Triggers are specific moments in time that can crystallize a long-standing grievance. Triggers are the hardest to see coming because they are closely entwined with local cultures. Often an outsider cannot predict what will be a triggering event and what will not. It is hard to make steadfast rules about triggers because they vary so much from one context to another, but things to watch for include:

- Shifts in how people talk about others in their society/community.
- Cascading events, where several triggering events in a short time may be the rise of a conflict crescendo.

The many relevant dimensions at play in any local context may make a trigger more or less potent in terms of provoking violent responses. Ideologies, cultural practices such as holidays or celebrations and gender practices or beliefs are just a few examples of cultural dynamics that may serve to unite or antagonize particular populations and/or identify groups. A few examples include:

- In pastoralist areas of Africa, elopement or bride stealing is a common trigger for local violence, because it goes against local marriage traditions and also has economic and social implications for the bride’s family, in that they do not receive dowry for the marriage; which in turn can affect ability of sons to marry, and lead to perceptions that the family honor and standing has been damaged.

- Another example is the shooting of Malala Yousafzai on her way to school, which provoked a backlash against the Taliban in Pakistan and led to increased activism promoting girls’ education.

- Incidents of sexual or gender-based violence directed towards an identity group’s members also serves as a particularly powerful trigger for retaliatory attacks.
For more than 200 years, the marching season has been a source of conflict between Northern Ireland’s Protestant and Catholic communities. Members of the Protestant Orange Order, who stage the majority of parades, insist it is part of their heritage to march in commemoration of key historical events. Catholics argue that they should not have to endure “triumphalist” parades, which mostly celebrate Protestant victories over Catholics, through their neighborhoods.

**Key takeaway:** A trigger is the spark. It can often be predicted (e.g., during elections or holidays) and programmed around; but other triggers are not as easily identified, especially by external parties.

What are some other examples of triggering events?

- Crash of the helicopter carrying the Rwandan president, triggering the genocide
- 2007 Kenyan elections
- Rosa Parks in the U.S. civil rights movement
- Raising prices of bread in 1970s Egypt
- Rodney King’s police brutality case in Los Angeles
- Natural disasters
- Loss of leadership / assassination
It's time to apply the equation. Take the next 25 minutes to complete this exercise.

1. Take 5 minutes to read the two-page conflict scenario on Bolivia.
2. As a group, identify a recorder and spokesperson to report out.
3. Take 15 minutes to conduct a basic conflict diagnosis of the scenario, attempting to apply all three elements of the conflict equation with your colleagues. Encourage everyone in your group to participate.
4. Prepare a 3-5 minute report on your findings.

Trainers are to provide warnings midway through the exercise, and when 10 minutes remain. During the exercise, facilitators should walk around to ensure that each group is moving through each component while saving enough time to discuss opportunities. (A common problem has been groups spending most of their time on means and motives).

**Option:** At the 10-minute warning, if groups are working a bit slowly through the exercise, assign each table-top a single component to report out on. If there are more than three tables, assign components more than once.
Report-out of Exercise (25 minutes)

Limit each group’s report to 3-5 minutes, for a total of 20 minutes, with 5 minutes for discussion/concluding thoughts. Start with motives, followed by means and then opportunities, but be sure to allow equal time for each. See possible answers for each component on the following page.

Use an iterative process to limit repetition of findings. Whether each group has one component or the full equation, have one group report out and other groups simply add their findings. This approach will save time. Additional notes for processing:

- Ensure that groups portray correct details. It’s important for them to be able to identify examples for each of the components, so correct any items needed.
- Push groups that focus on motives to identify deeper patterns of grievances. Ask what they think is the key or critical motivation.
- Push groups to grasp a broader understanding of means beyond the actors themselves, e.g., organizational capacity, financing, etc.
- After all the groups have reported ask them if they think this analysis caught all the important issues or if they think that things are missing from this analysis. This question helps to set the stage for the next round of PowerPoint slides. The most common answer is the role of the US.

Given everything reviewed, how many of you think this situation resulted in violent conflict? Why do or do you not think this is the case?

Answer: In the immediate aftermath, violent conflict did not occur. Prompt people to think about resiliency and the forces that work against conflict.

Give a brief (2 min) overview of what has since happened in Bolivia:
Highlight that although recent violence broke out at demonstrations, no widespread violence has occurred to date.

- People went to the polls instead of to violence. Government channels are dealing with the conflict, such as through voting for autonomy statutes and the referendum on Morales.
- The populace still sees the government as legitimate and effective. The performance of the institutions is addressing their grievances. This shows that resiliencies are at work in Bolivia.

