



2017

TRUST

**GLOBAL PHILANTHROPY
FORUM CONFERENCE**

APRIL 18-20 · WASHINGTON, DC



2017
TRUST

**GLOBAL PHILANTHROPY
FORUM CONFERENCE**
APRIL 18-20 · WASHINGTON, DC

This book includes transcripts from the plenary sessions and keynote conversations of the 2017 Global Philanthropy Forum Conference. The statements made and views expressed are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of GPF, its participants, World Affairs or any of its funders. Prior to publication, the authors were given the opportunity to review their remarks. Some have made minor adjustments. In general, we have sought to preserve the tone of these panels to give the reader a sense of the Conference.

The Conference would not have been possible without the support of our partners and members listed below, as well as the dedication of the wonderful team at World Affairs. Special thanks go to the GPF team—Suzy Antounian, Bayanne Alrawi, Laura Beatty, Noelle Germone, Deidre Graham, Elizabeth Haffa, Mary Hanley, Olivia Heffernan, Tori Hirsch, Meghan Kennedy, DJ Latham, Jarrod Sport, Geena St. Andrew, Marla Stein, Carla Thorson and Anna Wirth—for their work and dedication to the GPF, its community and its mission.

STRATEGIC PARTNERS

USAID
The MasterCard Foundation
Anonymous
The Rockefeller Foundation
Margaret A. Cargill Foundation
Horace W. Goldsmith Foundation

Newman's Own Foundation
The David & Lucile Packard Foundation
Skoll Foundation
Skoll Global Threats Fund
The Walton Family Foundation
The World Bank
IFC (International Finance Corporation)

SUPPORTING MEMBERS

The Leona M. and Harry B. Helmsley Charitable Trust
Conrad N. Hilton Foundation
Humanity United
IDB
Maja Kristin
MacArthur Foundation
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation

MEMBERS

Anonymous
Felipe Medina
Omidyar Network
Sall Family Foundation
Qatar Foundation International

The Global Philanthropy Forum is a project of World Affairs.

This collection of transcripts is a publication of World Affairs.

Copyright ©2017 World Affairs. All rights reserved.

Reproduction in whole or in part without the express permission of the authors is prohibited.

Front Cover Photo Credit: Nicoleta Raftu | Shutterstock.com

Back Cover Photo Credit: lazylama | Shutterstock.com

CONTENTS



FOREWORD	X
ADVISORY COUNCIL	7
STEERING GROUP	9
2017 CONFERENCE AGENDA	10
SPEAKER BIOGRAPHIES	28
OPENING REMARKS: JANE WALES	80
Jane Wales	
WHO IS US? PLURALISM, PROBLEM SOLVING AND CITIZEN POWER	82
James Goldston, Eric Liu, Jane Wales	
BUILDING THE CAPACITY FOR TRUST: THE CHILD. . . .	96
Randa Grob-Zakhary, Peter Laugharn, Carolyn Miles, Deogratias Niyonkiza	
SPECIAL ADDRESS: LUIS ALBERTO MORENO	110
Peter Laugharn, Luis Alberto Moreno	
CITIZEN POWER, WAGING PEACE	116
Nicola Benyahia, Alaa Murabit, Sanam Naraghi-Anderlini	

SPECIAL ADDRESS: AMBASSADOR CARLOS PINZÓN 132
Ambassador Juan Carlos Pinzón, Jane Wales

TRUST, JUSTICE AND THE CONFLICT CONTINUUM . . 140
**Robert Malley, David Miliband, John Prendergast, Yifat Susskind,
David Tolbert, Robin Wright**

SPECIAL ADDRESS: RAJIV SHAH 154
Rajiv Shah, Jane Wales

PHILANTHROPY, LEGITIMACY AND VOICE:
HERE AND ABROAD 162
Zia Khan, Patrick McCarthy, Adele Simmons, Julia Stasch, Cecilia Conrad

ADVANCING TRUST: SECRETARY MADELEINE
ALBRIGHT IN CONVERSATION WITH MCNULTY
PRIZE LAUREATES 176
**Lana Abu-Hijleh, Jordan Kassalow, Anne Welsh McNulty, Dele Olojede,
Jane Wales, Madeleine Albright**

RACE, JUSTICE AND LEGITIMACY IN AMERICA 194
Carroll Bogert, Adam Foss, Glenn E. Martin

TRUST, IDENTITY POLITICS AND THE MEDIA 208
Abdalaziz Alhamza, Uzodinma Iweala, Ben Rattray, Malika Saada Saar

FOREWORD



Jane Wales

Events that have unfolded since our 2017 conference only reinforce our contention that trust is humanity’s most valuable asset. It provides the societal glue on which wellbeing relies. Without it, we cannot manage the dangers we face, nor steward the resources we share. Without it, we cannot solve large problems together.

Yet trust is at an all-time low, with large percentages of the American public reporting to pollsters that they do not trust our government, and — perhaps more worrisome — that they do not trust one another. The trust deficit is not unique to our democracy. The Edelman Trust Barometer reveals that this is a global phenomenon. Nor is it the creation of a single leader or the consequence of one event. The decline has been decades in the making. It coincides with longer-term trends driven by the information revolution and economic globalization. Together they have decentralized decision-making and authority, reshaped communities and economies, and accelerated rapid and wrenching change.

However, pervasive distrust was neither inevitable nor need it be a permanent condition. Working together, philanthropy, civil society and policymakers have the opportunity to help reverse that trend, by making common cause, modeling collaborative problem-solving, and rebuilding social capital in the process.

That was and remains the commitment of the donors and other change-makers gathered at the Global Philanthropy Forum in 2017. They seek to build the capabilities, institutions and understandings that make societal trust — and shared success — possible.

OUR CONVERSATIONS BEGAN WITH THE CHILD and the ways to invest in his or her capacity to adapt, rebound, and even thrive under the stresses of scarcity, poverty, dislocation and struggle. We focused on early childhood development (ECD), at the stage of life when self and “the other” are

defined and the building blocks of resilience are put in place. We heard from leaders who have made ECD their priority, and seen results. They included **Peter Laugharn** of the Conrad N. Hilton Foundation; **Randa Grob-Zakhary** of Porticus, **Carolyn Miles**, of Save the Children, **Sherrie Westin** of Sesame Workshop, who was joined on stage by **Big Bird** to share their, and IRC's, educational work with children in refugee camps. *Sesame Street and IRC have since been awarded the MacArthur Foundation's 100&Change prize to continue this important initiative.* The health needs of mother and child in the first thousand days from conception to the age of two, and the means for delivering maternal and child care, were the focus of **Deo Niyizonkiza** of Village Health Works and **Raj Panjabi**, the inspiring Liberian physician who founded Last Mile Health — *and has more recently won the TED prize for his path-breaking work.* We also heard from **Ashish Karamchandani** of FSG, who described the ways in which a parent's best intentions can have an unintended and traumatizing effect. His research shows that unethical private preschool representatives persuade poor Indian parents to enroll their two- and three- year-olds at an age when children should be home, bonding with family, and learning by playing and doing, rather than by rote. Ashish is working with the Indian government to inform parents and regulate the pre-school industry, so as to remove this avoidable impediment to a child's socio-emotional development. His approach is to combine analysis, advocacy, tenacity and caring.

WE THEN MOVED TO SOCIETIES IN THE MIDST OF CHANGE, where pluralism — the ability of multiple cultures to co-exist within a shared society — may be the test of a state's viability. **Eric Liu** of Citizen University asked what it means to be an American, a German, a South African at a time when the demographic order is in flux, complicating the question of “who is us?” In liberal democracies with a history of cultural diversity, the answer, in theory, is clear: we are united by shared values, open societies that embrace cultural liberalism, democratic capitalism, and equality under the law. **James Goldston** of Open Society Justice Initiative described the conditions under which a commitment to liberalism and pluralism might wane, giving way to nationalist populism, even ethnocentrism. Eric spoke to the role that citizen power can and must play. In liberal democracies, individuals have rights and the citizenry shares power. James described the ways in which civil society helps to protect and preserve the former; Eric spoke our responsibility to exercise the latter. Their session was followed by Working Groups that focused on specific test cases in Africa, Europe, Latin America and the Levant, with **Daniel Bekele** of Human Rights Watch; Besiktas City Council member **Sedef Cakmak**; **Sercan Çelebi** of Vote and Beyond; and **Aykan Erdemir** of the Foundation for Defense of Democracies. The Colombian experience in forging peace with the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) offered important lessons on how difficult it is to overcome years of distrust and embrace a former enemy for the good of the

whole. Helping to illuminate that process was **President Luis Alberto Moreno** of the Inter-American Development Bank; Colombian **Ambassador Juan Carlos Pinzón**; **Fernando Cortés** of Fundación Bolívar Davivienda; **Alejandro Eder**, former Director General, Colombian Agency for Reintegration; **Felipe Medina** of Transforming Philanthropy Initiative; and activist and advocate **Laura Ulloa**.

WE THEN TURNED TO THE ROLE OF THE STATE. If pluralism is essential to free and well-functioning societies, it is also the sine qua non of liberal democracy, and essential to the legitimacy — and sustainability — of the state. But when states fail to meet the needs of their citizens and collapse into violent conflict, what is the role of the international community and global civil society? Where does responsibility lie? We explored interventions along the conflict continuum — from prevention to reconciliation to reconstruction — as well as global norms that assign responsibility. We asked whether citizen trust in their government can be maintained when access to health, education, jobs and even justice is uneven. Helping us to focus on governments and the governed were by **David Miliband** of the International Rescue Committee (*later selected as the winner of the MacArthur Foundation's 100&Change grant*); **John Prendergast** of the Enough Project; **Yifat Susskind** of MADRE; **David Tolbert** of the International Center for Transitional Justice; **Rob Malley** of International Crisis Group; and **Robin Wright** of the Woodrow Wilson Center and *The New Yorker*. Taking on the case of access to justice in the US was **Adam Foss** of Prosecutor Impact, **Carroll Bogert** of The Marshall Project, and **Glenn E Martin** of JustLeadershipUSA. Equal access to justice and equal protection under the law are critical elements of our liberal democracy. Yet, in practice, in the US, a young man of color is more likely than his white counterpart to be picked up, locked up, and prosecuted for suspected criminal offenses. If he cannot gain pre-trial release, the young man remains in jail while awaiting prosecution. The jury is more likely to find him guilty, and the prosecutor is more likely to ask for a stiff sentence, which the judge is more likely to impose. Once released, that young man can be denied housing, a job, credit, and even the ability to exercise his right to vote. His family will have been impoverished by the costs associated with his trial, imprisonment and lost earning capacity. This pattern of bias — whether unconscious or not — has served to delegitimize our system of justice in the eyes of a growing number of Americans. Conservative and liberal philanthropists are collaborating to advance reforms that regain the trust of all Americans.

WE TURNED TO THE ROLE OF AN INDEPENDENT PRESS, a crucial civil society actor that holds government to account, and provides citizens access to the impartial information they need to make informed judgments, reason together, exercise their rights and responsibilities, and engage in collective action. In times of crisis, the media fulfills the vital role of alerting the public

to danger and connecting citizens to rescue efforts, as Ushahidi has done in Kenya. Or it can alert the international community to human rights abuses as does “Raqqqa is Being Slaughtered Silently.” But the very capabilities that allow the media to alert and inform, also allow it to sow division — as it did in Rwanda leading up to and during the genocide — by spreading untruths, and, through “dog whistles”, targeting ethnic groups and inciting violence against them. We were joined by **Dele Olojede** of Timbuktu Media, **Abdalaziz Alhamza** of Raqqqa is Being Slaughtered Silently, **Nataliya Gumenyuk** of Hromadske.TV, **Uzodinma Iweala** of Ventures Africa (and author of Beasts of No Nation; Producer, Waiting for Hassana); and **Malika Saada Saar** of Google. Together they considered the role of the high- and low-tech media in spreading hate or advancing reconciliation over the web and the airwaves.

Throughout we maintained a focus on the practice of philanthropy itself, and its sources of legitimacy and trust. As decision-making and authority are decentralized and new expectations of transparency and accountability take hold, the roles of all institutions and their leaders are changing, and foundations are not immune. Most — like **Antony Bugg-Levine** of the Nonprofit Finance Fund — argued that a philanthropy’s legitimacy stems first and foremost from delivering results. Rockefeller Foundation’s new president **Raj Shah** and **Julia Stasch** and **Cecilia Conrad** of the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation agreed, and added that legitimacy also requires a demonstrated commitment to transparency and knowledge-sharing, key characteristics of MacArthur’s 100&Change Initiative, and a commitment of Raj’s in his new role. **Randa Grob-Zakhary**’s experience with the global philanthropy Porticus sees the benefits of the philanthropy’s diversity and reach. The experience of **Barbara Gonzales** of the Tanzania-based Mo Dewji Foundation reveals the benefits of being close to the “customer,” one’s grantees. **Laurie Michael**’s Open Road Alliance has found that grantors’ failure to invite a candid conversation with grantees about risk can stand in the way of smart planning on both sides of the grantor-grantee relationship. The reach and distribution GPF members taking part in the discussion ranged from Porticus, to foundations in Europe, Africa, Asia, Latin America. And the most well attended working group featured leaders of foundations and donor networks in the Global South, including Felipe Medina’s Transforming Philanthropy in Colombia and GPF affiliates: the Brazil Philanthropy Forum and the African Philanthropy Forum.

But perhaps most interesting in recent developments in philanthropy has been experimentation with more open methods of sourcing great leaders with game-changing ideas, on the assumption that — in this fast-changing world — the best innovations may come from unexpected places in unanticipated ways. That is the case with the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation’s 100&Change Initiative, discussed in a fireside chat between Foundation CEO **Julia Stasch** and Managing Director **Cecilia**

Conrad. They candidly shared the experimental nature of the initiative, and the desire for a transparent process designed to benefit all applicants. Although it is a winner-take-all competition, all proposals will be offered in searchable form for grant-makers and others seeking new grantees or partners. Finally, in a welcoming display of the discoveries prize philanthropy can bring, and a vivid reminder of the interaction between the worlds of policy and civil society, was former Secretary of State **Madeleine Albright**’s conversation with social entrepreneurs who are laureates of the **John P. McNulty Prize** awarded to social entrepreneurs by the foundation of the same name. The foundation celebrates the tenth anniversary of the prize established by Anne McNulty and her children in the name of Anne’s late husband. Among those laureates who joined the conversation was **Lana Abu-Hijleh** of the Middle East Leadership Initiative, who was later selected as the 2017 winner of the \$100,000 prize.

Seized of the importance of trust, we’ve decided to build upon the subject in 2018, when our focus will be on the many ways philanthropy and civil society are building social capital: the product of reciprocal relationships of cooperation across sectors, borders and even ideologies. We look forward to seeing you then, on May 2-4 in Redwood City.



ADVISORY COUNCIL

LAURENE POWELL JOBS, CHAIR

Founder and President
Emerson Collective

FAZLE HASAN ABED

Founder and Chairperson
BRAC

FOLA ADEOLA

Co-Founder
Guaranty Trust Bank
Founder and Chairman
FATE Foundation

SYED BABAR ALI

Founder
Packages Limited

LAURA ARRILLAGA-ANDREESSEN

Founder & Board Chair
Stanford Center for Philanthropy
& Civil Society

BRIZIO BIONDI-MORRA

Board
AVINA Americas

RICHARD BLUM

Chairman and President
Blum Capital Partners, LP

LARRY BRILLIANT

Chairman
Skoll Global Threats Fund
Co-Founder
The Seva Foundation

JEAN CASE

Co-Founder and CEO
The Case Foundation

RICHARD CURTIS

Co-Founder, Vice Chairman, and Trustee
Comic Relief (UK)

HERNANDO DE SOTO

Founder and President
Institute for Liberty and Democracy

KEMAL DERVI

Vice President and Director
Global Economy and Development
Brookings Institute

WILLIAM H. DRAPER, III

Co-Chairman
Draper Richards Kaplan Foundation

BILL DRAYTON

Founder and CEO
Ashoka

PEGGY DULANY

Founder and Chair
Synergos Institute

PETER GABRIEL

Co-Founder
WITNESS
Co-Founder
The Elders

ROBERT GALLUCCI

Distinguished Professor
Georgetown University
Director
Library's John W. Kluge Center

WILLIAM H. GATES, SR.

Co-Chair
Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation

JULIETTE GIMON

Philanthropist

VARTAN GREGORIAN

President
Carnegie Corporation of New York

STEPHEN HEINTZ

President
Rockefeller Brothers Fund

ESTHER HEWLETT

Founder
Youth Philanthropy Worldwide

STEVEN M. HILTON

Chairman
Conrad N. Hilton Foundation

TERESA HEINZ KERRY

Chair Emeritus
The Heinz Endowments

ANGÉLIQUE KIDJO

Goodwill Ambassador
UNICEF
Founder
The Batonga Foundation

LATA KRISHNAN

Chair
America India Foundation
Chief Financial Officer
Shah Capital Partners

CAROL LARSON

President and CEO
The David & Lucile Packard Foundation

ANNIE LENNOX

Founder
The SING Campaign

TSITSI MASIYIWA

Co-Founder
Higherlife Foundation

GRAÇA MACHEL

Founder
Graça Machel Trust

JOHN P. MORGRIDGE

Chairman Emeritus
Cisco Systems, Inc.
Co-Founder
Tosa Foundation

ALI MUFURUKI

Chairman and CEO
Infotech Investment Group, Ltd.

CATHERINE MUTHER

Founder and President
Three Guineas Fund

PAMELA OMIDYAR

Founder and Board Chair
Humanity United

SALLY OSBERG

President and CEO
Skoll Foundation

SUSAN PACKARD ORR

Trustee
The David & Lucile Packard Foundation

ALAN PATRICOF

Founder and Managing Director
Greycroft, LLC

JAN PIERCY

Senior Advisor
Enclude

JUDITH RODIN

Philanthropist

EDWARD SCOTT

Co-founder
BEA Systems, Inc.
Co-founder and Chairman Emeritus
Center for Global Development

ADELE SIMMONS

President
Global Philanthropy Partnership

JEFFREY S. SKOLL

Founder and Chair
Skoll Foundation & Skoll Global
Threats Fund

CHRIS STONE

President
Open Society Foundations

B. STEPHEN TOBEN

President
Flora Family Foundation

ARCHBISHOP DESMOND TUTU

Co-Founder
Desmond & Leah Tutu Legacy
Foundation

JANE WALES

President and CEO
World Affairs &
Global Philanthropy Forum
Vice President
Aspen Institute

WILLIAM S. WHITE

Chairman and CEO
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation

TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

Vice Chair
United Nations Foundation and
Better World Fund

TAE YOO

*Senior Vice President of
Corporate Affairs*
Cisco Systems, Inc.

MUHAMMAD YUNUS

Founder
Grameen Bank, Bangladesh
Chair
The Yunus Centre

STEERING GROUP

JENNIFER BUFFETT

PETER BUFFETT

ANNE MARIE BURGOYNE

ED CAIN

VALERIE DABADY

NICK DEYCHAKIWSKY

WILLIAM H. DRAPER III

ROBERT FORRESTER

BERNARDO GUILLAMON

JACQUELINE STRASSER HIGGINS

TRISTA KONTZ-BARTELS

PENELOPE LEWIS

MICHAEL MADNICK

ANNIE MAXWELL

FELIPE MEDINA

CHRISTINE MORSE

RANDY NEWCOMB

SALLY OSBERG

JAN PIERCY

REETA ROY

MAGGIE MITCHELL SALEM

GINGER SALL

CHARLES SLAUGHTER

JEFF UBOIS

CATHERINE ZENNSTRÖM

2017 CONFERENCE **AGENDA****TUESDAY APRIL 18****7:30 AM BREAKFAST****9:00 AM SPEED NETWORKING**

CULPEPER, LATROBE, ROOSEVELT

Jumpstart the Conference Tuesday morning with “speed introductions.”

9:45 AM BREAK**10:05 AM MUSICAL OPENING: ARLINGTON CHILDREN’S CHORUS**

Arlington Children’s Chorus is a group of talented young singers from Arlington and elsewhere in the Washington, DC Metropolitan area. The Chorus fosters high-quality musical experiences as an essential element of a comprehensive education, while supporting local causes through free performances and community service. It also incorporates lessons in math, foreign language and literature, and develops skills in discipline, poise and teamwork. Following its debut performance in Benjamin Britten’s “A Midsummer Night’s Dream” with Wolf Trap Opera Company, the Chorus has appeared at numerous local venues, including the White House and the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, where choristers have performed with the American Ballet Theater, Ballet West, Joffrey Ballet and Washington Ballet. ACC choristers have also performed for a variety of private organizations, including Mothers Against Drunk Driving, the Washington Redskins Charitable Foundation and church-affiliated fundraisers for Wounded Warriors and Save the Children. Founding Artistic Director Kevin Carr is an accomplished music educator in the Arlington Public Schools. He has directed choruses for many years and his elementary chorus has been featured on WTOP radio, News Channel 8, Fox 5 News and in the Reuters International video, “Music and the Brain.” They are currently looking to expand learning and performance opportunities for choristers by actively pursuing state, regional, national and international engagements, along with donor support for these endeavors. Learn more at www.ArlingtonChildrensChorus.org.

10:15 AM WELCOME, OPENING REMARKS

GRAND BALLROOM

JANE WALES Founder, Global Philanthropy Forum @janewales**10:20 AM****KEYNOTE CONVERSATION:****JIM YONG KIM, PRESIDENT, WORLD BANK GROUP**

GRAND BALLROOM

JIM YONG KIM President, World Bank Group @JimYongKim**IN CONVERSATION WITH JANE WALES** Founder, Global Philanthropy Forum @janewales

11:05 AM WHO IS US? WHO DECIDES? PLURALISM, PROBLEM-SOLVING AND CITIZEN POWER
GRAND BALLROOM

What does it mean to be an American, a German, a South African? In many societies, the pressures of economic dislocation and mass migration are seen as threatening to upend the demographic, social and economic order, complicating the question “Who is us?” In liberal democracies with a history of cultural diversity, the answer, in theory, is clear: we are united by shared values, an open society that embraces cultural liberalism, democratic capitalism and equality under the law. What might shake that conviction? James Goldston will speak to the conditions under which a commitment to liberalism and pluralism might wane and give way to nationalist populism, even ethnocentrism, opening the door for political opportunists to question the very legitimacy of our political institutions and appealing to our darker side. And Eric Liu will speak to the role that citizen power can and must play. In liberal democracies individuals have rights and the citizenry holds and shares power. James will describe how civil society helps to protect and preserve the former; Eric will speak to our responsibility to exercise the latter.

LIGHTNING ROUNDS:

JAMES GOLDSTON Executive Director, Open Society Justice Initiative
@JamesAGoldston

ERIC LIU Founder and CEO, Citizen University @ericpliu

IN CONVERSATION WITH JANE WALES

11:50 AM LUNCH
GRAND BALLROOM

1:00 PM KEYNOTE CONVERSATION: BIG BIRD
GRAND BALLROOM

Join Big Bird and Sherrie Rollins Westin, Executive Vice President of Global Impact and Philanthropy for Sesame Workshop, for a conversation about how Sesame Street’s educational programming helps children grow up happy, healthy and in harmony with the world around them. The lessons of Big Bird and his friends are tailored to the unique needs of children, their country and culture, reaching millions of children in more than 150 countries.

BIG BIRD

IN CONVERSATION WITH SHERRIE ROLLINS Westin Executive Vice President for Global Impact and Philanthropy, Sesame Workshop
@srwestin

1:10 PM BUILDING THE CAPACITY FOR TRUST: THE CHILD
GRAND BALLROOM

The first five years of a child’s life are a period of intense creativity, invention and growth. During this period, children rely on those around them to provide for their physical, cognitive and socio-emotional development needs to ensure their capacity to trust and become resilient

adults. Distressingly, nearly 200 million children globally may not reach their developmental potential due to the effects of unhealthy environment and paucity of educational opportunities. Many of these children also live in stressful circumstances—caused by poverty, abandonment or violent conflict—and so face additional challenges in learning to trust. This session will investigate the factors impacting early childhood development and learn which interventions can prevent, mitigate or address the potentially lasting effects of toxic stress. If—as Nelson Mandela said—“there is no keener revelation of society’s soul than the way it treats its children,” then surely the legitimacy of a state rests at least in part on whether it meets its obligations to the young.

PANEL DISCUSSION:

RANDA GROB-ZAKHARY Global Head of Education, Porticus
@RandaGrob

CAROLYN MILES President and CEO, Save the Children @carolynsave

DEOGRATIAS NIYONKIZA Founder and CEO, Village Health Works @VHW

MODERATOR PETER LAUGHARN President and CEO, Conrad N. Hilton Foundation @peter_laugharn

2:15 PM SPECIAL ADDRESS: LUIS ALBERTO MORENO, PRESIDENT, INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK
GRAND BALLROOM

2:35 PM BREAK

3:00 PM WORKING GROUPS

TRACK 1: TRUST AND THE CHILD A HEALTHY START: THE FIRST THOUSAND DAYS
KENNEDY

The first thousand days, from conception to age two, are critical to a child’s development. Scientific evidence shows that during this time the foundations for lifelong health are set. Furthermore, the impact of poor health and nutrition in early life has intergenerational consequences, including the widening of social and economic inequality. This working group will focus on maternal and child health to ensure that both mother and child are equipped with the necessary foundations for health at the beginning of life.

LIANA GHENT Executive Director, International Step by Step Association
@lianaghent

RAJESH PANJABI Co-Founder and CEO, Last Mile Health @rajpanjabi

LAURA STACHEL Co-Founder and Executive Director, We Care Solar
@lestachel

MODERATOR JOAN LOMBARDI Senior Advisor, Bernard Van Leer Foundation @joan_lombardi

TRACK 2: TRUST AND THE “OTHER” COUNTERING IDENTITY POLITICS, NURTURING PLURALISM IN AFRICA

ROOSEVELT

The African continent has not been immune from the stresses associated with change. South Africa, so long the world's model for national reconciliation, has been buffeted by some of the same trends and seen the rise of xenophobic violence and the mistreatment of migrants, refugees and asylum seekers. In Rwanda, where Paul Kagame led the country from genocide to peace, healing divides, restrictions on freedom of speech and political space remain, impeding the emergence of a robust civil society. These are reminders that transitions are fragile, tenuous and lengthy. Progress toward pluralism, no matter how remarkable, rarely follows a straight line. Far graver conditions persist in localities like Sudan, Somalia and Uganda, where less legitimate leaders and abusive security agencies operate with impunity. This working group will focus on the efforts of local and global civil society actors who are working to protect individual rights and rebuild community in societies under stress.

DANIEL BEKELE Senior Director for Africa Advocacy, Human Rights Watch @DanielBekele

ANDREW HUDSON Executive Director, Crisis Action @andrewhudsonau

DAVID TOLBERT President, International Center For Transitional Justice @dtolbert_david

MODERATOR DELE OLOJEDE Founder, Timbuktu Media @DeleOlojede

TRACK 2: TRUST AND THE “OTHER” TURKEY UNDER STRESS: POLITICAL PLURALISM AND IDENTITY POLITICS IN THE POST-SYKES-PICOT WORLD

LATROBE

While Turkey's ruling Justice and Development Party had sought to present itself as a champion of a more pluralistic, democratic and modern society, President Recep Tayyip Erdogan's response to last summer's abortive coup belied that claim. The Turkish government has shrunk the civic space, cracking down on the media, political opposition groups and other dissenting voices. The extension of Turkey's state of emergency has given President Erdogan expanded powers to enact laws that suspend citizens' rights. At the same time, the conflict between Turkish security forces and the armed Kurdistan Workers Party has led to human rights violations. And 2.2 million Syrian refugees create their own pressures as Turkey seeks to restrict their numbers. What role can global and Turkish civil society play in this increasingly restrictive environment? Are there opportunities for philanthropy to make a difference?

SEDEF CAKMAK City Council Member of Besiktas Municipality, Turkey @sedef_cakmak

SERCAN ÇELEBI Founder, Vote and Beyond @SercanCelebi83

AYKAN ERDEMİR Senior Fellow, Foundation for Defense of Democracies @followFDD

MODERATOR EDMUND CAIN Vice President, Grant Programs, Conrad N. Hilton Foundation @EJC45

TRACK 4: TRUST, PHILANTHROPY AND CIVIL SOCIETY WHAT WORKS: LESSONS FROM PHILANTHROPIES OF THE GLOBAL SOUTH

CULPEPER

As private wealth is created in high-growth economies in the Global South, a growing number of HNWI are choosing to put their private resources to the service of the public good. Family and corporate foundations are being formed, partnerships forged and initiatives launched in Asia, Latin America and Africa, where the Global Philanthropy Forum's fastest-growing affiliates have formed. Like GPF members in North America and Europe, these philanthropists form networks to learn from each other and offer insights into the communities and societies they know well. This working group offers an opportunity to learn directly from them; to hear about new research on trends in philanthropy in China, Brazil, sub-Saharan Africa and the Gulf States; and to understand why we at GPF share the conviction that the next wave of philanthropic innovation will come from the Global South.

JERI ECKHART QUEENAN Head, Global Development, The Bridgespan Group @BridgespanGroup

PAULA FABIANI CEO, Instituto para o Desenvolvimento do Investimento Social (IDIS) @PaulaFabiani

BARBARA GONZALEZ CEO, Mo Dewji Foundation @DewjiFoundation

MOSUN LAYODE Director, African Philanthropy Forum @MosunLayode

FELIPE MEDINA Chairman, Transforming Philanthropy Initiative @GIVETOCOLOMBIA

MODERATOR SIMI NWOGUGU Executive Director, Junior Achievement Nigeria @JANigeria

4:30 PM

BREAK AND NETWORKING

6:00 PM

**RECEPTION: SPONSORED BY CHARITIES AID FOUNDATION
AND CAF AMERICA
COLONNADE**

7:00 PM

MUSICAL INTERLUDE: BUTTERSCOTCH

Butterscotch, the retro-futuristic, voice percussionist virtuosa, is a force to be reckoned with in today's music scene. Being the world's first female beatboxing champion, and a finalist on America's Got Talent, she has created a unique style. While she beatboxes, she sings and plays either guitar or piano, performing her own compositions and jazz standards. Butterscotch has shared stages with Sergio Mendes, Wyclef Jean, Earth, Wind & Fire and other musical legends. Her new CD, "The Scotch Tapes Vol. 1-3" is available at www.ButterscotchMusic.com.

7:15 PM

**DINNER
GRAND BALLROOM**

8:00 PM MUSICAL INTERLUDE: BUTTERSCOTCH**8:15 PM CITIZEN POWER, WAGING PEACE****GRAND BALLROOM**

As we explore how trust is restored in fragmented societies, we will delve deeper into the role that individual citizen leaders play in preventing or ending violent conflict, and rebuilding societal trust in the process. While ceasefires can be negotiated by governments, peace-building is rarely imposed from above. Instead, courageous and capable citizen leaders exercise their power and leverage their own authority to advance a sustainable peace. Our moderator will facilitate a conversation among several such extraordinary leaders.

NICOLA BENYAHIA Founder and Counselor, Families for Life
@Families_Life

ALAA MURABIT SDG Global Advocate and High-Level Commissioner, The United Nations @almmura

SANAM NARAGHI-ANDERLINI Co-Founder and Executive Director, International Civil Society Action Network (ICAN) @sanambna

7:30 AM**LESSONS FROM THE FRONT LINES — HOW TRUE IMPACT IS REALIZED****KENNEDY**

Hear first-hand from the Draper Richards Kaplan Foundation team and their social entrepreneurs how to create real impact across the globe. Join an intimate conversation with DRK's most impactful social entrepreneurs who are addressing some of society's most complex issues from immigration to human rights around the globe. Facilitated by Jim Bildner, CEO, Draper Richards Kaplan Foundation.

NATALIE BRIDGEMAN Fields Founder & Executive Director, Accountability Counsel @nataliebfields — Defending the environmental and human rights of communities around the world that have been harmed by internationally financed development projects

LINDSAY STRADLEY Co-Founder, Sanergy @LindsayStradley — Building sustainable sanitation in urban slums in Africa

CHARLES SENNOTT Founder & Executive Director, The GroundTruth Project @CMSennott — Embedding journalists in conflict zones

DAVID LUBELL Founder & Executive Director, Welcoming America @dmlubell — Building a national network of governmental and non-governmental organizations working to build local support for immigrants and advance inclusion and prosperity

SHERRY LACHMAN Founder & Executive Director, Foster America @foster_america — Improving the lives of America's most vulnerable children by building a pipeline of leaders and innovators who will help transform the child welfare system

WEDNESDAY APRIL 19**7:30 AM RISK IN PHILANTHROPY: PRACTICAL STRATEGIES TO KEEP IMPACT ON TRACK!****ROOSEVELT**

In this working session, we will be discussing best practices to consider in managing risks that affect results. Going beyond traditional 'compliance,' this session will look at "risks to impact" and how Foundations can implement risk management strategies across their departments to both insure and ensure that they and their grantees actually achieve the impact they seek.

Join Ellen Taus, CFO of The Rockefeller Foundation, Tomer Inbar of Patterson Belknap Webb & Tyler LLP, and Laurie Michaels, Founder of Open Road Alliance, for a practical discussion of risk, impact and what we can do about it. Topics covered will include contingency budgeting, addressing risk with your Board and how to incorporate risk assessments into the application process.

TOMER INBAR Partner, Patterson Belknap Webb & Tyler LLP @tomerinbar

LAURIE MICHAELS Founder, Open Road Alliance @OpenRoadTweets

ELLEN TAUS Treasurer and CFO, The Rockefeller Foundation
@RockefellerFdn

MODERATOR MAYA WINKELSTEIN Executive Director, Open Road Alliance @OpenRoadTweets

8:30 AM**BREAK**

9:00 AM WORKING GROUPS**TRACK 1: TRUST AND THE CHILD
TEACHING TRUST: THE IMPORTANCE OF EARLY
CHILDHOOD EDUCATION****KENNEDY**

A child's earliest years form the best window for a bright future. Early childhood education has social, health and economic benefits that reduce risks of school dropouts, incarceration and unemployment. Once the foundations for learning are laid, a person's capacity to absorb and apply new information, to adapt to differing circumstances and to develop new skills is made possible. Only then can the child prepare for the world, and the economy, that await. Moreover, primary schools continue to provide a place of safety and the environment for psycho-social development. In emergent and fragile contexts, educational programs can build resilience in children and families and create an entry point for peace-building in communities.

ASHISH KARAMCHANDANI Managing Director, FSG @AsKaramchandani**MANIZA NTEKIM** Senior Program Officer, Open Society Foundations Early Childhood Program @OpenSociety**LESLEE UDWIN** Founder and CEO, Think Equal @lesleeudwin**MODERATOR ROSS WIENER** Vice President and Executive Director, Education & Society Programs, Aspen Institute @AspenInstitute**TRACK 2: TRUST AND THE "OTHER"
NURTURING PLURALISM, COUNTERING IDENTITY POLITICS
IN THE US, EUROPE AND FORMER SOVIET UNION****ROOSEVELT**

Despite its long tradition of pluralism, American politics have now revealed underlying divisions and resentments along ethnic, racial, educational and economic lines. Similarly, nationalist and populist movements have grown in Europe, exacerbated by the pressures of inward migration; a pattern of division and suspicion is mirrored in France, Germany and the Netherlands. Long considered the originators and protectors of pluralism and liberal democracy, the West is now splitting along ideological lines, while political aspirants pledge to close the borders to "outsiders." More menacingly, Russia is again asserting its influence over the former Soviet territories, silencing dissent and closing the civic space. How can we, as citizens of liberal democracies, preserve democratic principles, and the embrace of pluralism those principles imply? What is the unique role of civil society, including an independent media?

ABDALAZIZ ALHAMZA Co-Founder, Raqqa is Being Slaughtered Silently @3z0ooz**JOE GOLDMAN** President, Democracy Fund @joegoldman**NATALIYA GUMENYUK** Head, Hromadske TV @ngumenyuk**MODERATOR RACHEL DENBER** Deputy Director, Europe and Central Asia Division, Human Rights Watch @Rachel_Denber**TRACK 3: TRUST AND GOVERNANCE
TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY: SHINING THE
SPOTLIGHT ON CORRUPTION****CULPEPER**

Transparency and accountability are hallmarks of liberal democracy. They are the sources of a government's legitimacy, and, as a consequence, its efficacy. The trust that results allows for a social compact to exist between the citizens and the state. This working group will focus on the challenges posed by official corruption and the role of citizens and citizen groups in ferreting out such misconduct and holding their governments to account. Participants will describe the ways in which civil society organizations and leaders are shining a light on the actions of government officials, assuring that all citizens are served and building a healthy relationship between the government and the governed.

SHELDON HIMELFARB CEO and President, PeaceTech Lab @shimelfarb

Vivek Maru Founder and CEO, Namati @VivekHMaru

SANJAY PRADHAN CEO, Open Government Partnership @SPradhanOGP**MARK HAYS** Anti-Money Laundering Campaign Leader, Global Witness @Global_Witness**MODERATOR TINA ROSENBERG** Co-Founder, Solutions Journalism Network @tirosenberg**TRACK 4: TRUST, PHILANTHROPY AND CIVIL SOCIETY
GETTING STUFF DONE: MAKING BIG BETS ON A SINGLE
GRANTEE VS BUILDING A FIELD****LATROBE**

Philanthropists have the rare ability to place "big bets" when it comes to investing in solutions to intractable problems, providing the space for creativity and innovation. At the same time, when working to restore social trust and societal cohesion, an equally important philanthropic strategy is to use smaller grants to seed or build a field, supporting a widely distributed group of community organizations and civil society groups working in the same locality or on the same issue. Finally, some philanthropists choose to be cause-agnostic and instead encourage an entrepreneurial mindset, and a disruptive approach, by funding great leaders with smart ideas and the drive to see them through. In this working group, individual donors, foundation officers and other experts will consider which approach to take, and under what circumstances, to yield the best results.

CECILIA CONRAD Managing Director, The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation @bvrbvra**MOLLY KINDER** Professor of Practice and Director, Georgetown University's Beeck Center for Social Impact and Innovation @MollyKinder**RACHEL KORBERG** Associate Director, Rockefeller Foundation @RKorberg**MODERATOR NICHOLAS TEDESCO** Senior Philanthropic Advisor, The Philanthropy Centre at J.P. Morgan @TedescoNicholas**10:30 AM****BREAK**

10:45 AM **SPECIAL ADDRESS: AMBASSADOR JUAN CARLOS PINZÓN, AMBASSADOR OF COLOMBIA TO THE UNITED STATES**
GRAND BALLROOM

11:05 AM **MUSICAL INTERLUDE: NOMAD DANCERS**
Nomad Dancers is a collective inspired by dance traditions of Iran, Uzbekistan, Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, Tajikistan, India and Turkey, traveling across borders and bridging cultures in search of the ultimate dance experience. Nomad Dancers promote peace and understanding among all peoples through sharing art and culture.

Presenting Persian, Uzbek, Uighur, Gypsy and Middle Eastern traditional folkloric dances, as well as Bollywood and Fusion choreographies at cultural events, celebrations and festivals in the Washington DC metropolitan area.

11:15 AM **TRUST, JUSTICE AND THE CONFLICT CONTINUUM**
GRAND BALLROOM
If pluralism is essential to free and functioning societies, it is also the sine qua non of liberal democracy, and essential to the legitimacy—and sustainability—of the state. But when states fail to meet the needs of their citizens and collapse into violent conflict, what is the role of the international community and global civil society? Where does responsibility lie? We will explore interventions along the conflict continuum as well as global norms that assign responsibility. Will citizens trust their government, if access to health, education, jobs and even justice is uneven? And when governance fails, how can human security be assured? This conversation will focus on governments and the governed, with particular attention to access to justice and examples of conflict prevention, conflict resolution and post-conflict reconciliation. Throughout, the role of race, gender, religious affiliation and ethnicity will be explored.

PANEL DISCUSSION:

DAVID MILIBAND President and CEO, International Rescue Committee
@DMiliband

JOHN PRENDERGAST Founding Director, Enough Project @EnoughProject

YIFAT SUSSKIND Executive Director, MADRE @MADREspeaks

DAVID TOLBERT President, International Center for Transitional Justice
@dtolbert_david

ROBIN WRIGHT Joint Fellow, the US Institute of Peace and Woodrow Wilson Center @wrightr

MODERATOR ROBERT MALLEY Incoming Vice President for Policy, International Crisis Group @CrisisGroup

12:30 PM **LUNCH**
GRAND BALLROOM

1:30 PM **SPECIAL ADDRESS: RAJIV SHAH, PRESIDENT, ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION**
GRAND BALLROOM

1:50 PM **MUSICAL INTERLUDE: NATY HERNANDEZ**
Naty Hernandez, or simply Naty, is a singer-songwriter, guitarist, acoustic and electric bassist and a native of Medellín, Colombia. Her music is a sonic journey that merges the rhythms from the Andean mountains in Colombia with jazz, pop and world music sounds. While her music is deeply rooted in Colombian rhythms such as bambuco, guabina and pasillo, Naty's music approach brings her to lead a new generation of Colombian women composers as her music continues to revitalize the traditional repertoire.

She has shared stage with such artists as Marta Gómez and María Isabel Saavedra, and has toured different cities throughout Colombia, Mexico, Panama, Peru and the United States. Naty is currently one of the youngest members of the Colombian Andean Music Songwriters Corporation "CANTANDINA" with whom she has made numerous workshops and concerts. Her song "Manos de Agua" has received widespread praise and remained in the Top 20 of "Radio Nacional Colombia" for more than 8 weeks.

Naty is currently finalizing her new album, due in the Spring-Summer 2017. She is a full-tuition recipient from Berklee College of Music in Boston, finishing a dual major in Songwriting and Contemporary Writing & Production. She also holds a degree in Guitar Performance from EAFIT University in Colombia.

1:55 PM

PHILANTHROPY, LEGITIMACY AND VOICE: HERE AND ABROAD**GRAND BALLROOM**

As decision-making and authority are decentralized and new expectations of transparency and accountability take hold, the roles of institutions and their leaders are changing. What are the implications for philanthropy? What is the source of a foundation's legitimacy, and how might it preserve its capacity to confer legitimacy on its grantees? Some argue that philanthropies build trust through modeling a values-based approach and commitment to knowledge-sharing. Others argue that trust flows from philanthropies' capacity to "get stuff done." And, finally, some note that by demonstrating collaborative problem-solving across sectors, disciplines and even ideologies, philanthropy can take it a step further. It can help to restore trust in our unique form of self-governance in which the public, private and citizen sectors each have a role to play. In living their values and striving for results, philanthropies have pursued multiple models—ranging from big bets to small grants widely distributed. But perhaps most interesting, some have experimented with new, more open methods of sourcing great leaders with game-changing ideas, on the assumption that—in this fast-changing world—the best innovations may come from unexpected places in unanticipated ways.