Now that the simple conflict equation has been applied to a real case, Bolivia, we’re going to add another layer and do a more advanced level walkthrough of the conflict equation.
Bolivia Scenario: Possible Responses to Exercise

Motives
- Exclusion: new constitution strengthens the rights of indigenous groups
- Desire for greater autonomy from the central government
- Mismanagement of resources (mostly in non-indigenous areas)
- Perception that mixed-race areas do not want to redistribute wealth among the country’s poor; historical indigenous grievance against relatively prosperous East
- Haves and have-nots: Access to resources (land, natural gas)
- Sense among the non-indigenous that the Morales government discriminates against them or excludes them
- Racism

Means
- Government access to police and military
- Ideology, anti-Americanism
- Alliance with Chavez
- President as indigenous and therefore aligns with their identify and needs
- Indigenous groups have access to government institutions
- Traditional elite who have access to resources (people, power)

Opportunity
- Passage of the new constitution strengthens the rights of indigenous groups (trigger for the anti-government demonstrations and moves to seek greater autonomy in Eastern Bolivia)
- National referendum to determine if the constitution will take effect
- Referendum on the autonomy statutes
- Violent crackdown on protests
- Hate speech

Bolivia Update Since 2007:

Evo Morales was re-elected as President for his third time in 2014. Tensions since 2007 have remained largely dormant, as Morales’ government is seen as incredibly powerful. Though critics were concerned at Morales’ move to increase government control and taxation on gas and oil, the investments from gas royalties have pumped money into government spending, increasing development throughout the country. “The gas money has been the source of Morales’s power, allowing him to vastly expand the reach and the role of the Bolivian state.” (Washington Post, 2014)
Two additional aspects must be taken into account in a conflict analysis: context and mitigating factors. This is a pass through slide; next couple of slides go deeper into each of these components.
First, one must consider the context in which a conflict occurs. The context can be understood as the oxygen surrounding the equation — in the sense that oxygen is a necessary component for fire. The context impacts everything in the equation: motives, means and opportunity.

What are the critical contextual issues in the Bolivia case?
- Bolivia has natural gas
- Regional influence of Chavez and Venezuela.
- Geography – lowlanders and highlanders coincide with identity cleavages.

Note: Keep the Bolivia example in mind to continue to explore the concept of context. It contains two aspects: structural conditions and governance issues.

Gendered roles and social patterns are important aspects of conflict contexts, but it’s important to recognize that these can sometimes shift dramatically during conflict among other contextual factors that are more fixed. During the social upheaval of conflict, both women and men have sometimes seen gender roles radically redefined.

Examples:
- In Liberia, women exploited the social taboo against women’s nakedness to pressure men into negotiating peace, threatening to strip outside the negotiating hall if the men did not reach an agreement.
- In Mindanao, men’s mobility was restricted during conflict, leading some men to feel their masculinity threatened, making them more likely to take up arms.
Note that context and grievances are not the same. Contextual elements are givens; they change slowly and are structural conditions. Context is correlated to violent conflict but will not in itself cause violent conflict. Think of context as pull factors.

Examples:
- As a result of the Arab Spring, Libya collapsed. Populations and groups started fleeing to neighboring countries, triggering a collapse in bordering Mali. This is an example of an exogenous factor. It is critical to take into account the impact on Mali given it’s placement in a “bad neighborhood.”
- Kenya is in a similar situation with Al-Shabaab influence coming over the border from neighboring Somalia. This is something that must be taken into account in the Kenyan context.

Structural conditions are conditions that we treat as givens because they are difficult to alter within our planning horizon. People tend to look at things like poverty or heterogeneity and think they cause conflict. But many countries have these conditions without conflict, so we have to be careful not to make the wrong assumption that structural conditions cause conflict. Structural conditions are less malleable than governance.

Governance How are people and things managed? How are rules made and enforced? Governance mediates the effects of structural factors on people’s lives. Good governance can prevent grievances from being motives.

Key takeaway: It is important to pay attention to the context – while context will not directly cause conflict, contextual factors can pull the situation towards conflict.

Revisit the Bolivia Example: Bolivia has natural gas. This is a structural condition; as such, it does not cause conflict. But we want to look at how governance in Bolivia mediates, or fails to mediate, the effects of structural factors on people’s lives. In the Bolivia case, the institutions that dealt with gas resources benefited the elites, but now a new group with greater political power wants that to change. The existence of natural gas is not creating this conflict; that is a structural condition or pull factor of the context. The conflict is about if or how the government will manage the resources.
What does “mitigating factors” mean? What if you have all the elements to the equation but it does not end in violence?

Just as drivers of conflict are part of the equation, it is important to recognize the factors that can mitigate conflict and drive peace. These peacekeeping functions can maintain some degree of law and order and, at a minimum, keep violence at bay.

We often focus heavily on what is negative, rather than supporting the positives. Support for existing mitigating factors is often highly effective to prevent conflict and is more sustainable than other types of interventions. Mitigating factors may be last in our presentation, but they are not least important!