PARTNERING ACROSS SECTORS:

HRH PRINCESS LAMIA AL SAUD Secretary General, Alwaleed Philanthropies @alwaleed_philan

EXERCISING VOICE; PUTTING FAMILIES AND CHILDREN FIRST:

PATRICK MCCARTHY President and CEO, The Annie E. Casey Foundation @AECFNews

SOURCING GREAT LEADERS; CASTING A WIDE NET:

JULIA STASCH President, The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation @macfound

IN CONVERSATION WITH CECILIA CONRAD Managing Director, The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation @bvrbvra

THE PRACTICE OF RESILIENCE: LESSONS FROM THE FIELD:

ZIA KHAN Vice President, Initiatives and Strategy, The Rockefeller Foundation @ZiaKhanNYC

3:10 PM

BREAK

3:30 PM

WORKING GROUPS**TRACK 1: TRUST AND THE CHILD
REBUILDING TRUST: MANAGING THE EFFECTS OF TOXIC STRESS****ROOSEVELT**

Children in traumatic and adverse environments, who have endured violent conflict, are displaced from their homes, or who live in poverty, are the most vulnerable to the effects of toxic stress, which can increase the risk of cognitive and physical impairment into adult years. These children are frequently exposed to factors such as (but not limited to) resource scarcity, migration, parental absence, social isolation weakening their capacity to trust, and to thrive.

NADINE BURKE HARRIS Founder and CEO, Center for Youth Wellness @DrBurkeHarris

PATRICK MCCARTHY President and CEO, The Annie E. Casey Foundation @AECFNews

KAREN SPENCER Founder and Chairman, Whole Child International @kspencer1508

SHERRIE ROLLINS Westin Executive Vice President for Global Impact and Philanthropy, Sesame Workshop @srwestin

MODERATOR RANDA GROB-ZAKHARY Global Head of Education, Porticus @RandaGrob

**TRACK 2: TRUST AND THE "OTHER"
ISLAMOPHOBIA: TURNING OUR BACKS ON REFUGEES
KENNEDY**

According to the United Nations Refugee Agency, there are now more than 21 million refugees among the 65 million migrants in the world, many of whom are from Muslim-majority countries, including Syria, Libya, Iraq and Afghanistan. President Trump's executive order temporarily suspending the admission of migrants from six Muslim-majority countries, and placing an indefinite hold on acceptance of Syrian refugees, reflects growing public fears of Muslims, especially those who are foreign-born. This working group will examine how philanthropy and civil society can help address Islamophobia and, in particular, reopen our hearts and our borders to refugees escaping violent conflict, persecution or natural disaster.

NIHAD AWAD National Executive Director, Council on American-Islamic Relations @NihadAwad

SHADI HAMID Senior Fellow, Brookings Institution @shadihamid

MAHA HILAL Content Manager, Islamic Scholarship Fund @mahmoooha2013

JACINTA MA Director of Policy and Advocacy, National Immigration Forum @mallMa1

TRACK 3: TRUST AND GOVERNANCE
MAKING PEACE; HEALING DIVIDES: THE CASE OF COLOMBIA
CULPEPER

The Colombian experience in forging peace with the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC)—first rejected, then accepted by the public—offers important lessons on how difficult it is to overcome years of distrust and embrace a former enemy for the good of the whole. Now that former FARC guerrillas are demobilizing and returning home, how can they be reintegrated into Colombian society and reconciliation be achieved? Can Colombians achieve both justice and peace? This working group will draw on the experiences of former Colombian government officials, philanthropic leaders and citizen activists and will focus on the role of social organizations in reuniting Colombian society, drawing lessons for citizens seeking to sustain peace in other localities.

FERNANDO CORTES Executive Director, Fundación Bolívar Davivienda @FundacionBD

ALEJANDRO EDER Executive Director, FDI Pacífico @alejoeder

LAURA ULLOA Advocate and Activist

MODERATOR FELIPE MEDINA Chairman, Transforming Philanthropy Initiative @GIVETOCOLOMBIA

TRACK 4: TRUST, PHILANTHROPY AND CIVIL SOCIETY
THE OUTLOOK ON OUTCOMES: REORIENTING THE DONOR/
GRANTEE RELATIONSHIP AROUND RESULTS

LATROBE

Donors and grantees aspire to achieve long-term and sustained positive impact for the clients and communities they serve. But that's not how most funding is set up. Instead, the system is oriented around funding activities and outputs, rather than the results donors and grantees ultimately seek. Reorienting the system around outcomes and results can radically improve how effectively social challenges are addressed, but requires a new social contract between donors and grantees. In this session, meet two nonprofit leaders who have transformed their organizations to focus around outcomes. They will share practical insights about how this approach has enabled them to build new levels of trust with their donors and to establish the capabilities, culture and systems required from all sides to pull off this approach. This session will also preview a national knowledge campaign on outcomes orientation that Nonprofit Finance Fund and the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco will launch this summer.

MOLLY BALDWIN Founder and CEO, Roca @Rocalnc

MARIANA COSTA CHECA Co-Founder and CEO, Laboratoria @mcostach

SAM SCHAEFFER Executive Director and CEO, Center for Employment Opportunities @samjschaeffer

MODERATOR ANTONY BUGG-LEVINE CEO, Nonprofit Finance Fund @ABLImpact

5:00 PM BREAK

6:00 PM RECEPTION HOSTED BY THE McNULTY FOUNDATION
in celebration of the McNulty Prize 10th anniversary
FOYER

The McNulty Foundation seeks to inspire, develop and drive leaders to solve the most critical challenges of our time.

The McNulty Prize celebrates the boldness and impact of individuals using their exceptional leadership abilities, entrepreneurial spirit and private sector talents to address the world's toughest challenges.

The Prize is awarded annually in partnership with the Aspen Institute. The winner receives \$100,000 and is selected by a jury that includes Secretary Madeleine Albright, Darren Walker, Brizio Biondi-Morra and Olara Otunnu. Each Laureate receives \$10,000.

7:00 PM DINNER HOSTED BY THE McNULTY FOUNDATION
GRAND BALLROOM

8:15 PM ADVANCING TRUST: SECRETARY MADELEINE ALBRIGHT IN CONVERSATION WITH McNULTY PRIZE LAUREATES
GRAND BALLROOM

What happens when successful professionals step up to tackle the world's most intractable challenges? Former Secretary of State and McNulty Prize Jury Chair Madeleine K. Albright will join Jane Wales in leading a conversation with McNulty Prize laureates who are bringing their entrepreneurial skills, spirit and resources to bear on the critical challenges of our time. Hear their stories of struggle, determination and success, and dialogue on what it takes to build trust in communities around the globe.

WELCOME REMARKS:

ANNE WELSH McNulty, President, McNulty Foundation

PANEL DISCUSSION:

LANA ABU-HIJLEH Country Director, Global Communities Palestine

JORDAN KASSALOW Founder, VisionSpring

DELE OLOJEDE Founder, Timbuktu Media

MODERATOR MADELEINE ALBRIGHT Former United States Secretary of State, and Chair, Albright Stonebridge Group

MODERATOR JANE WALES Founder, Global Philanthropy Forum

THURSDAY APRIL 20

7:30 AM BREAKFAST BUFFET & TABLE TALKS
GRAND BALLROOM
 A conference attendee leads each conversation, facilitates networking and encourages targeted knowledge-sharing.

7:30 AM “IS IT NUTS TO GIVE MONEY TO THE POOR?” BEYOND THE HEADLINES
ROOSEVELT
 Join an open conversation with GiveDirectly co-founder, Michael Faye and Field Director, Caroline Teti on the evolution of cash transfers in emerging markets and the lives of the more than 1B who now receive them. We'll also go behind the scenes of GiveDirectly's landmark universal basic income project—soon to reach over 25,000 individuals across 200 villages—sharing operational and research insights from one of the largest social experiments ever undertaken. Facilitated by Vox journalist Dylan Matthews, who has written extensively on effective altruism and universal basic income.

MICHAEL FAYE Co-Founder, GiveDirectly @MichaelLFaye

CAROLINE TETI Field Director, GiveDirectly @Give_Directly

FACILITATOR DYLAN MATTHEWS Journalist, Vox @dylanmatt

8:30 AM BREAK

9:00 AM RACE, JUSTICE AND LEGITIMACY IN AMERICA
GRAND BALLROOM
 Equal access to justice and equal protection under the law are critical elements of our liberal democracy. Yet, in practice, in the US young men of color are more likely than their white counterparts to be picked up for, locked up for, and prosecuted for suspected criminal offenses. If they cannot gain pre-trial release, these young men remain in jail while awaiting prosecution. The jury is more likely to find these men guilty, and the prosecutor is more likely to ask for a stiff sentence, which the judge is more likely to impose. Once incarcerated, these young men may not be protected from mental and physical harm. Once released, they can be denied housing, jobs, credit and even the ability to vote. Their families will have been impoverished by the costs associated with trials, imprisonment and lost earning capacity. This pattern of bias—whether unconscious or not—has served to delegitimize our system of justice in the eyes of a growing number of Americans. Can philanthropy and civil society advance the reforms needed for our justice system to regain the trust of all Americans? Can we realize the vital goal of equal justice for all?

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS:

ADAM FOSS President, Prosecutor Impact @adamjohnfoss

PANEL DISCUSSION:

CARROLL BOGERT President, The Marshall Project @carrollbogert

GLENN E. MARTIN Founder and President, JustLeadershipUSA @glennEmartin

MODERATOR ADAM FOSS President, Prosecutor Impact @adamjohnfoss

10:15 AM BREAK

10:40 AM TRUST, IDENTITY POLITICS AND THE MEDIA
GRAND BALLROOM
 Essential to a free and functioning democracy is an independent press, a crucial civil society actor that holds government to account, and provides citizens access to the impartial information they need to make informed judgements, reason together, exercise their rights and responsibilities, and engage in collective action. In times of crisis, the media fulfills the vital role of alerting the public to danger and connecting citizens to rescue efforts, as Ushahidi has done in Kenya. Or it can alert the international community to human rights abuses as does “Raqqqa is Being Slaughtered Silently.” But the very capabilities that allow the media to alert and inform, also allow it to sow division—as it did in Rwanda leading up to and during the genocide—by spreading untruths, and, through “dog whistles,” targeting ethnic groups and inciting violence against them, whether in Rwanda or rural California. This panel will focus on examples of innovators who are using the media for good, whether it be to provide a platform for innovation, to call out abuse or to deepen understanding of the conditions that fuel deadly conflict.

ABDALAZIZ ALHAMZA Co-Founder, Raqqqa is Being Slaughtered Silently @3z0ooz

BEN RATTRAY Founder and CEO, Change.org @brattray

MALIKA SAADA SAAR Senior Counsel on Civil and Human Rights, Google @MalikaSaadaSaar

MODERATOR UZODINMA IWEALA CEO and Editor-in-Chief, Ventures Africa; Author, *Beasts of No Nation* @VenturesAfrica

11:55 AM KEYNOTE CONVERSATION: PARTNERING ACROSS SECTORS
GRAND BALLROOM

RH PRINCESS LAMIA AL SAUD Secretary General, Alwaleed Philanthropies @alwaleed_philan

ANTHONY LAKE Executive Director, UNICEF

INTRODUCTION PETER ROBERTSON Chairman, Board of Trustees, World Affairs @worldaffairs

12:20 PM MUSICAL CLOSING

12:30 PM CONFERENCE ADJOURNS AND LUNCH

SPEAKER BIOGRAPHIES



LANA ABU-HIJLEH

COUNTRY DIRECTOR, GLOBAL COMMUNITIES PALESTINE @G_Communities

Since 2003, Lana Abu-Hijleh has been the country director of Global Communities Palestine, a nonprofit international development organization. She leads a team of 200 Palestinian and international professionals in designing and implementing assistance programs that focus on economic revitalization, community and social infrastructure, democracy and governance, job creation and food security in the West Bank and Gaza. Abu-Hijleh initiated the Youth Local Council, a movement which offers Palestinian young people an opportunity to participate in, and run their own electoral process, respond to constituent concerns, plan and execute community improvement projects and shadow local ministers and council members in efforts to learn about good governance practices and become engaged citizens in the political process. In 2014, she was named a McNulty Prize laureate for her work to create and scale the Youth Local Councils.

Previously, Abu-Hijleh served as the deputy resident representative of the UNDP Program of Assistance to the Palestinian People for more than 17 years. She is the first Palestinian woman to become a member of the board of directors of the Palestine Investment Fund and the Bank of Palestine. She is a fellow of the Aspen Institute Global Leadership Network, a member of the global Young Presidents' Organization, and vice chair of the Partners for New Beginning, Palestine chapter. She serves on the boards of Palestine Economic Policy Research Institute, Arab Hotels Company, El-Funoun Palestinian Dance Troupe and the Palestinian Institute for Public Diplomacy. She is also a member of the Education for Employment Foundation-Palestine and the Business Women Forum.

MADELEINE ALBRIGHT

CHAIR, ALBRIGHT STONEBRIDGE GROUP AND FORMER UNITED STATES SECRETARY OF STATE @madeleine

Madeleine Albright is chair of Albright Stonebridge Group, a global strategy firm, and chair of Albright Capital Management LLC, an investment advisory firm focused on emerging markets. Albright was the 64th Secretary of State of the United States. In 1997, she was named the first female secretary of state and became, at that time, the highest ranking woman in the history of the U.S. government. From 1993 to 1997, Albright served as the U.S. permanent representative to the United Nations and was a member of the president's cabinet. She is a professor in the practice of diplomacy at the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service.

Albright chairs the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs. She is the president of the Truman Scholarship Foundation. Albright is also the chair of the John P. McNulty Prize jury. In 2012, she was chosen by President Obama to receive the nation's highest civilian honor, the Presidential Medal of Freedom, in recognition of her contributions to international peace and democracy.

ABDALAZIZ ALHAMZA

CO-FOUNDER, RAQQA IS BEING SLAUGHTERED SILENTLY @3z0ooz

Abdalaziz Alhamza is an award-winning Syrian journalist, human rights defender and activist living in Germany. He is the founder and spokesperson of *Raqqa is Being*

Slaughtered Silently (RBSS), a nonpartisan, independent news page that exposes the atrocities committed by the Bashar Al-Assad regime in Syria.

Alhamza started non-volatile protests and demonstrations against the Syrian regime in 2011 and was arrested by the regime three times in 2012. The Islamic State Group (ISIS) has interrogated him more than once about his activism. After ISIS took control of his hometown Raqqa in January 2014, he escaped to Turkey and started RBSS with his friends to show the reality of life in Raqqa and ISIS.

In 2015, Alhamza received the International Press Freedom Award by the Committee to Protect Journalists and was named a Global Thinker by *Foreign Policy*. In 2016, he was awarded the Ischia International Journalism Award, the Civil Courage Prize and other awards on behalf of RBSS.

Alhamza graduated with a degree in biochemistry from Raqqa University.

NIHAD AWAD

NATIONAL EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, COUNCIL ON AMERICAN-ISLAMIC RELATIONS (CAIR) @NihadAwad

Nihad Awad is the national executive director and co-founder of the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR), America's largest Muslim civil liberties and advocacy organization, with regional offices nationwide. As a national leader in the civil rights movement, Awad has led multiple campaigns to defend the rights of Muslims and to help Americans of other faiths better understand Islam. Awad has testified before both houses of the U.S. Congress on matters involving Muslims in America.

In 1997, he served on the White House Civil Rights Advisory Panel to the Commission on Aviation Safety and Security. In 2004, he was named one of National Journal's more than 100 Most Influential People in the U.S. whose ideas help to shape the debate over public policy issues for the next decade. In 2012, he was named by a Georgetown University publication as one of the 500 most influential Muslims in the world. In 2010, *Arabian Business* ranked him as 39th in the *Arabian Business Power 100* list, its annual listing of the most influential Arabs. In 2015, *Los Angeles Times* listed Awad as one of the new civil rights leaders: emerging voices in the 21st century.

Awad has also been frequently interviewed on national and international media such as *CNN*, *Fox*, *MSNBC*, *PBS*, *C-SPAN*, *Al-Jazeera*, *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, *USA Today*, *National Public Radio* and *BBC World Service*.

MOLLY BALDWIN

FOUNDER AND CEO, ROCA, INC. @RocaInc

Molly Baldwin is the founder and CEO of Roca, Inc., a nonprofit organization that works to disrupt the cycle of incarceration and poverty by helping young people transform their lives. A graduate of UMass, Amherst, Baldwin began her professional life as a youth worker and community organizer. She founded Roca in 1988.

For more than three decades, Baldwin has been a tireless advocate, mentor and community convener, reaching out to the highest-risk young people from Massachusetts' most dangerous urban communities, and bringing together the major

institutions, corporations and agencies that affect these young people's lives. With the help of engaged institutions and Roca's committed staff, Baldwin's efforts at Roca have helped over 25,000 young people make positive and profound changes in their lives.

Today, Roca intensively reaches out to more than 800 participants each year across some 20 communities in Massachusetts, operating on the singular belief that with the right help people can change in spite of seemingly insurmountable circumstances.

Baldwin has been the recipient of numerous regional and national awards. In 2016, she received the Boston Bar Foundation Public Service Award and is widely recognized as a thought leader on criminal justice reform and high-risk young adults. A long-distance runner, she holds a master's degree in education from Lesley University and an honorary PhD from Salem State University.

DANIEL BEKELE

SENIOR DIRECTOR FOR AFRICA ADVOCACY, HUMAN RIGHTS WATCH @DanielBekele

Daniel Bekele is the senior director for Africa advocacy at Human Rights Watch in New York. He previously served in the organization as the executive director of the Africa division from 2011 to 2016. Prior to joining Human Rights Watch, Bekele practiced law in Ethiopia and he managed Action Aid Ethiopia's policy research and advocacy department. He also served as the legal department director and secretary of the board for United Insurance Company.

Bekele has extensively consulted with non-governmental organizations including Oxfam, ARTICLE 19, Freedom House and PACT, as well as with USAID and the World Bank. He has worked in varying capacities with numerous civil society organizations, and led the national-level campaign for the Global Call to Action against Poverty. Bekele's focus includes promoting African civil society organizations, human rights and good governance.

In the 2005 parliamentary elections in Ethiopia, Bekele was actively involved in promoting human rights and independent election monitoring, as well as peace initiatives in the aftermath of the post-election crisis. However, he was arrested for his activism and spent more than two years in prison in Ethiopia. He was internationally recognized as prisoner of conscience, and in 2009 received the Alison Des Forges Award for extraordinary activism. In 2010, he was nominated for the Martin Ennals Human Rights Defenders Award and the Index Freedom of Expression Award.

Bekele received a bachelor's degree in law and a master's degree in regional development studies from Addis Ababa University, and a master's degree in legal studies from Oxford University, where he is completing a PhD in international law.

NICOLA BENYAHIA

FOUNDER AND COUNSELOR, FAMILIES FOR LIFE @Families_Life

Nicola Benyahia has extensive experience within the social care sector, spanning more than 25 years with work in the context of mental health provision. She is a fully qualified, registered BACP (British Association of Counselling and Psychotherapy) counselor with specific experience in mental health, brain injury and most recently

working and counseling young people ages 14 to 25 years old. As a mother who was personally affected by the impact of violent radicalization processes in her own family, she decided to give her experience a voice and recently stepped forward for other families sharing similar problems.

Benyahia has been featured in international media on various topics related to prevention and intervention with violent radicalization. Following the death of her son in Syria in 2015, she founded Families for Life, a counseling organization which aims to support families through the psychological and counter radicalization process. She hopes, through her organization, to support and empower families to combat the shame of radicalization and provide them with a platform for their voices to be heard. She continues to speak and present at various international events and hopes in her continued efforts and work to create a humanistic understanding of violent extremism and begin to provide genuine opportunities for families to engage and participate in future policy making.

JIM BILDNER

CEO, DRAPER RICHARDS KAPLAN FOUNDATION @jimbildner

Jim Bildner is the CEO of the Draper Richards Kaplan Foundation. He works with his team to expand and manage the foundation's portfolio and pipeline, build out the donor and talent base, and develop thought leadership for the foundation. He is also an adjunct lecturer in public policy at the Harvard Kennedy School and a senior research fellow at the Hauser Institute for Civil Society and the Center for Public Leadership at Harvard University. Bildner's prior experience includes 22 years in the private sector, several years in the government and public sector, and more than a decade in the foundation and philanthropic sector.

Among his board affiliations, he is a trustee of The Kresge Foundation, The Nonprofit Finance Fund, The Public Citizen Foundation, the Health Foundation for the Americas, New Jersey Performing Arts Center, The Newport Festivals Foundation, and a member of the executive board of WBUR (Boston Public Radio). He also serves on the boards of ROCA, Inc., Baroo, Inc., Fox Islands Wind, LLC, the EBSF Loan Fund, the Island Institute and Coastal Innovation Loan Fund, Education SuperHighway, IDEO.org, SIRUM, the Earth Genome, CAST, OpenBiome, Service Year, Open Up Resources, Landed, Inc., the GroundTruth Project and the Empowerment Plan. He is a member of Young Presidents'/World Presidents' Organization and a member of the Chief Executives Organization.

In his board service, Bildner serves on the investment committees of boards with aggregate endowments in excess of \$4 billion, as well as a member of multiple finance, investment and audit committees of these boards. In 2010 he was named chair of Kresge's Social Innovative Capital Committee, and in 2014, became chair of Kresge's Investment Committee.

CARROLL BOGERT

PRESIDENT, THE MARSHALL PROJECT @carrollbogert

Carroll Bogert is president of The Marshall Project, a nonpartisan, nonprofit news organization that seeks to create and sustain a sense of national urgency about the U.S. criminal justice system. Launched in November 2015, The Marshall Project covers a wide range of topics including mass incarceration, race and policing, juvenile justice, health and mental health, as well as immigration. It is the youngest news organization ever to win the Pulitzer Prize.

Bogert was previously deputy executive director at Human Rights Watch, running its award-winning global media operations for 18 years. Before joining Human Rights Watch in 1998, Bogert spent 12 years as a foreign correspondent for Newsweek in China, Southeast Asia and the Soviet Union.

ANTONY BUGG-LEVINE

CEO, NONPROFIT FINANCE FUND @ABLImpact

Antony Bugg-Levine is the CEO of Nonprofit Finance Fund, a national nonprofit and financial intermediary that unlocks the potential of mission-driven organizations through tailored investment, strategic advice and transformational ideas. He oversees more than \$340 million of investment capital, a national consulting practice, and works with a range of philanthropic, private sector and government partners to develop and implement innovative approaches to financing social change. He writes and speaks on the evolution of the social sector and the emergence of the global impact investing industry. He is the co-author of "Impact Investing: Transforming How We Make Money While Making a Difference" (Wiley, 2011).

As a managing director at The Rockefeller Foundation, Bugg-Levine designed and led the foundation's impact investing initiative. He is the founding board chair of the Global Impact Investing Network and convened the 2007 meeting that coined the phrase "impact investing."

Previously, Bugg-Levine was the country director for Kenya and Uganda for TechnoServe, a nongovernmental organization that develops and implements business solutions to rural poverty. Earlier in his career, as a consultant with McKinsey & Company, he advised Fortune 100 clients in the financial services and health care sectors, and helped develop new frameworks for incorporating social dynamics into corporate strategy. He is an associate adjunct professor in the Social Enterprise Program at the Columbia Business School. He is also a Young Global Leader of the World Economic Forum.

NADINE BURKE HARRIS

FOUNDER AND CEO, CENTER FOR YOUTH WELLNESS @DrBurkeHarris

Nadine Burke Harris is a pediatrician and a pioneer in the field of medicine. She is a leader in the movement to transform how we respond to early childhood adversity and the resulting toxic stress that dramatically impacts our health and longevity. By revealing the science behind childhood adversity, she offers a new way to understand the adverse events that affect all of us throughout our lifetimes.

As the founder and CEO of Center for Youth Wellness, Burke Harris has brought these scientific discoveries and her new approach to audiences at the Mayo Clinic, American Academy of Pediatrics and Google Zeitgeist. Her TED Talk, "How Childhood Trauma Affects Health Across a Lifetime," has been viewed more than two million times, and her work has been profiled in *The New Yorker*; in Paul Tough's best-selling book, "How Children Succeed: Grit, Curiosity, and the Hidden Power of Character" and in Jamie Redford's feature film, "Resilience."

Burke Harris serves as an expert advisor on the Too Small to Fail initiative championed by the Clinton Foundation in association with Next Generation to improve the lives of children ages birth to five.

EDMUND CAIN

VICE PRESIDENT, GRANT PROGRAMS, CONRAD N. HILTON FOUNDATION @EJC45

Edmund J. Cain oversees all domestic and international grant programming at the Conrad N. Hilton Foundation, including overall responsibility for the foundation's strategic planning. Prior to joining the foundation, Cain served as director of The Carter Center's Global Development Initiative, which facilitated national development strategies in post-conflict countries. A senior member of The Carter Center's Peace Program team, Cain advised former President Carter on global development issues and participated in election monitoring missions. Prior to that, Cain had a long career with the United Nations serving in Malaysia, Myanmar and Afghanistan, and was a U.N. resident coordinator in Turkey and in Egypt. He was also the first director of the United Nations Development Programme's (UNDP) Emergency Response Division. In that capacity he oversaw the formulation of UNDP's disaster response policy and led missions to war-torn and disaster-affected countries. Cain also served in the U.N. Secretariat as the chief of staff to the U.N. undersecretary general for general assembly and political affairs. A fellow at the Harvard Center for International Affairs and senior fellow at UCLA's Luskin School of Public Affairs, Cain holds a master's degree in public affairs from the University of Oregon and a bachelor's degree in political science and international affairs from the University of Delaware.

SEDEF ÇAKMAK

CITY COUNCIL MEMBER OF BESIKTAS MUNICIPALITY, TURKEY @sedef_cakmak

Sedef Cakmak is a city council member of Besiktas Municipality in Istanbul, Turkey. During the local elections of March 2014, she was the only cis-woman, homosexual candidate running for the Municipal City Council membership. While a university student, she engaged in social movements and became a human rights activist, specifically focusing on LGBTI rights. Between 2004 and 2010, she was the founder and a core member of the International Relations Commission and the Academical Research Commission of Lambdaistanbul LGBTI Solidarity Association. In 2011, she took part in the foundation of the Social Policies Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation Studies Association (SPoD) and served as the first chairwoman of the association between 2011 to 2013.

When assuming her position in 2015, Cakmak fulfilled her mission to raise the profile of LGBTIs in Turkish society. As the first and only openly LGBTI politician who has been elected to a position in Turkey, she encouraged others to run for public office.

Fighting for a world that respects diversity, freedom and democracy, she established the Equality Unit in Besiktas Municipality in order to develop and implement local policies on minority rights, women's rights and refugee rights. Cakmak further founded the Women Solidarity Center to help victims of domestic violence. She also participated in the establishment of the International Relations Directorate at Besiktas Municipality and has been representing the Municipality on various national and international platforms.

She holds a bachelor of arts in sociology from Galatasaray University in Istanbul, Turkey.

SERCAN ÇELEBI

FOUNDER, VOTE AND BEYOND @SercanCelebi83

Sercan Çelebi, a McKinsey & Company alum, has extensive experience in a significant number of management consultancy projects for both multinational clients and public sector across continents throughout his career. From tomato and pepper agriculture in İzmir to national energy investments, from social media and big data analysis to management consultancy in New York, Çelebi has a vast array of multinational leadership stories in different industries.

Çelebi is also one of the co-founders, former spokesperson and chairman of Oy ve Ötesi Foundation (Vote and Beyond), an independent and nonpartisan election monitoring organization that emerged ahead of Turkish local elections in 2014 as a completely voluntary initiative. In the past five elections that took place within a space of only two years, Oy ve Ötesi trained more than 170,000 volunteers across Turkey, monitored all five elections to different extents in the front lines and cross-checked the aggregated official results with a state-of-art software developed by its volunteers.

A graduate of German High School in Istanbul and Yale University, Çelebi takes special interest in agribusiness and in the process of setting up an ecological farm in the Mount Ida region of Çanakkale in Turkey.

Çelebi practices martial arts and is fluent in English, German and Spanish.

CECILIA CONRAD

MANAGING DIRECTOR, THE JOHN D. AND CATHERINE T. MACARTHUR FOUNDATION @bvrbvra

Cecilia Conrad is a managing director at the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. Her portfolio includes the MacArthur Fellows program, the MacArthur Award for Effective and Creative Institutions and 100&Change.

Before joining the foundation in January 2013, she had a distinguished career as both an economics professor and an administrator at Pomona College in Claremont, California. Before joining the faculty at Pomona College, Conrad served on the faculties of Barnard College and Duke University. She was also an economist at the Federal Trade Commission and a visiting scholar at The Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies.

Conrad received her bachelor of arts degree from Wellesley College and holds a PhD in economics from Stanford University.

FERNANDO CORTÉS

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, FUNDACIÓN BOLÍVAR DAVIVIENDA @FundacionBD

Fernando Cortés is the vice president of corporate social responsibility at Grupo Bolívar and the executive director of Fundación Bolívar Davivienda, the philanthropic arm of Grupo Bolívar, based in Bogotá. His experience spans many industry sectors including: graphic arts, food, consumer products, flowers, construction, financial services and the social sector.

Cortés focuses on managing and developing economic and social projects, taking into account the generation of value to all related parties and with the expectation of leaving a mark for the improvement of communities and the environment.

At Fundación Bolívar Davivienda, his valuable management skills have allowed the organization to grow and scale quickly with a mission to support and foster transformative and high-impact projects that generate capacities in people, communities and organizations to build a more just, equitable and innovative society.

Cortés graduated from School of Business Administration of Universidad de los Andes in Bogotá and holds a master's degree from the Thunderbird School of Global Management.

MARIANA COSTA CHECA

CO-FOUNDER AND CEO, LABORATORIA @mcostach

Mariana Costa Checa is co-founder and CEO of Laboratoria, a social enterprise that gives young women from low-income backgrounds in Latin America a career in technology. She and her team are building a leading force of female tech talent from Latin America in order to turn the tech sector into a powerful source of social transformation. She is a firm believer in the idea that social entrepreneurship is the way to bring together the best of two worlds.

Recently, Costa Checa had the honor of sharing a panel with President Obama and Mark Zuckerberg at the 2016 Global Entrepreneurship Summit at Stanford University. Furthermore, MIT named her one of the most innovative people in Peru under the age of 35.

Before becoming a social entrepreneur, Costa Checa worked for organizations such as TechnoServe and the Organization of American States on social development projects in El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Peru and Kenya. She holds a Bachelor of Science in international relations from the London School of Economics and a master's degree in public administration from Columbia University in New York.

RACHEL DENBER

DEPUTY DIRECTOR, EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA DIVISION, HUMAN RIGHTS WATCH @Rachel_Denber

Rachel Denber, deputy director of the Europe and Central Asia Division at Human Rights Watch, specializes in countries of the former Soviet Union. Previously, Denber directed Human Rights Watch's Moscow office and did field research and advocacy in Russia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Estonia, Ukraine, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. She has authored reports on a wide range of human rights issues throughout the region.

Denber earned a bachelor's degree from Rutgers University in international relations and a master's degree in political science from Columbia University, where she studied at the Harriman Institute. She speaks Russian and French.

JERI ECKHART QUEENAN

HEAD, GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT, THE BRIDGESPAN GROUP @BridgespanGroup

Jeri Eckhart Queenan leads The Bridgespan Group's global development practice, focusing on poverty alleviation in India, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America and China. She has held leadership positions in the private, public and nonprofit sectors. Her work at Bridgespan includes precedent-setting projects with Goldman Sachs' 10,000 Women, an initiative that has achieved strong measurable results by empowering underserved women entrepreneurs in 40 countries. She has led similar high-impact engagements with organizations such as The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, The Salvation Army, Children's Investment Fund Foundation, United Nations Foundation, Inter-American Development Bank and Women's World Banking.

Eckhart Queenan has co-authored numerous articles on women's entrepreneurship, scaling impact, high impact corporate philanthropy, performance measurement and board governance. Leading articles include: "Pay-What-It-Takes Philanthropy," "Designing for Transformative Scale: Global Lessons in What Works," "Ten Thousand Strong," "Stop Starving Scale: Unlocking the Potential of Global NGOs," "Measurement as Learning," and "Three Cases of Better Corporate Philanthropy."

Eckhart Queenan served as a senior official in the executive branch of government, first as White House fellow and then as associate deputy secretary of labor, overseeing line agencies with a combined annual budget of \$28 billion. She led several Cabinet-level working groups on major policy issues during her tenure. Later she served as chair and CEO of the White House Fellows Foundation in Washington, DC, president of the White House Fellows Alumni Association, and five-year member of the President's Commission on White House Fellowships. She began her career at the Boston Consulting Group where she was a manager.

Eckhart Queenan serves on the governing board of Catholic Relief Services. She also has served on the governing boards of the Micro Ensure Board of Opportunity International, The BOMA Fund, which is dedicated to the self-sufficiency of nomadic tribes in northern Kenya, and the National Organization on Disability.

Eckhart Queenan graduated Phi Beta Kappa, summa cum laude, from UCLA and received her MBA with honors from the Harvard Business School. She and her husband, Charlie Queenan, have four children, ages 20 to 26.

ALEJANDRO EDER

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, FDI PACIFICO @alejoeder

Alejandro Eder is the executive director of FDI Pacifico, the Foundation for the Integral Development of the Pacific Region of Colombia based in Cali, Colombia. FDI Pacifico is a private nonprofit organization that works to promote the development of long term public interest projects and policies that will contribute to the social and economic development of Colombia's four Pacific provinces.

Prior to FDI Pacifico, Eder worked at the Office of the High Presidential Counselor for Reintegration and at the Colombian Agency for Reintegration (ACR) from 2007 to

2014. From 2007 to 2010, he was the policy and strategic advisor at the ACR and he led an effort to comprehensively redesign Colombia's reintegration process in order to make it more effective and sustainable. From 2010 to 2014, he was Colombia's high presidential counselor for reintegration and director general of the ACR.

As head of the ACR, Eder focused on developing a reintegration policy based on strengthening receptor communities, on developing the psychological and emotional stability of ex-combatants, and on guaranteeing the long-term sustainability of each individual's reintegration through education, vocational training and private sector and third party engagement.

Eder also worked for five years (2009 to 2014) in the Colombia peace process initially as a member of the team that secretly negotiated the framework agreement with the FARC in Havana, Cuba, and then as an alternate negotiator in the public phase of the process until October 2014.

Eder has an undergraduate degree from Hamilton College and a master's degree from Columbia University's School of International and Public Affairs. Before working with the Colombian government Eder worked in investment banking and finance in New York City and Colombia.

AYKAN ERDEMIR

SENIOR FELLOW, FOUNDATION FOR DEFENSE OF DEMOCRACIES @followFDD

Aykan Erdemir is a senior fellow at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies, a nonprofit, nonpartisan policy institute focused on foreign policy and national security. He is a former member of the Turkish Parliament (2011–2015) who served in the EU-Turkey Joint Parliamentary Committee, EU Harmonization Committee, and the ad hoc Parliamentary Committee on the IT Sector and the Internet. As an outspoken defender of pluralism, minority rights and religious freedoms in the Middle East, he has been at the forefront of the struggle against religious persecution, hate crimes and hate speech in Turkey.

He is a founding member of the International Panel of Parliamentarians for Freedom of Religion or Belief, and a drafter of and signatory to the Oslo Charter for Freedom of Religion or Belief (2014) as well as a signatory legislator to the London Declaration on Combating Anti-Semitism. Erdemir was recognized in 2014 as one of the Ten Outstanding Young Persons by the Junior Chamber International Turkey in the field of political, legal and governmental affairs. He was also awarded the 2016 Stefanus Prize for Religious Freedom.

Erdemir received his Bachelor of Arts in international relations from Bilkent University, Ankara, and holds a Master of Arts in Middle Eastern studies, as well as a PhD in anthropology and Middle Eastern studies from Harvard University. He was a doctoral fellow at Hauser Center for Nonprofit Organizations at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government, and a research associate at the University of Oxford's Center on Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS). In March 2015, Erdemir was awarded a distinguished fellowship at the Oxford Centre for the Study of Law and Public Policy at the Harris Manchester College, University of Oxford. He has taught at Bilkent University in Ankara, and Middle East Technical University, where he also served as deputy dean of the Graduate School of Social Sciences and graduate director of the German-Turkish Masters in Social Sciences.

Erdemir has co-authored three books and edited seven volumes including "Antagonistic Tolerance: Competitive Sharing of Religious Sites and Spaces" (Routledge, 2016).

PAULA FABIANI

CEO, INSTITUTO PARA O DESENVOLVIMENTO DO INVESTIMENTO SOCIAL (IDIS)
@PaulaFabiani

Paula Jancso Fabiani is the CEO of Institute for the Development of Social Investment (IDIS) in Brazil. Prior to this position, she was the chief financial officer at Maria Cecilia Souto Vidigal Foundation and Akatu Institute. Previously, she worked in private equity in one of the invested companies at Grupo Votorantim, in asset management and mergers and acquisitions at BankBoston and in trade finance at Lloyds Bank.

Fabiani is an economist and graduated from University of São Paulo. She holds an MBA from the New York University Stern School of Business. She earned specializations degrees in endowment asset management from London Business School and Yale, management of third sector organizations from Fundação Getúlio Vargas and early childhood from Harvard. She has authored of books about endowments and early childhood in Brazil.

Fabiani is board member of two Brazilian nonprofit organizations, civic entrepreneur of RAPS, contributes to the *Alliance Magazine* and is the first Brazilian accredited on the methodology Social Return on Investment (SROI).

MICHAEL FAYE

CO-FOUNDER, GIVEDIRECTLY @MichaelLFaye

Michael Faye is the co-founder of GiveDirectly and CEO of Segovia Technology, a software company that is working to end extreme poverty by making it easier for organizations to pay anyone, anytime, anywhere in the emerging markets. GiveDirectly has been ranked a top international charity by GiveWell, recognized by FastCompany as one of the top 10 most innovative companies in finance, and was said to be "sending shockwaves through the charity sector" by *The Guardian*.

Faye's work on international development has been published in the "American Economic Review," "Brookings Papers on Economic Activity," "Foreign Affairs" and others. He is a term member of the Council of Foreign Relations, was named one of Foreign Policy's 100 leading Global Thinkers in 2013. He has spoken extensively on development and philanthropy.

Faye holds a PhD in economics from Harvard, from where he also earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in math and classics.

NATALIE BRIDGEMAN FIELDS

FOUNDER AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ACCOUNTABILITY COUNSEL @nataliefields

Natalie Bridgeman Fields, founder and executive director of Accountability Counsel, is an attorney with two decades of experience in advocating globally for environmental and human rights. Through her leadership, Accountability Counsel is working alongside communities that have been harmed by development projects to demand justice, and to create and improve systems of accountability in development finance.

She has consulted for NGOs and international financial institutions on accountability issues and has litigated corporate accountability, human rights and environmental cases in U.S. federal courts.

Her experience ranges from serving as a partner in advocacy with indigenous communities in Latin America, to challenging abuse and creating policy change at the highest levels of government. Echoing Green and the Draper Richards Kaplan Foundation have both recognized Fields for her groundbreaking approach to advancing rights.

She earned a Bachelor of Arts degree from Cornell University, where she received a Udall Scholarship and the Schwerner National Activist Award, and holds a law degree from UCLA School of Law, where she was editor-in-chief of the *Journal of International Law and Foreign Affairs*. Fields is fluent in Spanish and lives in the Bay Area with her husband and children.

ADAM FOSS

PRESIDENT, PROSECUTOR IMPACT @adamjohnfoss

Adam Foss is a former assistant district attorney in the Juvenile Division of the Suffolk County District Attorney's Office (SCDAO) in Boston, Massachusetts, and a fierce advocate for criminal justice reform and the importance of the role of the prosecutor in ending mass incarceration. Foss believes that the profession of prosecution is ripe for reinvention. Requiring better incentives and more measurable metrics for success beyond, simply, "cases won" led him to co-found Prosecutor Impact, a nonprofit that develops training and curriculum for prosecutors to reframe their role in the criminal justice system.

Most recently, The Root named Foss one of the 100 Most Influential Black Americans of 2016. He was named Graduate of the Last Decade by his alma mater, Suffolk University Law School and is a visiting senior fellow at Harvard Law School. In February of 2016, Foss delivered a TED talk that has already eclipsed 1.5 million views. In 2015, he was voted one of the country's 40 Most Up-and-Coming Lawyers by National Law Journal and in 2013, the Massachusetts Bar Association voted him Prosecutor of the Year.

Foss works with Grammy-award winning artist John Legend on his efforts to end mass incarceration. In both his professional and personal capacities, he volunteers much of his time to the community he works in.

LIANA GHENT

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, INTERNATIONAL STEP BY STEP ASSOCIATION @lianaghent

Liana Ghent is the director of the International Step by Step Association (ISSA), a membership organization which serves as a learning community and a champion for quality and equity for all young children and their families. Since 2006, when she started at ISSA, under her leadership, the network has expanded to include over 70 member organizations from across Europe and Central Asia, engaging a dynamic mix of NGO's, research centers, higher education and academic institutions. All ISSA members work to ensure the best quality care and education for young children, especially the most vulnerable, and together reach more than one million children.

Ghent has more than 20 years of leadership experience in the nonprofit sector, primarily with programs in higher education and in early childhood development. Her leadership experience includes being regional director and later co-president of the Civic Education Project, a nonprofit organization engaged in higher education initiatives in Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. Before joining ISSA, she worked with the Open Society Foundation's Higher Education Support Program.

She served on the board of directors of the Consultative Group for Early Childhood Care and Development. Currently she is a member of the Interim Executive Group of the Early Childhood Development Action Network, and of the Leadership Council of the Global Compact for Early Childhood Development.

JOE GOLDMAN

PRESIDENT, DEMOCRACY FUND @joegoldman

Joe Goldman is the president of the Democracy Fund, a bipartisan foundation working to ensure that the U.S. political system is able to withstand new challenges and deliver on its promise to the American people. He is also the president of Democracy Fund Voice, previously Democracy Fund Action. Before joining the Democracy Fund, he was an investment director at Omidyar Network where he incubated the Democracy Fund for three years.

Goldman has spent his career working to strengthen democratic institutions through public deliberation and policy reform. Previously, he was vice president of citizen engagement at AmericaSpeaks where he directed and facilitated large-scale public deliberations across the country, including the Unified New Orleans Planning Process after Hurricane Katrina and the redevelopment of the World Trade Center site after 9/11. He has written extensively about the theory and practice of deliberative democracy and spoken about the value of public deliberation in venues around the world.

Goldman has also engaged the public from inside government. He managed Mayor Anthony Williams' Neighborhood Action Initiative in Washington, which engaged thousands of residents in shaping the city's budget priorities. Neighborhood Action was named Program of the Year by the International Association of Public Participation. Goldman also managed the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission's Common Ground regional planning process in Chicago, which later received the Outstanding Planning Award from the American Planning Association for its innovative use of technology and broad community outreach.

Goldman was a Public Service Fellow at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government, where he received a master's degree in public policy. He graduated with honors in political science from Vassar College.

JAMES GOLDSTON

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, OPEN SOCIETY JUSTICE INITIATIVE @JamesAGoldston

James Goldston is the executive director of the Open Society Justice Initiative, which advances the rule of law and legal protection of rights worldwide through advocacy, litigation, research and the promotion of legal capacity. A leading practitioner of international human rights and criminal law, Goldston has litigated

several groundbreaking cases before the European Court of Human Rights and United Nations treaty bodies, including on issues of torture, counterterrorism and racial discrimination.

In 2007 to 2008, he served as coordinator of prosecutions and senior trial attorney in the Office of the Prosecutor at the International Criminal Court.

Prior to Open Society, Goldston was the legal director of the Budapest-based European Roma Rights Centre, director general for human rights of the Mission to Bosnia-Herzegovina of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and prosecutor in the office of the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, where he focused on organized crime.