Examples of possible mitigating factors relative to each element of the equation include:

- **Context**: Membership in regional organizations; effective, impartial judiciary. Methods of inter-group negotiation; local problem-solving practices driven by cultural traditions or rituals; history of reconciliation.
- **Motives**: Tradition of intermarriage leads to identities gradually being subsumed into a larger identity
- **Means**: Presence of U.N. peacekeeping forces
- **Opportunity**: Elections, natural disasters

Clarify that an opportunity can go either way. For example, the tsunami in Indonesia contributed to mitigating conflict dynamics in Aceh, while in Sri Lanka the tsunami exacerbated existing conflict dynamics.

What are some examples of contextual mitigating factors in the Bolivia context?

- The military is united.
- People are not asking for a new country, but are asking for autonomy and continuing to work within the system.
- A shared enemy (the U.S.) creates unity.
- Factions that have the same language and religion.
CMM also calls these mitigating factors resiliencies. The word resiliency has become quite popular in recent years and can have different definitions based on the context in which it is being discussed.

The broader USAID definition of resiliency implies a normatively positive idea – the ability of people, households or communities to adapt and recover from things like famine or natural disaster.

For CMM and the overall peacebuilding community, we think of resiliency as a factor that can push against the potential for conflict and is defined as:

- **Resiliencies are sources for conflict mitigation.** Resilience refers to qualities in people or institutions that enable them to manage the stresses of disagreements or disputes to prevent escalations of violence. Social patterns of resilience are mitigating factors.

Other similar views to that of CMM include:

- **OECD:** “[resilient states or institutions] “are capable of absorbing shocks and transforming and channeling radical change or challenges while maintaining political stability and preventing violence… resiliency increases when expectations, institutions, and the political settlement interact in ways that are mutually reinforcing.”

- **Geneva Peacebuilding Platform, Paper No. 6, Ken Menkau:** “A resilient community is one which is able to successfully resist pressure to resort to violence as it resolves or manages the tension.”

Are resiliencies normatively good or positive? NO – Al-Qaeda is quite resilient; autocratic institutions are extraordinarily resilient; countries raising their own militias are also resilient.

An institution or society’s flexibility — not merely its strength — often makes it resilient. Furthermore, resiliency often refers to the ability to adapt to change, rather than resist change, in a conflict context.
Resilient identities in the context of conflict may be, for example, an inclusive sense of nationality (like the “melting pot” or “salad bowl” metaphors in the United States). It could also be a “culture of fear” or of passivity in a particularly authoritarian regime.

**In some instances, CMM considers resiliency as the opposite of fragility.** Resilient institutions are likely “effective and legitimate,” and probably part of what makes them effective is the ability to adapt or to continue to operate even in changing circumstances. For example, a constitutional system of law, or the institution of marriage, may all be systems that persist (fairly or unfairly) over many generations, adapting to or resisting change. *Caution to facilitator: The idea of resiliency as the opposite of fragility may be tricky to explain if not well-versed in these terms and comparisons.*

**Resiliencies are not, however, the mirror image of grievances.** Mitigating factors are not always normatively good. Resiliency just refers to the way individuals or communities interact and function within social patterns.

For instance, in dormant conflict, while active violence may not be present, grievances still may exist. Just because actors are not mobilizing, does not equate to satisfaction. **Latent grievances** mean there are very real grievances, but that individuals/communities often learn to work around these grievances and within the system they are dissatisfied with, thus becoming more of a societal norm.

CMM is working to develop a more refined list of resiliencies and the components of resiliency. In the interim, CMM’s THINC piece provides illustrative means for resiliencies to exacerbating violent conflict and resiliencies for building peace (found on page 20).

**Key takeaway:** Resiliencies typically work as a source to mitigate conflict and should be sought in any conflict analysis. If a society (individuals/communities and institutions) is resilient, peace is more sustainable.
Remember not to assign “good” or “bad” to each category, e.g., a monopoly on the use of force could include dictatorship or military dominance.
**Interstate versus Intrastate Conflict Q&A**

Does this analytical model work for interstate conflict as well as intrastate conflict?

**Response:**

In general, no. This model explains intrastate war (or internal violent conflict); it was not developed to deal with interstate war. However, some aspects of it will have some relevance to interstate war.

1. Interstate conflict is infrequent, especially compared to intrastate conflict, which averages two new outbreaks each year.

2. Internal conflict variables do not have much value outside a national context.

3. The study of interstate war (i.e., international relations) is much older than that of intrastate war. This field has yielded ample interesting theory, but the only reliable (and significant by statistical standards) conclusion, “democratic peace,” says that democracies go to war less often. A war between two democracies is especially unlikely.