Goldston graduated from Columbia College and Harvard Law School, and has taught at Columbia Law School and Central European University.

BARBARA GONZALEZ

CEO, MO DEWJI FOUNDATION @DewjiFoundation

Barbara Gonzalez is the head of the Mo Dewji Foundation, a registered charity founded by Africa's youngest billionaire, Mohammed Dewji. The foundation is dedicated to enriching the lives and alleviating Tanzanian citizens from poverty and hardship through health, education and community development. She is responsible for developing strategies to address some of the world's most challenging inequities and leading all the foundation's efforts to promote equity and sustainable livelihoods for all Tanzanians.

Gonzalez serves on the advisory board for Young African Leaders Initiative (YALI) Regional Leadership Center East Africa. YALI was launched by President Barack Obama as a signature effort to invest in the next generation of African leaders.

Prior to the foundation, Gonzalez was a consultant at Deloitte Consulting Limited Tanzania. She was involved in projects for public sector clients including USAID, UNICEF, World Bank and Plan International.

Gonzalez holds a master's degree in development management from the London School of Economics and Political Science, and a bachelor's degree with honors in economics and political science from Manhattanville College in Purchase, New York.

RANDA GROB-ZAKHARY

GLOBAL HEAD OF EDUCATION, PORTICUS @RandaGrob

Randa Grob-Zakhary is the global head of education at Porticus, an international philanthropic organization, and a board member of the Global Partnership for Education at the World Bank. She is the former CEO of the LEGO Foundation and brings with her two decades of experience in neuroscience, children's development and education.

She has served as a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution on matters of global education, and as a program advisor to the Clinton Global Initiative. Prior to that, she worked with the global management consultancy McKinsey & Company, spanning the profit and nonprofit sectors, before founding an institute for early learning and development.

She is an established speaker and author, having earned her doctoral degree in neuroscience and medical degree at the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, and bachelor's degree from Columbia University in New York. She resides in Switzerland.

NATALIYA GUMENYUK

HEAD, HROMADSKE TV @ngumenyuk

Nataliya Gumenyuk is a Ukrainian journalist specializing in foreign affairs. She is the co-founder and head of Hromadske.TV, an independent television station creating public broadcasting in Ukraine, and Hromadske International, a multimedia platform that explains the Eastern European geopolitical storm in both English and Russian.

Since the start of the revolution, and later conflict in Ukraine, Gumenyuk has been reporting from the field in Maidan, Crimea and Donbas. As an independent, international correspondent, she has reported on major political and social events from approximately 50 countries. She has been closely following post-Arab Spring developments in the Arab world and is the author of the book "Maidan Tahrir. In Search of the Lost Revolution," a collection of reports from the Middle East researching what happens to societies after the revolution. As a commentator, Gumenyuk cooperates with a number of Ukrainian and international media outlets.

SHADI HAMID

SENIOR FELLOW, BROOKINGS INSTITUTION @shadihamid

Shadi Hamid is a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and the author of "Islamic Exceptionalism: How the Struggle Over Islam is Reshaping the World," which was shortlisted for the 2017 Lionel Gelber Prize, awarded to the best book of the year on foreign affairs. He is also a contributing editor for *The Atlantic*. His previous book "Temptations of Power: Islamists and Illiberal Democracy in a New Middle East" was named a *Foreign Affairs* Best Book of 2014.

An expert on Islam and politics, Hamid served as director of research at the Brookings Doha Center until January 2014. Prior to joining Brookings, he was director of research at the Project on Middle East Democracy (POMED) and a Hewlett Fellow at Stanford University's Center on Democracy, Development, and the Rule of Law.

Hamid received his Bachelor of Science and Master of Arts from Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service. He holds a PhD in political science from Oxford University.

MARK HAYS

ANTI-MONEY LAUNDERING CAMPAIGN LEADER, GLOBAL WITNESS

@Global_Witness

Mark Hays is a campaign leader for Global Witness, a nonprofit campaigning organization that seeks to expose and break the links between natural resource exploitation, corruption and conflict. Hays works specifically on Global Witness' campaign advocating for beneficial ownership transparency in the U.S. and around the world.

For nearly 15 years, Hays has conducted advocacy, research and campaign development for a wide range of environmental and social change organizations, including Oxfam America, The Sierra Club, Public Citizen, Greenpeace, NAACP and others. His work has helped these organizations develop bold and strategic campaign strategies to engage a wide variety of stakeholders—including business—in transformative environmental and social change efforts.

Hays is also board president of UPSTREAM, a U.S.-based environmental organization dedicated to creating a healthy, sustainable and equitable society by addressing the root causes of waste and advocating for more sustainable products and packaging throughout the global economy.

MAHA HILAL

CONTENT MANAGER, ISLAMIC SCHOLARSHIP FUND @mahmooha2013

Maha Hilal is an organizer with Witness Against Torture, a steering committee member of the DC Justice for Muslims Coalition and a content manager for the Islamic Scholarship Fund. Previously, she was executive director of the National Coalition to Protect Civil Freedoms.

Hilal has worked at a number of human rights and social justice organizations including the Center for Victims of Torture, the National Religious Campaign Against Torture and the Government Accountability Project. She was previously a Christine Mirzayan Fellow at the National Academy of Sciences as well as a recipient of the Department of State's critical language scholarship for Arabic study in Morocco.

Hilal earned her doctorate degree in May 2014 from the Department of Justice, Law and Society at American University in Washington, D.C. The title of her dissertation was "'Too Damn Muslim to be Trusted': The War on Terror and the Muslim American Response." She received her master's degree in counseling and her bachelor's degree in sociology from the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

SHELDON HIMELFARB

CEO AND PRESIDENT, PEACETECH LAB @shimelfarb

Sheldon Himelfarb is the president and CEO of PeaceTech Lab, a nonprofit organization working for individuals and communities affected by conflict by using technology, media and data to accelerate local peacebuilding efforts. Headquartered at the U.S. Institute of Peace (USIP), Himelfarb and his team carries out the organization's mission to inspire a new industry of peacetech entrepreneurs by bringing together engineers and activists, MBAs and conflict experts, social scientists and data scientists to design, develop and adapt new solutions to counter age-old drivers of conflict. They work in close collaboration with public and private sector partners.

Himelfarb joined USIP from the corporate executive board, where he was on the Technology Practice Leadership team, working with chief information officers from governments, universities and multi-national corporations. Prior to this, he served as a foreign policy adviser to a member of the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the head of North American Documentary Development for Yorkshire TV, and CEO and executive producer for Common Ground Productions, the media division of

Search for Common Ground. He is an award-winning filmmaker, former commentator for National Public Radio's "Sunday Morning Edition" and author of numerous articles on politics, popular culture and conflict. He has managed peacebuilding programs in numerous conflicts including Bosnia, Iraq, Angola, Liberia, Macedonia and Burundi. He received the Capitol Area Peace Maker Award from American University.

Himelfarb holds a doctorate degree from Oxford University and a bachelor's degree in political science from Johns Hopkins University.

TOMER INBAR

PARTNER, PATTERSON BELKNAP WEBB & TYLER LLP @tomerinbar

Tomer Inbar is a partner with the law firm Patterson Belknap. He represents U.S. and international tax-exempt organizations, for-profit organizations that deal with them, in a broad range of structural and operating matters including tax and corporate issues, impact and charitable investing, regulatory compliance, governance, operational policies and procedures, audits, unrelated business income tax issues and executive compensation matters.

Inbar regularly advises clients on an array of corporate transactions and structures involving tax-exempt organizations such as joint ventures and the establishment of for-profit subsidiaries, corporate restructuring, private equity fund formation, hybrid structures and licensing and service arrangements.

Among Inbar's clients are public charities, private foundations, colleges and universities, environmental conservation groups, economic development organizations, advocacy groups, museums and cultural institutions, many of which are active worldwide.

Inbar is a regular speaker at programs for tax-exempt organizations. Recent topics have focused on structuring program and mission related investments, charitable investment funds, lobbying and political campaign activities, the fiduciary aspects of program and mission relating investing, aggregating capital for social good, charitable issues relating to energy and the environment, crisis management and communications, and board governance considerations and liability concerns.

ANDREW HUDSON

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CRISIS ACTION @andrewhudsonau

Andrew Hudson is an international human rights lawyer with 20 years of varied UN and international advocacy experience. He has held many positions at Crisis Action since joining in 2010, including New York director and deputy executive director. He provides world-class leadership to a global team and has spearheaded some of the organization's signature advocacy successes, as well as leading critical aspects of the internationalization of Crisis Action.

Prior to Crisis Action, Hudson worked for four years at Human Rights First, formerly known as Lawyers Committee for Human Rights, in New York. While there, he coordinated UN advocacy, managed the Human Rights Defenders Program and led work focused in Latin America.

Previously, Hudson was a lawyer in Australia representing indigent clients and refugees, and spearheading major law reform projects. He has worked with the UN

High Commissioner for Refugees in Ecuador, the UN Regional Commission in Thailand, the Australian delegation to the UN General Assembly and the UN Special Rapporteur on Extrajudicial Executions.

Hudson holds honors degrees in politics and law from the University of Melbourne and a Master of Laws from New York University School of Law. He is a John Monash Scholar.

UZODINMA IWEALA

CEO AND EDITOR-IN-CHIEF, VENTURES AFRICA AND AUTHOR, BEASTS OF NO NATION @VenturesAfrica

Uzodinma Iweala is the CEO and editor-in-chief of Ventures Africa, a publication that looks at business, policy, innovation and culture on the evolving continent of Africa. He is an award-winning writer and a medical doctor.

Iweala was a Radcliffe Fellow at Harvard University where he worked on a new novel about Washington, DC, entitled “Speak No Evil.” His first novel, “Beasts of No Nation,” was released in 2005 to critical acclaim, and won numerous awards. “Beasts of No Nation” was translated into 12 languages and was also selected as a New York Times notable book. It has been adapted as a major motion picture starring Idris Elba. His second book, “Our Kind of People,” a non-fiction account of HIV and AIDS in Nigeria, was released in 2012 in the United States and the United Kingdom. He is the co-owner of Ventures Africa magazine and was the acting CEO of the Private Sector Health Alliance of Nigeria. He is also a co-founder of Txlite Nigeria Ltd., a company that provides pay-as-you go solar solutions across Nigeria.

Iweala holds a bachelor’s degree, magna cum laude, in English and American literature and language from Harvard College and is a graduate of Columbia University’s College of Physicians and Surgeons.

ASHISH KARAMCHANDANI

MANAGING DIRECTOR, FSG @AsKaramchandani

Ashish Karamchandani is the managing director at FSG, a mission-driven consulting firm that focuses on using market-based solutions to drive sustainable social change. His emphasis has been on multi-year programs such as low income housing. Through his work, Karamchandani helped to develop a housing market that has sold more than 100,000 homes and has more than 10 housing companies now offering 15-year mortgages to informal sector customers with no income documentation. He is currently co-leading a program to improve private preschool education for low income households in urban India.

Karamchandani was the founder of Monitor Inclusive Markets (MIM), a social action unit within the Monitor Group. He pioneered MIM’s market-based approach to addressing the world’s development challenges and worked across multiple sectors. Prior to founding MIM, he started Monitor Group’s consulting business in India. Karamchandani also co-founded Ummeed, a nonprofit organization in India that works with children who have developmental disabilities.

Karamchandani holds a Bachelor of Tech from Indian Institute of Technology, Bombay, a Master of Science from University of California, Berkley, and a PhD from Stanford University.

JORDAN KASSALOW

FOUNDER, VISIONSPRING @JKassalow

Jordan Kassalow is the founder of VisionSpring, a nonprofit organization providing access to eyewear in the developing world, as well as EYEliance, a coalition of multi-sector public, private and NGO partners and stakeholders that collaborate to find solutions to the world’s unmet need for eyeglasses. Kassalow also founded Scojo New York, a ready-to-wear reading eyewear company, as well as the Global Health Policy Program at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). Prior to his position at CFR, he served as director of the River Blindness Division at Helen Keller International.

Kassalow is the inaugural winner of the McNulty Prize for his work with VisionSpring. He is a fellow of the Draper Richards Kaplan Foundation, Skoll, Ashoka, and is a Henry Crown Fellow at the Aspen Institute. He was named one of the Schwab Foundation’s 2012 Social Entrepreneurs and was recently named to Forbes Impact 30. VisionSpring has been internationally recognized by the Skoll Foundation, the Aspen Institute and the World Bank, is a three-time winner of Fast Company’s Social Capitalist Award and is a winner of Duke University’s Enterprising Social Innovation Award.

Additionally, Kassalow is a partner at Drs. Farkas, Kassalow, Resnick & Associates, a leading contact lens and laser specialty practice in New York City. Kassalow earned a Doctorate of Optometry from the New England College of Optometry and a Fellowship in Preventive Ophthalmology and master’s degree in public health from Johns Hopkins University.

ZIA KHAN

VICE PRESIDENT, INITIATIVES AND STRATEGY, THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION @ZiaKhanNYC

Zia Khan is vice president for initiatives and strategy for The Rockefeller Foundation. He oversees the foundation’s approach for achieving impact and realizing the organization’s mission and goals. He leads the program team in New York, Bangkok and Nairobi, and their work in searching for new opportunities, developing strategies and executing initiatives. Khan also provides direction for the foundation’s commitment to supporting new innovations and capacities in the sector.

Prior to joining the foundation, Khan was a management consultant who advised senior leaders in different sectors on strategy and organizational performance. His previous experience includes being a partner at Booz & Company (now known as Strategy&) and a principal at Katzenbach Partners where he founded and led the San Francisco office. Khan is the co-author of “Leading Outside the Lines” and is a frequent writer and speaker on strategy, innovation and topics related to the foundation’s goals, focus areas and work. He holds a Bachelor of Science from Cornell and a Master of Science and PhD from Stanford University.

JIM KIM

PRESIDENT, WORLD BANK GROUP @JimYongKim

Jim Yong Kim is the twelfth president of the World Bank Group. Soon after he assumed this position on July 1, 2012, the organization established its goals to end extreme poverty by 2030 and to boost shared prosperity. In September 2016, the World Bank Group's board of executive directors unanimously reappointed Kim to a second, five-year term as president, beginning in July 2017.

A physician and anthropologist, Kim's career has revolved around health, education and delivering services to the poor for more than two decades. Prior to joining the World Bank Group, Kim was president of Dartmouth College. He is a co-founder of Partners In Health (PIH) and a former director of the HIV/AIDS department at the World Health Organization.

Before assuming the Dartmouth presidency, Kim held professorships and chaired departments at Harvard Medical School, the Harvard School of Public Health and Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston. He also served as director of Harvard's François-Xavier Bagnoud Center for Health and Human Rights.

In 1987, Kim co-founded Partners In Health, a Boston-based non-profit organization now working in poor communities on four continents. Challenging previous conventional wisdom that drug-resistant tuberculosis and HIV/AIDS could not be treated in developing countries, PIH successfully tackled these diseases by integrating large-scale treatment programs into community-based primary care.

As director of the World Health Organization's HIV/AIDS department, Kim led the 3 by 5 initiative, the first-ever global goal for AIDS treatment, which sought to treat 3 million new HIV/AIDS patients in developing countries with anti-retroviral drugs by 2005. Launched in September 2003, the ambitious program ultimately reached its goal by 2007.

Kim's work has earned him wide recognition. He was awarded a MacArthur Genius Fellowship (2003), was named one of America's 25 Best Leaders by U.S. *News & World Report* (2005), and was selected as one of *TIME* magazine's 100 Most Influential People in the World (2006).

Born in 1959 in Seoul, South Korea, Kim moved with his family to the United States at the age of five and grew up in Muscatine, Iowa. He graduated with a bachelor's degree, magna cum laude, from Brown University in 1982. He earned his MD from Harvard Medical School in 1991 and a PhD in anthropology from Harvard University in 1993.

MOLLY KINDER

PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE AND DIRECTOR, GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY'S BEECK CENTER FOR SOCIAL IMPACT AND INNOVATION @MollyKinder

Molly Kinder is professor of practice at Georgetown University and director at the Beeck Center for Social Impact and Innovation. She has more than 15 years of experience in policy, innovation, impact investing, philanthropy, research and international development.

Most recently, Kinder served as vice president and founding team member of the Global Innovation Fund, a groundbreaking new \$200 million social investment fund

that she helped design, capitalize, launch and lead. Supported by the Omidyar Network and the governments of the U.K., U.S., Australia and Sweden, the fund pioneers a new approach to early stage impact investing to pilot, test and scale promising global development solutions. Previously Kinder served in the Obama administration at USAID as director of special programs of Development Innovation Venture, an initiative modeled on venture capital that backs innovative solutions to intractable problems in the developing world.

Kinder worked overseas with the World Bank in India and Pakistan, and in Liberia's finance ministry in the government of Nobel prize-winner Ellen Johnson Sirleaf. Earlier in her career, Kinder was a senior policy analyst at the Center for Global Development and directed the center's work on Pakistan. She co-authored the Center's best-selling book, "Millions Saved: Proven Successes in Global Health," which is required reading in more than 60 universities. She also served as director of agriculture and Europe policy at the ONE Campaign and as deputy director at the Clinton Global Initiative. Kinder started her career as a Jesuit Volunteer working with Oregon's homeless population and as an intern at Oxfam America.

Kinder served as a term member of the Council on Foreign Relations, is a Truman Security Fellow and was ranked in the "Top 99 under 33" in foreign policy by *Diplomatic Courier*. Her media appearances include *CNN*, *NPR*, *Al Jazeera*, *Voice of America*, *USA Today*, *TIME Magazine*, and *The Boston Globe*. She holds an MPA in international development from the Harvard Kennedy School and a bachelor of arts degree from the University of Notre Dame.

RACHEL KORBERG

ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION @RKorberg

Rachel Korberg (Bergenfield) is an associate director at The Rockefeller Foundation where she leads efforts to identify new, large-scale opportunities for impact. This early-stage ideas pipeline includes a global workshop series, big data and analytics work, and strategic advisory to the Foundation's executive leaders. She also co-lead exploratory work around the sharing economy and independent workforce in the U.S., managed grant making on financial inclusion and economic recovery in the aftermath of the Ebola outbreak in West Africa, and coordinates the LGBTQI staff group.

Korberg was previously vice president at Serengeti Capital, a venture capital and investment advisory firm focused on African markets. Earlier, she served both as an aid worker and in strategy, monitoring and evaluation roles with Innovations for Poverty Action, ACTED, USAID and National Democratic Institute (NDI). She has executive training in human-centered design from Stanford University and holds a master's degree in international relations from Yale University, where she was a research assistant to former World Bank President James Wolfensohn.

SHERRY LACHMAN

FOUNDER AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, FOSTER AMERICA @foster_america

Sherry Lachman is the founder and executive director of Foster America, a nonprofit that supports America's most vulnerable children by building a pipeline of leaders and innovators to transform the child welfare system.

Lachman has devoted her career to improving government systems to help disadvantaged children and families. She previously served as a domestic policy advisor to Vice President Joe Biden, a senior policy advisor at the Department of Education, a senior education counsel to Senator Al Franken, and an attorney at the Juvenile Law Center. Since founding Foster America, she has been recognized as a fellow in the Halcyon Incubator, senior fellow at the Taubman Center at the Harvard Kennedy School, and as Draper Richards Kaplan entrepreneur.

Lachman holds a bachelor's degree from the University of Pennsylvania, a master's degree in philosophy from the University of Cambridge, a doctorate of law from Columbia University School of Law, and a master's degree in public policy from the Harvard Kennedy School. Her commitment to child welfare stems from her experience in foster care as a child.

ANTHONY LAKE

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, UNICEF

Anthony Lake is the sixth executive director of the United Nations Children's Fund. Over a career spanning 45 years of public service, Lake has worked at the most senior levels of the U.S. government, including his tenure as national security adviser (1993-1997). He also served as the U.S. president's special envoy in Ethiopia, Eritrea and Haiti.

Lake's experience in international development began in the 1970s, as director of International Voluntary Services, one of the world's oldest peace organizations. He has also served on the board of directors of Save the Children and the Overseas Development Corporation. Over the past ten years, Lake has been an international adviser to the International Committee of the Red Cross, and chair of the Marshall Legacy Institute. From 1998 to 2007 he served on the board of the U.S. Fund for UNICEF, with a term as chair from 2004 to 2007, after which he was appointed a permanent honorary member.

PETER LAUGHARN

PRESIDENT AND CEO, CONRAD N. HILTON FOUNDATION @peter_laugharn

Peter Laugharn serves as president and CEO of the Conrad N. Hilton Foundation, a family foundation established in 1944 by the man who started Hilton Hotels. They provide funds to nonprofit organizations working to improve the lives of disadvantaged and vulnerable people throughout the world.

Laugharn is a passionate leader with 25 years of foundation and nonprofit experience internationally, with a focus on improving the well-being of vulnerable children. Previously, Laugharn was executive director of the Firelight Foundation, which identifies, funds and supports promising African nonprofits serving vulnerable children and families in the areas of education, resilience and health. Prior to Firelight,

Laugharn served as executive director of the Netherlands-based Bernard van Leer Foundation, whose mission is to improve opportunities for children up to age eight years old who are growing up in socially and economically difficult circumstances.

Laugharn began his career at Save the Children, where he worked in a variety of roles. A graduate of Stanford and Georgetown Universities, Laugharn holds a PhD in education from the University of London. He was a Peace Corps volunteer in Morocco from 1982 to 1984. He was a co-founder of the International Education Funders Group and the Coalition for Children Affected by AIDS, and is a member of the National Advisory Board of the Haas Center for Public Service at Stanford University.

MOSUN LAYODE

DIRECTOR, AFRICAN PHILANTHROPY FORUM @MosunLayode

Mosun Layode has more than 15 years of experience in international development and nonprofit leadership. She most recently served as the executive director of WIMBIZ (Women in Management, Business and Public Service), a leading nonprofit organization focused on elevating the status and influence of women and their contributions to nation building.

Prior to this, Layode was the executive director of LEAP Africa (Leadership, Effectiveness, Accountability, Professionalism) which is committed to inspiring and empowering a new cadre of African leaders.

Passionate about the interplay of social issues and business, Layode founded Social Runway, a nonprofit organization that supports social innovators. She also served as an independent development consultant for nonprofit organizations.

Layode studied urban and regional planning at the Federal University of Technology in Akure, Nigeria, and obtained an Master of Science degree in environmental resources management from Lagos State University. She holds an MBA from Lagos Business School and benefited from the executive programs offered by IESE Business School and Harvard Business School. Layode currently sits on nonprofit boards and is an alumnus of the United States International Visitors Leadership Program.

ERIC LIU

FOUNDER AND CEO, CITIZEN UNIVERSITY @ericpliu

Eric Liu is an author, educator and civic entrepreneur. He is the founder and CEO of Citizen University, which promotes and teaches the art of powerful citizenship through a portfolio of national programs, and is the executive director of the Aspen Institute Citizenship and American Identity Program. His books include the national bestsellers "The Gardens of Democracy," and "The True Patriot," co-authored with Nick Hanauer. Liu's most recent book is "A Chinaman's Chance," published in July, 2014. His first book, "The Accidental Asian: Notes of a Native Speaker," was a New York Times notable book featured in the PBS documentary "Matters of Race." His other books include "Guiding Lights: How to Mentor—and Find Life's Purpose," the official book of National Mentoring Month and "Imagination First," co-authored with Scott Noppe-Brandon of the Lincoln Center Institute, which explores ways to unlock imagination in education, politics, business and the arts.

Liu served as a White House speechwriter for President Bill Clinton and later as the president's deputy domestic policy adviser. After the White House, he was an executive at the digital media company RealNetworks. In 2002, he was named one of the World Economic Forum's Global Leaders of Tomorrow, and in 2010, he was awarded the Bill Grace Leadership Legacy Award by the Center for Ethical Leadership.

Liu lives in Seattle where he teaches civic leadership at the University of Washington and hosts *Citizen University TV*, an award-winning television program about civic power. In addition to speaking regularly at venues across the country, Liu also serves on numerous nonprofit and civic boards. He is the co-founder of the Washington Alliance for Gun Responsibility, and a board member of the Corporation for National and Community Service. He is a graduate of Yale College and Harvard Law School. A regular columnist for CNN.com and a correspondent for TheAtlantic.com, Liu can be found on Twitter @ericpliu.

JOAN LOMBARDI

SENIOR ADVISOR, BERNARD VAN LEER FOUNDATION @joan_lombardi

Joan Lombardi is an international expert on child development and social policy. She directs Early Opportunities LLC, focusing on innovation, policy and philanthropy. She currently serves as senior advisor to the Bernard van Leer Foundation on global child development strategies, as well as to a range of foundations on domestic early childhood issues including The Buffett Early Childhood Fund and the Pritzker Family Foundation. In 2017, she is serving as a senior fellow at the Center for the Study of Social Policy.

Over the past 45 years, Lombardi has made significant contributions in the areas of child and family policy as an innovative leader and policy advisor to national and international organizations and foundations, and as a public servant. She served in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services as the first deputy assistant secretary for early childhood development from 2009 to 2011 in the Obama administration, deputy assistant secretary for policy and external affairs in administration for children and families and the first commissioner of the Child Care Bureau among other positions from 1993 to 1998 during the Clinton administration. Outside of public service, she served as the founding chair of the Birth to Five Policy Alliance (now the Alliance for Early Success) and as the founder of Global Leaders for Young Children.

Lombardi is the author of numerous publications including "Time to Care: Redesigning Child Care to Promote Education, Support Families and Build Communities" and co-author of "Beacon of Hope: The Promise of Early Head Start for America's Youngest Children." She serves as the president of the board of Thousand Days, a member of the board of trustees of Save the Children and is on the executive committee of the Scientific Advisory Board for Grand Challenges Canada.

DAVID LUBELL

FOUNDER AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, WELCOMING AMERICA @dmlubell

David Lubell is the founder and executive director of Welcoming America, a nonprofit organization established in 2009 that helps communities in the U.S. and around the world reach their full potential by becoming welcoming to immigrants and

refugees. Welcoming America's unique expertise is in helping long-time residents of communities adjust to—and seize as an opportunity—demographic change caused by significant migrant in-flows.

Lubell's award-winning concept has gained recognition nationally and internationally. The Obama White House honored Welcoming America as a White House Champion of Change for innovations in immigrant integration. In 2014, the United Nations Alliance of Civilizations (UNAOC) and BMW Group distinguished Welcoming America as a recipient of their Intercultural Innovation Award. In 2016, he gave a TEDxBerlin Talk to highlight the importance of welcoming newcomers and received the Ohtli Award, one of the highest awards given by the Government of Mexico to those who work with the Mexican community abroad.

Lubell began his career as the advocacy and organizing director of Latino Memphis. He later founded and became executive director of the Tennessee Immigrant and Refugee Rights Coalition (TIRRC). He is a recipient of several social entrepreneurship fellowships, including those from Ashoka, Draper Richards Kaplan and Harvard. He is also a World Economic Forum Young Global Leader, and was named to the 2016 Chronicle of Philanthropy's 40 under 40 list.

A Wesleyan University graduate, Lubell holds a master's degree in public administration from the Harvard Kennedy School of Government and a certificate in nonprofit management from Georgetown University.

JACINTA MA

DIRECTOR OF POLICY AND ADVOCACY, NATIONAL IMMIGRATION FORUM @JacintaMa1

Jacinta Ma is the director of policy and advocacy at the National Immigration Forum. She helps to develop the forum's policy priorities and advocacy strategy for implementing these priorities. She has more than 20 years of experience in law, policy and civil rights.

Prior to the Forum, Ma was the deputy director at Asian Americans Advancing Justice (AAJC) where she oversaw a team of lawyers and other professionals working on civil rights issues that affected the Asian American community such as immigration and immigrant rights. Prior to working at AAJC, Ma was senior advisor to U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Commissioner Stuart J. Ishimaru where she advised the commissioner on matters involving employment discrimination and administrative law. Ma also served as senior policy advisor in the Office of First Lady Michelle Obama working on matters related to childhood obesity, mentoring and other priorities of the first lady. She has a wide-range of experience as a civil rights attorney on issues as diverse as voluntary desegregation in schools and transportation equity to litigating housing discrimination and bias-motivated threats or intimidation cases.

Ma received her JD from New York University School of Law and her Bachelor of Arts from the University of California, Berkeley.

ROBERT MALLEY

VICE PRESIDENT OF POLICY, INTERNATIONAL CRISIS GROUP @CrisisGroup

Robert Malley is the incoming vice president of policy for the International Crisis Group. Recently, he served as special assistant to President Barack Obama, senior advisor to the president for the Counter-ISIL campaign, and White House coordinator for the Middle East, North Africa and Gulf region in 2015 to 2016. Prior to that, he was senior director for the Gulf region and Syria. As the most senior White House official focused on the Middle East, Malley advised the president, secretary of state and national security advisor, coordinated government-wide efforts to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, and was the lead White House negotiator for the Iran nuclear deal as well as for international talks on the Syrian civil war, including negotiations with the Russian Federation. He also oversaw the National Security Council staff's work on the broad range of Middle East issues, from the Israeli-Palestinian conflict to relations with Gulf states. He earned the State Department's Distinguished Service Award in 2016.

Before joining the National Security Council staff in February 2014, Malley founded and directed the International Crisis Group's Middle East and North Africa program from January 2002. Prior to that, he was a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations.

Until January 2001, Malley was special assistant to President Clinton for Arab-Israeli affairs and director for Near East and South Asian affairs at the National Security Council. In this capacity, he served as a principal advisor to the president and the national security advisor at the White House on the Middle East peace process.

Malley first joined the National Security Council staff in August 1994 as director for democracy. He helped coordinate U.S. refugee policy and efforts to promote democracy and human rights abroad. He also played a leading role in U.S. policy toward Cuba. In July 1997, he became executive assistant to the national security advisor, acting as an informal chief of staff for Samuel R. Berger. Malley served as a law clerk to Justice Byron R. White of the United States Supreme Court from 1991 to 1992.

Malley is a graduate of Yale University, Harvard Law School and Oxford University, where he was a Rhodes Scholar. He is the author of "The Call from Algeria: Third Worldism, Revolution and the Turn to Islam" and, with Hussein Agha, of several articles, including "Camp David: The Tragedy of Errors," "The Last Negotiation," "Three Men in a Boat," " Hamas - The Perils of Power" and "The Arab Counter-Revolution." He has published articles in the *New York Review of Books*, *Foreign Affairs*, *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, *Le Monde* and several other publications.

GLENN MARTIN

FOUNDER AND PRESIDENT, JUSTLEADERSHIPUSA @glennEmartin

Glenn Martin is the president and founder of JustLeadershipUSA (JLUSA), an organization dedicated to cutting the U.S. correctional population in half by 2030. He is part of the vanguard of advocates working to make that future a reality. His goal is to amplify the voice of the people most impacted, and to position them as reform

leaders. At its core, JLUSA challenges the assumption that formerly incarcerated people lack the skills to thoughtfully weigh in on policy reform. Rather, JLUSA is based on the principle that people closest to the problem are also the people closest to its solution.

Martin speaks from personal experience, having spent six years incarcerated in a New York state prison in the early 1990s. That experience has informed his career, which has been recognized with honors such as the 2016 Robert F. Kennedy Human Rights Award and the 2014 Echoing Green Black Male Achievement Fellowship. Martin is also the founder of the #CLOSErikers campaign. Prior to founding JLUSA, he was the vice president of The Fortune Society, one of the most respected re-entry organizations in the country, the co-director of the National HIRE Network at the Legal Action Center, and one of the co-founders of the Education from the Inside Out Coalition. Martin's bold, unflinching leadership is recognized by leaders from across the political spectrum. Praise from Karol V. Mason, assistant attorney general for the Office of Justice Programs, is representative of the accolades he has received: "Thanks to you and so many others like you, we are on our way to restoring common sense to our corrections policies and correcting a terrible imbalance in this country."

Martin is a sought after public speaker and a frequent media guest appearing on national news outlets such as *NPR*, *MSNBC*, *Fox News*, *CNN*, *Al Jazeera* and *C-SPAN*.

VIVEK MARU

FOUNDER AND CEO, NAMATI @VivekHMaru

Vivek Maru, founder and CEO of Namati, created the organization in 2011 to support the movement for legal empowerment around the world. Namati and its partners have built cadres of grassroots legal advocates, also known as community paralegals, in ten countries. These advocates have worked with more than 40,000 people to protect community lands, enforce environmental law and secure basic rights to healthcare and citizenship.

Namati convenes the global legal empowerment network, a community of more than 800 legal empowerment organizations from 150 countries that are collaborating on common challenges and learning from one another. This community successfully advocated for inclusion of access to justice in the new global development framework, the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals.

From 2003 to 2007, Maru co-founded and co-directed the Sierra Leonean organization Timap for Justice, which has been recognized as a pioneering model for delivering justice services in the context of a weak state and a plural legal system. From 2007 to 2011, he served as senior counsel in the Justice Reform Group of the World Bank.

Maru was named an Ashoka Fellow in 2014 and a "legal rebel" by the American Bar Association in 2015. In 2016, Maru, Namati, and the Global Legal Empowerment Network received the Skoll Award for social entrepreneurship.

Vivek graduated from Harvard College, magna cum laude, and Yale Law School. He writes regularly in academic journals and in the press. He also directs the Legal Empowerment Leadership Course at Central European University.

DYLAN MATTHEWS

JOURNALIST, VOX @dylanmatt

Dylan Matthews is a senior correspondent at Vox. He covers domestic, economic and tax policy, developments in political science and economics, and philanthropy, with a particular focus on global poverty, effective altruism and the cash revolution in development. His recent projects include a history and evaluation of the legacy of the 1996 welfare reform, an assessment of the effectiveness of the Clinton Foundation's efforts to reduce HIV and AIDS drug prices, and a profile of GiveDirectly's basic income experiment in Kenya.

PATRICK MCCARTHY

PRESIDENT AND CEO, THE ANNIE E. CASEY FOUNDATION @AECFNews

Patrick McCarthy is the president and CEO of the Annie E. Casey Foundation, a private philanthropy dedicated to building a brighter future for children, families and communities in the United States. Throughout his career, he has focused on reforming the public systems that serve families facing significant barriers such as closing youth prisons and creating economically inclusive, family-supporting communities.

McCarthy is co-chair of Baltimore's Promise, serves on the executive committees for Living Cities and East Baltimore Development Inc., and on the boards of Community Wealth Partners, the Foundation Center and Bryn Mawr College.

Prior to becoming president and CEO, McCarthy was the foundation's senior vice president, overseeing work in the areas of health, juvenile justice, education, early childhood, youth development, child welfare and income security.

McCarthy holds a PhD in social policy from the Bryn Mawr College Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research and an honorary Doctor of Laws degree from Montclair State University.

FELIPE MEDINA

CHAIRMAN, TRANSFORMING PHILANTHROPY INITIATIVE @GIVETOCOLOMBIA

Felipe Medina leads the Transforming Philanthropy Initiative, which creates a community of strategic philanthropists to facilitate collaboration and exchanges of best practices and lessons learned with the objective of increasing volume of effective social investments in Latin America. Medina spends 25 percent of his time analyzing and researching philanthropy and social investment trends. He is particularly interested in studying projects that generate sustainable development in Latin America. His focus is on the obstacles that exist in creating a culture of philanthropy in Latin America and the motivations for U.S. based philanthropists to get involved in international philanthropy.

Medina is chairman of the board of directors of Give to Colombia and Enseña por Colombia, and serves on the board of advisors of Lumni and LeapFrog Investments. He is a member of the steering groups for both the Global Philanthropy Forum and the Philanthropy Center at the Adolfo Ibañez University. Medina is also a member of the Global Advisory Council of Acumen and Teach for All. He is the chair of the board of directors of L'Atelier, a Reggio Emilia inspired pre-school that he founded with his wife Simonetta. L'Atelier is working with several organizations to establish Reggio Emilia inspired early education centers.

Medina began his career at Goldman Sachs in 1990, managing assets for Latin American clients. Between 2000 and 2003, he was the regional director for Latin America's private wealth management. Currently, Medina manages relationships with some of the most influential families and individuals in the region. He is a member of the Private Wealth Philanthropy Advisory Committee of Goldman Sachs.

Medina holds an MBA from Harvard Business School and a Bachelor of Science in economics and civil engineering from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

LAURIE MICHAELS

FOUNDER, OPEN ROAD ALLIANCE @OpenRoadTweets

Laurie Michaels is an individual philanthropist based in Aspen, Colorado, and founder of Open Road Alliance, a private philanthropic fund. Prior to establishing the organization, she maintained a practice in clinical psychology.

Through Open Road Alliance, Michaels and her team make charitable and recoverable grants to nonprofits in need of contingency funds. Her experience has led her to actively advocate for change within the philanthropic sector by highlighting the need for better risk management in grant making. She is a contributor to *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, *Stanford Social Innovation Review (SSIR)*, and *Forbes*, as well as a speaker at forums such as Fail Forward, Clinton Global Initiative, GEO, Council on Foundations and Global Philanthropy Forum.

Michaels currently serves on the board of directors for PATH and Search for Common Ground. She served on the board of the Aspen Community Foundation for 12 years and had been board chair for four years ending in 2013.

Michaels earned a Bachelor of Arts from Williams College and holds a PhD in counseling psychology from Colorado State University.

CAROLYN MILES

PRESIDENT AND CEO, SAVE THE CHILDREN @carolynsave

Carolyn Miles is president and CEO of Save the Children, an organization that gives children in the United States and around the world a healthy start, the opportunity to learn and protection from harm. The global Save the Children movement currently serves over 185 million children in the U.S. and in more than 120 countries.

Miles joined the organization in 1998, served as its chief operating officer from 2004 to 2011, and became president and CEO in September 2011. Under her senior leadership, the organization has more than doubled the number of children it reaches with nutrition, health, education and other programs. Resources were just under \$700 million in 2015. Miles' signature issues include hunger, learning outcomes and ending preventable child deaths.

Prior to Save the Children, she worked in the private sector in Hong Kong for American Express and as an entrepreneur. While in Asia, she confronted the deprivation of the region's children, which motivated her to dedicate her life to their welfare.

Miles has served on numerous boards, including Blackbaud, InterAction, USGLC, MFAN, Academy of Education, Arts and Sciences, and the University of Virginia's Darden School of Business, where she received her MBA. In 2015, Miles was named one of the 50 World's Greatest Leaders by *Fortune* magazine and inducted into the Connecticut Women's Hall of Fame. She is married with three children.

DAVID MILIBAND

PRESIDENT AND CEO, INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE @DMiliband

David Miliband is the president and CEO of the International Rescue Committee (IRC). He oversees the agency's relief and development operations in more than 30 countries, its refugee resettlement and assistance programs throughout the United States and the IRC's advocacy efforts in Washington and other capitals on behalf of the world's most vulnerable people.

Miliband had a distinguished political career in the United Kingdom more than 15 years. From 2007 to 2010, he served as the youngest foreign secretary in three decades, driving advancements in human rights and representing the United Kingdom throughout the world. As secretary of state for the environment in 2005 to 2006, he pioneered the world's first legally binding emissions reduction requirements. His accomplishments have earned him a reputation, in former President Bill Clinton's words, as "one of the ablest, most creative public servants of our time".

Earlier, Miliband was minister for schools (2002–2004); and head of Downing Street's Number 10 Policy Unit (1997–2001). He has also been a member of Parliament representing South Shields. He was co-chair of the Global Ocean Commission from 2012 to 2016.

Miliband graduated from Oxford University in 1987 with a first class degree in philosophy, politics and economics, and received his master's degree in political science in 1989 from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, which he attended as a Kennedy Scholar. He is married to violinist Louise Shackelton and they have two sons.

Miliband's parents were refugees from Belgium and Poland to the U.K. in the 1940s. As the son of refugees, he brings a personal commitment to the IRC's work.

LUIS ALBERTO MORENO

PRESIDENT, INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK (IDB) @MorenoBID

Luis Alberto Moreno is president of the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB). As president, he also chairs the board of executive directors of the Inter-American Investment Corporation (IIC) and the donors' committee of the Multilateral Investment Fund (MIF). The IDB works to improve lives in Latin America and the Caribbean. Through financial and technical support for countries working to reduce poverty and inequality, it helps to improve health and education, and to advance infrastructure.

During Moreno's tenure, the IDB has undergone a profound transformation of its organization, a significant generational change and a record increase of women in leadership positions at the institution. Among the principal achievements under Moreno's leadership is the Ninth General Capital Increase in 2010, which represented an expansion of financing and technical assistance to the region, and allowed for a historical financial program to Haiti of more than \$2 billion. This higher level of contribution to Latin American and the Caribbean economies was accompanied by an improved framework for the monitoring and evaluation of development effectiveness, the establishment of the first Environmental Safeguards Unit in a multilateral development bank and the implementation of an operational policy for gender equality.

Before joining the Bank, Moreno served as Colombia's ambassador to the United States for seven years. Diplomatic relations between Washington, DC, and Bogotá strengthened notably during his tenure, leading to substantial bilateral assistance programs that supported a major transformation in security and economic development in Colombia. His major achievements, among others, include his work in the design and approval of the Plan Colombia, an ambitious program for the fight against drugs and for the social and economic revival of the country, the renewal and extension of tariff preferences of the ATPA (Andean Trade Preference Act,) and his performance as one of the main drivers of the negotiations for the Treaty on free trade between Colombia and the United States.

In his country, Moreno had a distinguished career in the public and private sectors. He served as the minister of economic development, from which he prompted a prominent agenda to improve efficiency and competitiveness. Moreno was president of the Instituto de Fomento Industrial, and manager of social investment policies, including the housing strategy for low-income families. In the private sector, he advised major Colombian companies and foreign investors, and was an executive producer of a leading television news program.

Moreno holds a degree in business administration and economics from Florida Atlantic University and an MBA from the Thunderbird School of Global Management. For his achievements in the field of journalism, Harvard University awarded him a Neiman Fellowship in 1990 to pursue specialized studies and research at that institution. Moreno also holds the honorary degrees of *humaniorum litterarum doctorem*, and *doctorem in letters* from Georgetown University and Baruch College, respectively, and a *honoris causa* in business administration from Icesi University.

ALAA MURABIT

SDG GLOBAL ADVOCATE AND HIGH-LEVEL COMMISSIONER, THE UNITED NATIONS @almmura

Alaa Murabit is a physician and a UN high-level commissioner for health employment and economic growth, one of only 17 Sustainable Development Goal global advocates appointed by the UN secretary general. She is also a MIT Media Lab Director's Fellow. She was recently named a 2017 *Forbes* 30 Under 30 for her work in global health policy. Her TED Talk, "What My Religion Really Says About Women" was "TED Talk of the Day" and one of four "moving TED Talks to watch right now" by *The New York Times*.

Murabit completed high school at the age of 15 and moved from Saskatoon, Canada, to Libya, where she completed medical school. Driven by her desire to create inclusive processes and institutions, she founded The Voice of Libyan Women (VLW), an advocacy group for women, in 2011 at the age of 21. With a strong focus on challenging societal and cultural norms and utilizing traditional and historical role models, Murabit champions women's participation in peace processes and conflict mediation. Her programs, such as the groundbreaking Noor Campaign, have been replicated internationally.

Nicknamed "The Libyan Doogie Howser" by Jon Stewart and applauded for her innovative and inclusive approach to security, Murabit is a champion for inclusive peace processes, and acts as advisor to numerous international security boards,

governments and organizations, serving as a board trustee for International Alert and Keeping Children Safe.