4. That said, some concepts are the same in inter- and intrastate conflict. For example, identity can also play a large role in interstate conflicts.
   a. Afghanistan/Pakistan – Pashtun identity
   b. DRC/Rwanda – Hutu and Tutsi identity
   c. Georgia/Russia – South Ossetian identity; are they more Russian or Georgian?

   This underscores the fact that state borders often do not align with identity.

5. Interstate war happens most often between developed countries, so the development angle is not as strong as it is with internal wars. Because USAID is a development agency, we look at what affects the poor. Most often, this is internal conflict.

6. Agency mandates – USAID would rarely, if ever, be engaged in conflict work in an interstate war. This is the realm of State Department. USAID might play a small role, like providing humanitarian assistance or supporting track two or three peace processes.
SANTA CRUZ, Bolivia — Tens of thousands of anti-government demonstrators flooded the streets of this city and three other provincial capitals on Saturday as four of Bolivia’s wealthiest provinces celebrated efforts to seek greater autonomy from the central government.

The protests here in Bolivia’s most prosperous city, though they were a direct affront to President Evo Morales, had a festive spirit, as people waved green-and-white flags marked “Now We Are Autonomous” [photo above left].

“We don’t want Bolivia to disintegrate,” said Zenon Mita, 46, who runs a construction business here. “We just want Evo to recognize that we have our own priorities.”

Although the president sent hundreds of police officers to reinforce security in Santa Cruz and other capitals as fears of violence grew, there were no signs of a major armed presence on the streets. The only violence reported was an explosion on the fifth floor of the Palace of Justice here; no one was hurt.

But in Santa Rosa, an agricultural town near Santa Cruz, local television reported that more than 50 people were hurt in rock-throwing clashes on the main plaza as supporters of Mr. Morales traveled there in buses for a counter protest.

Morales supporters, meanwhile, gathered in the capital, La Paz, to celebrate a new Constitution aimed at strengthening the rights of indigenous groups [photo above right].

The passage of the Constitution in a chaotic assembly last week that was boycotted by the president’s critics set off the moves to seek greater autonomy in eastern Bolivia. A national referendum will determine whether the Constitution will take effect.

The “autonomy statutes” of the four provinces are the biggest challenge yet to Mr. Morales, who is Bolivia’s first indigenous president. The regional charters fall short of declaring independence, but supporters seek to give provincial officials power over natural gas royalties, agricultural policies and police forces.

The regional statutes, which are also subject to public referendum, have not taken effect. But they set in motion conditions for a clash between Mr. Morales and the regions of Bolivia that are richest in petroleum and arable land.
Officials in La Paz have lashed out at the autonomy moves, describing them as racist efforts from largely mixed-race provinces to resist attempts to redistribute wealth among the country’s poor. Grievances against the relatively prosperous east are most intense in the western highlands, home to Aymara and Quechua Indians.

Vice President Álvaro García Linera accused the elite in Santa Cruz, the richest lowland province, of “separatist and racist attitudes,” in comments to the official news agency on Friday. Mr. García Linera said Santa Cruz was seeking to limit migration of Indians from the altiplano, or highlands, with its new statute, effectively restricting Mr. Morales’s land reform project.

Political leaders here make no secret of their distaste for Mr. Morales’s policies. “Evo is putting us on the road to chaos with ideas that discriminate against people who are not indigenous,” Branko Marinkovic, the president of the Pro-Santa Cruz Committee, said in an interview. “No one wants to invest or create jobs in this environment.”

In addition to sending extra police officers to Santa Cruz and other capitals, the central government put the armed forces on alert. Mr. Morales, an ally of Hugo Chávez, Venezuela’s president, has also stepped up his criticism of the United States in recent days, accusing Washington of fomenting unrest here.

Mr. Morales spoke before thousands of supporters in downtown La Paz on Saturday, some of whom were waving the wiphala, a multicolored flag representing indigenous people in Bolivia. A few others, presumably supporters of Mr. Morales from Santa Cruz, waved the province’s green-and-white flag.

“Don’t be scared!” Mr. Morales yelled into the microphone in the televised speech. “We are united and organized!” Silvia Lazarte, the Quechua Indian who presided over the constitutional assembly, stood by the president.

Attempting to show that the armed forces were aligned with Mr. Morales in a country prone to coups in the last century, members of the army, air force and navy appeared alongside the president in La Paz.

“Death to the Yankees!” Mr. Morales said, finishing the address with a chant common in the Chapare, the coca-growing region where he commands a strong following, but rare in his speeches before other audiences.

Alex Contreras, Mr. Morales’s spokesman, told reporters in La Paz that one option to lessen the tensions would be to have European ambassadors step in to mediate between the government and the provinces. But neither side seemed ready for mediation on Saturday. Attention focused instead on two dramatically different visions for the country’s future.