An Ashoka fellow, Murabit is the youngest Marisa Bellisario International Humanitarian Award recipient, *The New York Times* International TrustWomen Hero 2014, Newsweek's 25 under 25 to watch, a BBC 100 Top Woman and SAFE Global Hero.

Murabit received her medical degree from the University of Zawia then went on to receive a master's degree in international strategy and diplomacy with distinction from the London School of Economics.

SANAM NARAGHI-ANDERLINI

CO-FOUNDER AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, INTERNATIONAL CIVIL SOCIETY ACTION NETWORK (ICAN) @sanambna

Sanam Naraghi-Anderlini is the co-founder and executive director of the International Civil Society Action Network (ICAN), a U.S. based nonprofit whose mission is to support civil society activism in promoting women's rights, peace and human security, and which spearheads the Women's Alliance for Security Leadership (WASL). Naraghi-Anderlini established the Inclusive Challenge Fund (ICF), an independent grant-making mechanism, to support women-led organizations in preventing extremism and promoting rights, peace and pluralism in crisis affected countries.

In 2011, Naraghi-Anderlini was the first senior expert on gender and inclusion on the UN's Mediation Standby Team. For more than two decades she has been a leading international peace strategist, providing guidance and training to UN agencies, governments and NGOs worldwide, and leading assessments including in Maoist cantonments in Nepal. In 2000, she was among the civil society drafters of UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on women, peace and security.

Between 2002 and 2005, as director of the Women Waging Peace Policy Commission, Naraghi-Anderlini led ground breaking field research on women's contributions to conflict prevention, security and peacemaking in 12 countries. Between 2008 and 2010, she led UNDP's ten-country action research on men in crisis settings. She has served on the advisory board of the UN Democracy Fund (UNDEF), and was appointed to the Civil Society Advisory Group (CSAG) on Resolution 1325, chaired by Mary Robinson in 2010. Since 2013, she has served on the working group on gender and inclusion of the Sustainable Development Network.

Naraghi-Anderlini is an adjunct professor at Georgetown University, and was a research associate and senior fellow at the MIT Center for International Studies between 2004 and 2015. She has published extensively on peace and security issues, including "Women Building Peace: What They Do, Why It Matters" (Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2007). She was the 2014 recipient of the UN Association of the National Capital Area Perdita Huston Award for human rights and the 2016 Greeley Peace Scholar at the University of Massachusetts. She holds a Master of Philosophy degree in social anthropology from Cambridge University. Iranian by birth, she is a U.K. citizen, and has twin daughters.

DEOGRATIAS NIYIZONKIZA

FOUNDER AND CEO, VILLAGE HEALTH WORKS @VHW

Deogratias "Deo" Niyizonkiza, Village Health Works (VHW)'s visionary founder and CEO, is a leading advocate for the most impoverished people in the world. His compassion, expertise and life experience have made him a key voice in global health and international development.

An American citizen, Niyizonkiza was born in rural Burundi, where he attended grade school and part of medical school. He eventually left the country during the catastrophic war that lasted more than a decade and took the lives of hundreds of thousands of people. He survived not only this man-made tragedy and poverty but also homelessness in New York City.

Niyizonkiza's life journey is told in Pulitzer Prize-winner Tracy Kidder's most recent work, *Strength in What Remains*, a *New York Times* best seller named one of the best books of the year by *The Washington Post*, *The San Francisco Chronicle*, *The Los Angeles Times* and *The Chicago Tribune*.

Despite the hurdles—homelessness, illness and low-paying work as a grocery store delivery boy—Niyizonkiza eventually enrolled at Columbia University, where he received a bachelor's degree in biochemistry and philosophy. After graduating from Columbia, he attended the Harvard School of Public Health, where he met Dr. Paul Farmer and began working at the medical non-profit organization Partners In Health. He left Partners In Health to continue his medical education at Dartmouth Medical School.

In 2005, with his unwavering conviction that humanity's progress should be in how we value and honor the dignity of others, including those a world away, Niyizonkiza traveled back to Burundi to establish Village Health Works in the remote village of Kigutu. His goal was to remove barriers to human dignity and progress by creating a healthcare system model in Burundi, an East-African country which is one of the poorest on the planet. Deo's passion rallied his native community of Kigutu into action. Thanks to community-donated land, a small amount of seed money from American fellow students and supporters, a community of compassionate volunteers and Deo's leadership, the health center opened in December 2007. Niyizonkiza's success in building an entirely community-driven health and development organization is unprecedented and makes Village Health Works unique among NGOs.

A frequent lecturer on global health, Deo is the recipient of multiple awards, including the 2014 Wheaton College Otis Social Justice Award, the 2014 Dalai Lama Unsung Hero of Compassion Award, the 2013 People to People International's Eisenhower Medallion Award, a 2013 honorary degree from Williams College, the 2011 International Medal Award of St. John's University and the 2010 Women Refugee Commission's Voices of Courage Award.

MANIZA NTEKIM

SENIOR PROGRAM OFFICER, EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAM, OPEN SOCIETY FOUNDATION @OpenSociety

Maniza Ntekim is a senior program officer for the Open Society Foundations' Early Childhood Program (ECP). She leads projects on ECP's global advocacy work as well as its work on early childhood development in Africa.

Ntekim has worked in the education and international development field for several different organizations. She taught in Rwanda before joining UNICEF Rwanda as its acting chief of education and education specialist where she oversaw UNICEF's education programs. She also co-chaired the Education Development Partners' Group and the One UN Education Working Group. In Tanzania, Ntekim worked for UNICEF Tanzania as the education specialist, managing UNICEF's integrated Early Childhood Program and its in-service education and training program for pre-primary and primary school teachers. Ntekim has worked as a consultant for UNESCO and for bilateral aid agencies including the U.K. Department for International Development, the Japan International Cooperation Agency and Save the Children U.K., covering all sub-sectors of education from pre-primary education to higher education.

Ntekim joined Open Society in March 2015 after working for the Children's Investment Fund Foundation as an education manager. She started her career as a policy advisor at the Confederation of British Industry working on learning and skills for employability. Before leaving for Rwanda, she worked for Amnesty International U.K. with responsibility for leading its lobbying of U.K. parliamentarians, ministers and civil servants on human rights.

SIMI NWOGUGU

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT NIGERIA @JANigeria

Simi Nwogugu is the executive director of Junior Achievement Nigeria (JAN), a member of Junior Achievement Worldwide, which is the world's largest and fastest-growing nonprofit economic education organization that empowers young people to own their economic success. Nwogugu brought Junior Achievement to Nigeria in 1999, after she served as a volunteer in New York and realized that the entrepreneurial training programs were exactly what the large unemployed youth population in Nigeria needed.

Nwogugu started her career as an investment banker at Goldman Sachs after studying economics and English at Mount Holyoke College. After setting up and running JAN for three years, she left to pursue an MBA at Harvard Business School, after which she worked at MTV Networks for a few years before launching HOD Consulting, Inc., a New York-based leadership development firm that helps organizations retain and advance high-performing women, particularly women of color.

Nwogugu and her contribution to work-life management in the United States, youth empowerment in Nigeria and her own personal struggles to balance work, family and social responsibility, are the subject of a Harvard Business School case study titled, "An Entrepreneur's Journey: Simi Nwogugu." After a decade of entrepreneurship, Nwogugu returned to her role as executive director of JAN in 2016, to help the organization expand its economic empowerment programs to young people in the North, especially those displaced by the Boko Haram crisis. Junior Achievement

Nigeria has reached over 670,000 in- and out-of-school youth in over 29 cities across Nigeria, and some of its alumni are successful business leaders and social entrepreneurs who volunteer their time and resources to ensure JAN's sustainability.

Nwogugu sits on the advisory council of the African Capital Alliance Foundation and is a member of the Global Advisory Committee for Teach For All. She is married with three children.

DELE OLOJEDE

FOUNDER, TIMBUKTU MEDIA @DeleOlojede

Dele Olojede, a writer, publisher and editor, is the first African to win the Pulitzer Prize. During his 35-year career in newspaper media, Olojede has reported and written from more than 50 countries on four continents, covering dictators, warlords, musicians, genocides, hopeful elections, famines and historic figures, including Nelson Mandela. He was the publisher of *NEXT* newspapers in his native Nigeria which, for an exhilarating five years in the mid-2000s, sought to demonstrate the centrality of an incorruptible media to a democratic society beset by rapacious elites. He won the McNulty Prize in 2011 for his vision and efforts in creating *NEXT*.

Olojede received the 2010 prize for Ethical Business Leadership from the GlobalForum for Ethics in Business. In 2009, he was awarded the Distinguished Alumni Prize of Columbia University, where he earned a master's degree in journalism nearly 30 years ago. He studied at the University of Lagos and is a fellow of the Aspen GlobalLeadership Network.

Olojede is currently building a platform for long-form writing about the African world. He is married to Amma Ogan, a former newspaper editor and columnist, and they have two young adult daughters.

RAJESH PANJABI

CO-FOUNDER AND CEO, LAST MILE HEALTH @rajpanjabi

Rajesh Panjabi is CEO of Last Mile Health and associate physician in the division of Global Health Equity at Brigham and Women's Hospital and Harvard Medical School. At age nine, Panjabi escaped a civil war in his home country of Liberia. He returned as a 24-year-old medical student and co-founded Last Mile Health.

Last Mile Health saves lives in the world's most remote communities by partnering with governments to design, scale and advocate for national networks of community health professionals. Last Mile Health's work has been published in *The Lancet*, the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, and *PLOS Medicine*, as well as featured by *TIME* magazine, *Fortune* magazine, *Forbes* magazine, *The Wall Street Journal*, *NPR*, and *The New York Times*. In 2016, *TIME* named Panjabi on its annual list of the 100 Most Influential People in the World, with a tribute from President Bill Clinton. In 2015, *Fortune* named him one of the World's 50 Greatest Leaders. Panjabi is a Forbes 400 Philanthropy Fellow, a Draper Richards Kaplan Foundation Social Entrepreneur and an Echoing Green Fellow. He is a recipient of the 2017 TED Prize, Clinton Global Citizen Award and the Global Citizen Movement Award.

Panjabi is a graduate of the University of North Carolina School of Medicine, holds a master's degree in public health from the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, and was a Clinical Fellow at Harvard Medical School and Massachusetts General Hospital.

JUAN CARLOS PINZÓN

AMBASSADOR OF COLOMBIA TO THE UNITED STATES @ColAmbPinzon

Juan Carlos Pinzón is the Colombian ambassador to the United States. Throughout his career, Pinzón has been a leader in both the public and private sectors. Most recently, Pinzón served as the minister of defense of Colombia for nearly four years. Under his leadership, the armed forces dealt the most severe blows to terrorist organizations—FARC and ELN—and Criminal Bands, highly degrading their capabilities, structure and leadership, which was critical to President Santos' peace strategy. This resulted in improved security conditions throughout the country and the lowest homicide rate in 35 years. During his tenure, the armed forces' equipment and training was modernized, the welfare of the men and women in uniform and their families was improved, and a transformation plan for the next 20 years was designed. Colombia also became an exporter of security expertise, aiding more than 60 nations.

Prior to serving as defense minister, Pinzón was chief of staff to President Juan Manuel Santos (2010–2011) and vice minister of defense (2006–2009). In 2011, the World Economic Forum selected him as a Young Global Leader. In addition to his longstanding dedication to advancing national and regional defense issues in Colombia, he has specialized in economics, public policy and strategic studies. He has also held positions such as senior advisor to the executive director of the World Bank, vice president of the Colombian Banking Association, assistant vice president of investment banking at Citibank, private secretary and chief of staff for the Ministry of Finance and an economist for Colombia at Citigroup.

Pinzón taught economics at the Pontificia Universidad Javeriana and the Universidad de Los Andes. A native of Bogotá, Colombia, Pinzón received an honorable mention for his outstanding academic performance while earning a Bachelor of Science degree in economics. He holds a Master of Science in economics from the Pontificia Universidad Javeriana in Bogotá, and he was awarded a scholarship to receive his master's degree in public policy from Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs. Pinzón also completed advanced courses in international relations and strategic studies at Johns Hopkins University, and in science and technology at Harvard University.

Pinzón is married to Pilar Lozano and has two children, Natalia and Juan Pablo.

SANJAY PRADHAN

CEO, OPEN GOVERNMENT PARTNERSHIP @SPradhanOGP

Sanjay Pradhan is the CEO of the Open Government Partnership, a multilateral initiative that aims to secure concrete commitments from governments to promote transparency, empower citizens, fight corruption and harness new technologies to strengthen governance. He joined the organization in May 2016.

Bringing a wealth of open government and innovation experience to the role, he previously served in three senior positions at the World Bank: vice president for leadership, learning and innovation; vice president of the World Bank Institute; and director for governance. While at the World Bank, Pradhan tirelessly promoted open development. He led the World Bank Group's governance and anticorruption strategy, launched the Global Partnership for Social Accountability, incubated ICT-mediated

citizen feedback to improve governance, initiated open contracting with partners, and rolled out a flagship collaborative leadership for development program to help government and civil society leaders undertake collaborative actions. During his tenure at the World Bank, Pradhan gained extensive experience working in Africa, South Asia, Europe and Central Asia.

Pradhan is a global spokesperson and distinguished speaker on open governance and anticorruption issues, appearing in major world forums including the European Parliament, the BBC World Debate and the TED Global Conference. He has published widely, and was a principal author of the 1997 World Development Report, "The State in a Changing World." He holds a doctorate of philosophy and a bachelor's degree from Harvard University.

JOHN PRENDERGAST

FOUNDING DIRECTOR, ENOUGH PROJECT @EnoughProject

John Prendergast is a human rights activist and a best-selling author who has focused on peace in Africa for more than 30 years. He is the founding director of the Enough Project, an initiative to end genocide and crimes against humanity. Along with American actor, filmmaker and activist George Clooney, he co-founded The Sentry, a new investigative initiative focused on dismantling the networks financing conflict and atrocities.

Prendergast has worked in the White House for the Clinton administration, the U.S. State Department, two members of U.S. Congress, the National Intelligence Council, UNICEF, Human Rights Watch, the International Crisis Group and the United States Institute of Peace (USIP). He has been a Big Brother (Big Brothers Big Sisters of America) for three decades as well as a youth counselor and a basketball coach. He is the author and co-author of ten books.

Prendergast also co-founded the Satellite Sentinel Project which uses satellite imagery to spotlight mass atrocities. With star players from the National Basketball Association, Prendergast launched the Darfur Dream Team Sister Schools Program to fund schools in Darfuri refugee camps. He also created Enough Project's Raise Hope for Congo Campaign which highlights the issue of conflict minerals, and its student arm the Conflict-Free Campus Initiative.

Prendergast has appeared in four episodes of *60 Minutes*, for which the team won an Emmy award, and helped create African stories for two episodes of "Law and Order: Special Victims Unit." He has traveled to Africa with NBC's "Dateline," ABC's "Nightline," PBS' "NewsHour," CNN's "Inside Africa," *Newsweek* and *The Daily Beast*. He also appears in the motion picture "The Good Lie," starring Reese Witherspoon and Emmanuel Jal, as well as documentary films such as "Merci Congo" "When Elephants Fight," "Blood in the Mobile," "Sand and Sorrow," "Darfur Now," "3 Points" and "War Child."

Prendergast also runs Not On Our Watch, an organization founded by Matt Damon, Don Cheadle, Brad Pitt and George Clooney that develops projects and campaigns bringing global attention to forgotten international crises. He has been awarded six honorary doctorates and has been a visiting professor at Yale Law School, Stanford University, Columbia University, Dartmouth College, Duke University and others.

BEN RATTRAY

FOUNDER AND CEO, CHANGE.ORG @brattray

Ben Rattray is the founder and CEO of Change.org, the world's largest platform for social change with more than 170 million users. Rattray has been named one of Time's 100 most influential people in the world, *Fortune's* 40 Under 40 rising young business leaders, and *Fast Company's* most creative people in business. He is a thought leader on the intersection of technology, business and social change. He has been profiled in dozens of news outlets including *The New York Times*, *NPR*, *The Washington Post*, and *CNN*. He is a graduate of Stanford University and the London School of Economics.

PETER ROBERTSON

CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF TRUSTEES, WORLD AFFAIRS @worldaffairs

Peter Robertson was vice chairman of the Board for Chevron Corporation, one of the world's largest energy companies, for seven years until April 1, 2009. He joined Chevron in 1973 and over his 36 year career he had a wide variety of responsibilities including the direction of Chevron's worldwide exploration and production and global gas businesses, corporate strategic planning and corporate policy, government and public affairs. He is a senior independent advisor at Deloitte LLP, a non-executive director of Jacobs Engineering Group and Sasol Limited and an advisory director of Campbell-Lutyens.

He is co-chairman of the US Saudi Arabian Business Council, chairman of the World Affairs Council of Northern California and a member of the International House Board at UC Berkeley. He is a past chairman of the US Energy Association. A native of Edinburgh, Scotland, he holds a bachelor's degree in Mechanical Engineering from Edinburgh University and an MBA from the University of Pennsylvania, Wharton School, where he was a Thouron Scholar.

TINA ROSENBERG

CO-FOUNDER, SOLUTIONS JOURNALISM NETWORK @tirosenberg

Tina Rosenberg is a Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist and author. She co-authors the "Fixes" column in *The New York Times* which looks at responses to social problems—what works, and why?—and is a co-founder of the Solutions Journalism Network, a nonprofit organization that seeks to help other journalists interested in doing solutions journalism.

She is a former editorial writer for *The New York Times* and a contributing writer for *The New York Times Magazine*. Her books include "Children of Cain: Violence and the Violent in Latin America," "The Haunted Land: Facing Europe's Ghosts After Communism" and *Join the Club: How Peer Pressure can Transform the World*, which won the Pulitzer Prize and National Book Award. She has written for dozens of magazines, including *The New Yorker*, *Rolling Stone*, *Foreign Policy* and *The Atlantic*, and has won a MacArthur Fellowship. She lives in New York City with her family.

MALIKA SAADA SAAR

SENIOR COUNSEL ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS, GOOGLE @MalikaSaadaSaar

Malika Saada Saar is Google's senior counsel on civil and human rights. Before joining Google, she was founder and executive director of the Human Rights Project for Girls (Rights4Girls), a human rights organization focused on gender-based violence against young women and girls in the U.S. Saar also served as special counsel on human rights at The Raben Group.

As a human rights lawyer and advocate, Saar led the effort to shut down Craigslist sex ads that served as the leading site for the trafficking of children for sex, ended the federal practice of shackling pregnant mothers behind bars in U.S. prisons, and successfully advocated for millions in federal funding for treatment services for at-risk families. *Newsweek* and *The Daily Beast* have named Saar as one of "150 Women Who Shake the World."

The Obama White House selected Saar to serve on the Presidential Advisory Council on HIV/AIDS. She also serves on the board of directors for the Robert F. Kennedy Center for Human Rights.

Saar has been featured in *The Daily Beast*, *Huffington Post*, *O: The Oprah Magazine*, *Newsweek*, *Politico*, *The Washington Post*, *San Francisco Chronicle*, *USA Today*, *Elle*, *Redbook Magazine*, *Essence*, *The Tavis Smiley Show*, *BBC*, *ABC News*, *Good Morning America*, *CNN* and *National Public Radio*. She has been honored by Brown University's highest alumni award, the Roger Williams Award, and by Georgetown Law Center's esteemed Robert F. Drinan award for public service.

Saar holds a Bachelor of Arts from Brown University, a Master of Arts in education from Stanford University, and a JD from Georgetown University Law Center. She lives in Washington, DC, with her husband and three children.

HRH PRINCESS LAMIA AL SAUD

SECRETARY GENERAL, ALWALEED PHILANTHROPIES @alwaleed_philan

HRH Princess Lamia Al Saud is the secretary general and member of the board of trustees at Alwaleed Philanthropies. For more than 37 years, Alwaleed Philanthropies has supported and initiated projects in over 124 countries regardless of gender, race or religion. The foundation collaborates with a range of philanthropic, government and educational organizations to combat poverty, empower women and youth, develop communities, provide disaster relief and create cultural understanding through education. Working with its partners, Alwaleed Philanthropies seeks to build bridges for a more compassionate, tolerant and accepting world.

Princess Lamia was appointed secretary general in April 2016, having previously served as executive manager of media and communication at the foundation. She is the daughter of Prince Majed bin Saud, the son of King Saud bin Abdulaziz Al Saud.

In 2010, Princess Lamia published her first novel, "Children & Blood," through Dar Al Saqi, one of the most respected independent publishing companies in the Middle East. The book tackles the complex issue of honor killings, and reflects on the harsh realities with which women in the Middle East are faced. In 2003, she started the

publishing company Sada Al Arab. The company produced three magazines and operated from Cairo, Beirut and Dubai. She also became a partner in a number of marketing companies based in Egypt, Lebanon and Saudi Arabia in 2006.

Princess Lamia earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in 2001 from Misr International University, Cairo, majoring in public relations and marketing advertising with a minor in journalism.

SAM SCHAEFFER

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND CEO, CENTER FOR EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES @samjschaeffer

Sam Schaeffer is the executive director and CEO of the Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO), a New York-based nonprofit that provides employment services to men and women with criminal convictions. CEO was created by the Vera Institute of Justice in the late 1970s and has been operating as an independent organization since 1996. Schaeffer joined CEO in 2009 to replicate the program in jurisdictions beyond New York City. During his tenure, CEO has expanded to 13 cities across California, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania and New York.

Prior to joining CEO, Schaeffer served as director of economic development for U.S. Senator Charles E. Schumer of New York. In that position, he oversaw all job creation and retention efforts, transportation, and infrastructure policy as well as social policy. Schaeffer graduated with a Bachelor of Arts degree from Reed College, Phi Beta Kappa.

CHARLES SENNOTT

FOUNDER AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, THE GROUNDTRUTH PROJECT @CMSennott

Charles Sennott is the founder and executive director of The GroundTruth Project, a nonprofit media organization based at the Public Broadcasting Service's flagship station, WGBH in Boston. An award-winning foreign correspondent, author, editor and entrepreneur, Sennott has reported on the front lines of wars and insurgencies in at least 15 countries.

Sennott's experience reporting internationally led him to launch The GroundTruth Project in 2014. He is dedicated to training the next generation of international journalists for the digital age. He is also co-founder and executive editor of GlobalPost, an award-winning news website which merged with PRI's "The World" in 2015, which is also based at WGBH.

Sennott was named a leading social entrepreneur by Draper Richards Kaplan, a Menlo Park, California, based venture philanthropy firm, which has added GroundTruth to its investment portfolio. Sennott served as the Boston Globe's Middle East bureau chief based in Jerusalem from 1997 to 2001 and as Europe bureau chief based in London from 2001 to 2005. He is the author of two books, "The Body and The Blood" and "Broken Covenant." He is a graduate of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, and of Columbia University's Graduate School of Journalism where he completed the one-year Sulzberger Executive Leadership Program.

RAJIV SHAH

PRESIDENT, ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION @RockefellerFdn

Rajiv Shah, president of The Rockefeller Foundation, brings more than 20 years of experience in business, government and philanthropy to the foundation. Appointed as USAID administrator by President Obama in 2009, and unanimously confirmed by the Senate, Shah was charged with reshaping the \$20 billion agency's operations to provide greater assistance to pressing development challenges around the globe. By elevating the importance of innovation, promoting public-private partnerships, rethinking internal practices and shifting how dollars were spent to deliver stronger results, Shah secured bipartisan support that enabled USAID to dramatically accelerate its work to end extreme poverty. Despite partisan gridlock on many issues, two significant presidential priorities—Feed the Future and Power Africa—passed the House and Senate with bipartisan support and were signed into law by President Obama, and the Global Food Security Act is the second largest global development legislation after PEPFAR. Shah's work delivered results for countries facing democratic transitions, post-conflict situations and humanitarian crises. He is widely credited with providing life-saving access to food, health and water for millions of children across the planet.

When Shah left USAID in 2015, he continued to follow his passion for creating opportunities for communities to thrive in the developing world by founding Latitude Capital, a private equity firm focused on power and infrastructure projects in Africa and Asia. He was also appointed a Distinguished Fellow in Residence at Georgetown University.

Prior to his appointment at USAID, Shah served as chief scientist and undersecretary for research, education and economics at the United States Department of Agriculture. He also served in a number of leadership roles at the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. There, he helped launch the Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (a joint venture by the Gates and Rockefeller foundations), the International Financing Facility for Immunization (credited with raising more than \$5 billion for childhood immunizations worldwide) and supported the creation of the Global Development Program.

Raised outside of Detroit, Michigan, Shah graduated from the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, and the Wharton School of Business. He and his wife, Shivam Mallick Shah, have three children.

KAREN SPENCER

FOUNDER AND CHAIRMAN, WHOLE CHILD INTERNATIONAL @kspencer1508

Karen Spencer founded Whole Child International in 2004 with the aim of improving the quality of care for vulnerable children worldwide. Targeting the largely overlooked emotional needs of society's most at-risk children, Whole Child's cost-effective, sustainable and replicable program provides the tools they need to become productive members of society.

As founder and CEO of the organization, Spencer leads an international team of trainers, researchers and other staff to change systems of care, to advocate and influence policy and to conduct related research. Whole Child programs are currently being brought to scale with funding from the Korean government through the Inter-American Development Bank and other donors.

Spencer has co-authored articles published in the peer-reviewed "Infant Journal of Mental Health and Perspectives in Infant Mental Health," contributing important insights and realistic solutions to the public debate. In September 2015, she was elected as an Ashoka Fellow for her innovative work as a social entrepreneur by the Ashoka Foundation, which honored her for identifying and filling a gap in care for orphans and vulnerable children. In 2016 she was made a Fellow at the University of Northampton in the United Kingdom.

LAURA STACHEL

CO-FOUNDER AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, WE CARE SOLAR @lestachel

Laura Stachel is the co-founder and executive director of We Care Solar, an award-winning nonprofit that designs and delivers solar-powered solutions to maternal health centers in energy-poor countries. Stachel, an obstetrician, holds an MD from the University of California, San Francisco, and a master's degree in public health from the University of California, Berkeley.

Stachel began working with her husband, Hal Aronson, to develop compact solar electric kits for maternal health care after researching maternal mortality in Nigeria. Their innovative Solar Suitcase provides efficient medical lighting, phone-charging and fetal monitoring that enables health workers to provide around-the-clock emergency care for expectant mothers and their newborns. We Care Solar has distributed more than 1,800 Solar Suitcases to health centers around the world, including in Uganda, Tanzania, Malawi, Sierra Leone, Nigeria, Liberia, Ethiopia, Nepal and the Philippines.

Stachel is a champion for sustainable energy solutions for women's health. She has been active in the UN Foundations Sustainable Energy for All initiative. She was a 2013 CNN Hero and has won numerous awards for her humanitarian work. Most recently, We Care Solar received the inaugural 2015 UN DESA Powering the Future We Want Award. Stachel is also a contributing author to "Social Entrepreneurship and Innovation," by Ken Banks.

JULIA STASCH

PRESIDENT, THE JOHN D. AND CATHERINE T. MACARTHUR FOUNDATION @macfound

Julia Stasch is president of the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. With assets of more than \$6.3 billion, an annual global grant making of \$250 million and offices in Chicago, Mexico City, Moscow, Delhi and Abuja, MacArthur is one of the nation's largest philanthropies. She previously led U.S. programs at the foundation, directing programs in housing, digital media and learning, justice reform, community development and public policy.

Previously, Stasch served as chief of staff for Chicago's Mayor Richard M. Daley and the city's housing commissioner. She led a \$1.3 billion initiative in affordable housing and a \$1.5 billion plan for the transformation of Chicago's public housing. In the first Clinton administration, Stasch was deputy administrator of the 20,000-person General Services Administration, which is responsible for federal agencies' real estate and technology.

Stasch was president and CEO of Shorebank Chicago Companies, including South Shore Bank, the nation's first community development bank. She worked at Stein & Company, a Chicago-based real estate firm, which grew from a start-up to a company of more than 200 people, with projects that included Chicago's Metcalfe Federal Building, United Center and McCormick Place. As president and COO, she led efforts to increase opportunities for women and minorities in the construction industry.

Early in her career, Stasch was a Vista volunteer and public school teacher. She holds a summa cum laude degree from Loyola University Chicago and a master's degree from the University of Illinois at Chicago.

LINDSAY STRADLEY

CO-FOUNDER, SANERGY @LindsayStradley

Lindsay Stradley is a co-founder of Sanergy, a pioneering social enterprise in Nairobi, Kenya dedicated to building healthy, prosperous communities in Africa's informal settlements by making hygienic sanitation affordable and accessible for everyone. Sanergy's systems-based approach empowers the local community to own and operate sanitation facilities and provides business and operational support to ensure its operators thrive. Sanergy collects and recycles the waste into organic fertilizer, which is sold to Kenyan farmers to address the region's food security challenges. In just five years, Sanergy has launched over 1,000 Fresh Life facilities run by a network of 500 operators who serve 47,000 residents with hygienic sanitation daily. Sanergy also employs 245 teammates—93% Kenyan and 40% under 25 years of age.

Previously, Stradley developed operating systems and business training for Bridge International, was a manager at Google in sales and operations, co-founded a charter high school in post-Katrina New Orleans, and was a Teach for America Corps Member. She is a Rainer Arnhold Fellow. Stradley holds an MBA from MIT Sloan, where she was a Seibel Scholar and President of MIT Sloan Net Impact, and a Bachelor of Arts from Yale University, where she graduated with Phi Beta Kappa honors. She lives in Nairobi, Kenya.

YIFAT SUSSKIND

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, MADRE @MADREspeaks

Yifat Susskind is the executive director of MADRE, an international women's rights organization that works to make human rights a reality for all people. For more than 20 years, she has partnered with women's human rights activists from Latin America, the Middle East, Asia and Africa to create programs in their communities that combine grassroots partnerships and international advocacy to meet urgent needs and create lasting solutions.

Susskind has led successful initiatives to secure women's rights, both in policy and in practice. Under her leadership, MADRE sustains women's shelters in war-zones while countering policies that lead to war, and runs projects that bring clean water to drought-afflicted communities while demanding a space for women's voices in climate policy.

She authored the MADRE report "Promising Democracy, Imposing Theocracy: Gender-Based Violence and the US War on Iraq," which remains widely circulated and cited. Her critical analysis has appeared online and in print publications such as *The New York Times*, *The Huffington Post*, *The Guardian*, and *The Washington Post*. Susskind has been featured as a commentator on *CNN*, *National Public Radio* and *BBC Radio*.

She is an eloquent, powerful advocate of women's resilience and solutions as vital to confront our world's many crises.

ELLEN TAUS

TREASURER AND CFO, THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION @RockefellerFdn

Ellen Taus is the chief financial officer and treasurer for The Rockefeller Foundation. She oversees the foundation's audit, tax, budgeting, insurance and cash management functions.

Prior to joining The Rockefeller Foundation, Taus was the chief financial officer of Oxford University Press USA, where she oversaw the organization's business operations in the United States. From 1999 to 2003, Taus served as the chief financial officer for the Electronic Publishing Division of *The New York Times* Company after having been the company's vice president and treasurer for three years. Earlier in her career, she worked in corporate finance for R.H. Macy & Company, and was the chief financial officer for the American Museum of the Moving Image.

A graduate of Northwestern University with a Bachelor of Arts in economics, Taus holds an MBA in finance and marketing from Columbia University. She currently serves on the stewardship committee of the Audubon Society of New York and is treasurer and a member of the board of directors of Comprehensive Development Inc., a New York City education organization.

NICHOLAS TEDESCO

SENIOR PHILANTHROPIC ADVISOR, THE PHILANTHROPY CENTRE AT J.P. MORGAN @TedescoNicholas

Nicholas Tedesco serves as a senior philanthropic advisor in the J.P. Morgan Private Bank Philanthropy Centre. Based in San Francisco, Tedesco provides clients in the Western region with insights and services to help meet their philanthropic goals through innovative advice, thought leadership and collaborative opportunities.

Prior to joining J.P. Morgan, Tedesco served as a relationship manager and program officer at the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, where he helped launch the Giving Pledge—an effort led by Bill and Melinda Gates and Warren Buffett to encourage the world's wealthiest individuals and families to commit the majority of their wealth to philanthropy. In this role, Tedesco managed relationships with current and prospective members of the pledge, as well as their staff and advisors. He helped to connect global philanthropists with one another in effort to exchange knowledge and encourage collaboration. Previously, Tedesco served as the deputy director of the Children's Health Forum, a national nonprofit focused on the prevention and eradication of childhood diseases that disproportionately impact underserved communities. He also worked as a client relationship manager at John Hancock Financial Services.

Tedesco was named to the inaugural *Chronicle of Philanthropy* 40 Under 40 ranking in 2016. He has been quoted in *The New York Times*, *The Wall Street Journal*, *MarketWatch*, *San Francisco Business Times* and other notable publications. He received a Bachelor of Arts from Villanova University and resides in San Francisco.

CAROLINE TETI

FIELD DIRECTOR, GIVEDIRECTLY @Give_Directly

Caroline Teti is a field director for GiveDirectly, a nonprofit organization aiming to reshape international giving. Each month, thousands of people receive unconditional cash transfers from GiveDirectly that transforms their lives. She joined GiveDirectly from Evidence Action where she worked as a senior program manager of Kenya's national school-based deworming program, the premier nationally-scaled-government-led deworming initiative that benefitted six million children each year.

Throughout her career, Teti has worked in Kenya within health, education, water and sanitation sectors in both governmental and nongovernmental organizations. She has gained vast experience in program management and advocacy programs for youth, women and children in Kenya, Africa and Europe. As a field director at GiveDirectly, Teti has managed the set-up of the Basic Income project providing leadership for the design of field execution and launching the Basic Income pilot in Kenya. She currently manages external relations for the Kenya country office, a role that involves managing partnerships with the Kenyan government, media and donors.

Teti holds a postgraduate degree in development communication from Daystar University, a Bachelor of Arts in English from Kenyatta University and postgraduate diploma in gender and human rights from Uppsalla University.

DAVID TOLBERT

PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR TRANSITIONAL JUSTICE

@dtolbert_david

David Tolbert is president of the International Center for Transitional Justice, a global human rights organization. Previously he served as registrar of the Special Tribunal for Lebanon and prior to that was assistant secretary-general and special expert to the United Nations secretary-general on United Nations Assistance to the Khmer Rouge Trials.

From 2004 to 2008, Tolbert served as deputy chief prosecutor of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY). He had previously been the deputy registrar of the ICTY and, at an earlier time, served at the ICTY as chef de cabinet to President Gabrielle Kirk McDonald and senior legal adviser, Registry, serving a total of nine years at the ICTY.

From 2000 to 2003, Tolbert held the position of executive director of the American Bar Association's Central European and Eurasian Law Initiative, which manages rule-of-law development programs throughout Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. He also held the position of chief, General Legal Division of the United Nations Relief Works Agency in Vienna, Austria and Gaza. In addition, he taught international law and human rights at the post-graduate level in the United Kingdom and practiced law for many years in the United States.

Tolbert was a Jennings Randolph Senior Fellow at the United States Institute of Peace and served as a member of the American Society of International Law Task Force on United States policy toward the International Criminal Court (ICC) during 2008 and 2009. He has a number of publications on international criminal justice, the ICTY and the ICC in the "Harvard Human Rights Journal," "The Fletcher Forum of World Affairs," and other journals and books. Tolbert frequently lectures and makes public appearances on international justice issues. He also represented the ICTY in the discussions leading up to the creation of the ICC and the Rome Conference, and served as an expert to the ICC Preparatory Committee Inter-Sessional meetings. Tolbert is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations.

LESLEE UDWIN

FOUNDER AND CEO, THINK EQUAL @lesleeudwin

Leslee Udwin is a British filmmaker, producer and director, and CEO of Think Equal. She was named the second most Impactful Woman of 2015 by *The New York Times*; Hillary Clinton was number one. She was awarded the prestigious Swedish Anna Lindh Human Rights Prize, previously won by Madeleine Albright, and was named Safe's Global Hero of 2015, Global Thinker by *Foreign Policy*. She also won the Best Producer Award—Women in Film and Television—for her ground-breaking documentary "India's Daughter," which won 28 international awards including the Peabody Award in 2016.

As a human rights campaigner, Udwin is no stranger to successfully campaigning films. Her productions include the drama "Who Bombed Birmingham?" starring John Hurt for HBO and Granada TV, which directly led to the release of the Birmingham Six after 17 years of wrongful imprisonment. Her feature films for her production company Assassin Films include "East is East"—which was awarded upward of 35

other prestigious awards worldwide including a BAFTA for Best Film and the London Critics' Circle Producer of the Year Award—"West is West" (BBC Films), "The One and Only" (Pathe Pictures) and "Mrs Ratcliffe's Revolution" (Warner Bros).

Udwin's first documentary feature, and her debut as a director, multi-award winning "India's Daughter" has been critically acclaimed around the globe, provoked a global discussion about gender equality and violation of the rights of women and girls. The film sparked a global movement to end violence against women and girls.

The perspective and insights yielded by the two-and-a-half year journey while making "India's Daughter" led her to establish Think Equal, a U.K. and U.S. based NGO. Its imitative aims to bring the missing third dimension to global education: social and emotional learning in values, respect and empathy on a compulsory basis, and from the first day of a child's journey at school. Currently, Udwin is advising the United Nations Human Rights Office on this global mission to break the cycle of violence.

LAURA ULLOA

ADVOCATE AND ACTIVIST

Laura Ulloa is a political scientist from the University of the Andes, with a specialization in organizations, social responsibility and development. She has worked for the Security Council of the United Nations in New York, with the Colombian Agency for Reintegration and currently serves as a coordinator for Social Projects at the Corona Foundation in Colombia. However, when she was just 11 years old, Ulloa was kidnapped and held captive by FARC for seven months.

Her ordeal started in 1999 when she and her family were victims of one of the largest mass kidnappings in Colombia. A group of guerrilla members dressed in military fatigues captured approximately 300 people attending church. While she and her family were able to escape, others were not so fortunate. Two years later on September 20, 2001, members of the FARC-EP hijacked her school bus and took her as the sole hostage. Despite the pain endured by her and her family, today Ulloa offers an interesting perspective through a refreshing and encouraging story for times of forgiveness and reconciliation.

Her latest endeavor was to bring together a former paramilitary fighter, former FARC combatant and the daughter of a former M-19 guerrilla member to start YTA, a leather goods and accessories brand. With this entrepreneurship, she wants to show that it is possible to start again, to sell products with a story and, most importantly, to highlight that reformed rebels have trades and talents that can replace weapons and warfare.

SHERRIE ROLLINS WESTIN

EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT FOR GLOBAL IMPACT AND PHILANTHROPY, SESAME WORKSHOP @srwestin

Sherrie Rollins Westin is executive vice president for global impact and philanthropy at Sesame Workshop, the nonprofit organization behind Sesame Street. Westin oversees the Workshop's programs addressing the needs of children from India to South Africa to the United States, providing early education through mass media and targeted initiatives.

During her career, Westin has held leadership positions in media, nonprofit and public service. She was assistant to the president for public liaison and intergovernmental affairs under President George H.W. Bush, assistant secretary for public affairs at the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, and held senior positions at the ABC Television Network and U.S. News & World Report.

Westin serves on the board of directors of the U.S. Fund for UNICEF, the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition and Communities in Schools, and as a trustee of Mount Holyoke College. She is a member of the U.S. Afghan Women's Council and The Council on Foreign Relations, and was named a Leading Global Thinker by *Foreign Policy Magazine* in 2016.

Westin holds an Honorary Doctorate from Concordia College in New York and is a graduate of the University of Virginia. She lives in Bronxville, New York with her husband David and her children, Lily and David.

ROSS WIENER

VICE PRESIDENT AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, EDUCATION & SOCIETY PROGRAMS, ASPEN INSTITUTE @AspenInstitute

Ross Wiener is a vice president at the Aspen Institute and executive director of the Education and Society Program. He leads a team of educators and analysts in creating rich learning experiences for education leaders, policymakers, advocates and foundation executives. The Education and Society Program convenes leaders across political lines and across levels of governance, from classrooms to capitals, with a focus on improving outcomes for traditionally underserved students. In addition to sponsoring public and off-the-record dialogues, Wiener and the Education and Society team create resources that shape education policy debates and assist education leaders with strategy and implementation.

From 2002 to 2009, Wiener was a policy director and then vice president for program and policy at the Education Trust, a national advocacy organization focused on equity in public education. He served for five years as a trial attorney in the U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division, Educational Opportunities Section and clerked for Judge Kermit Lipez on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

Wiener is graduate of the University of Wisconsin and the George Washington University Law School.

MAYA WINKELSTEIN

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, OPEN ROAD ALLIANCE @OpenRoadTweets

Maya Winkelstein is executive director of Open Road Alliance where she is responsible for the organization's overall investment strategy including finding new ways to deploy capital to achieve maximum social returns. Winkelstein has worked with Open Road since the organization's inception in 2012. Prior to her role as executive director, she worked with Open Road as an associate director with the consulting firm williamsworks. Former clients also include Eastern Congo Initiative, Nike Foundation, PATH, Tostan, and TOMS Shoes.

Prior to williamsworks, Winkelstein served in the nonprofit and government sectors focusing on program development, fundraising strategy and corporate partnerships. Former affiliations include The Corporate Council on Africa, International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS), the Institute of National Strategic Studies (INSS) at National Defense University (NDU) and Exclusive Analysis Ltd. She is a frequent contributor and guest speaker at forums such as Council on Foundations, Grantmakers for Effective Organizations, Clinton Global Initiative, and The Philanthropy Workshop. She is also a board member of Global Press Institute and a member of the leadership advisory council for GrantAdvisors.org.

Winkelstein holds a Bachelor of Arts from the University of Michigan, a Master of Science from the London School of Economics and a diplôme internationale from Sciences-Po in Paris, France. She lives in New York with her husband and young son.

JANE WALES

PRESIDENT AND CEO, GLOBAL PHILANTHROPY FORUM AND WORLD AFFAIRS; VICE PRESIDENT, THE ASPEN INSTITUTE @janewales

Jane Wales is CEO of the Global Philanthropy Forum and World Affairs, vice president of the Aspen Institute and host of the nationally-syndicated National Public Radio interview show *World Affairs* (formerly *It's Your World*).

Previously, Wales served in the Clinton Administration as special assistant to the President and senior director of the National Security Council. She simultaneously served as associate director of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, where her office was responsible both for advancing sustainable economic development through science and technology cooperation and for developing policy for securing advanced weapons materials in the former Soviet Union. In the Carter Administration, Wales served as deputy assistant secretary of state.

In the philanthropic sector, Wales chaired the international security programs at the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the W. Alton Jones Foundation and she directed the Project on World Security at the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. From 2007 to 2008, she served as acting CEO of The Elders, chaired by Archbishop Desmond Tutu and founded by Nelson Mandela. In 2008, Wales also chaired the Poverty Alleviation Track for the Clinton Global Initiative.

ROBIN WRIGHT

JOINT FELLOW, THE US INSTITUTE OF PEACE AND WOODROW WILSON CENTER
@wrightr

Robin Wright has reported from more than 140 countries on six continents for *The Washington Post*, the *Los Angeles Times*, *The New Yorker*, *The New York Times Magazine*, *TIME*, *The Atlantic*, *The Sunday Times of London*, CBS News, Foreign Affairs and many others. Her foreign tours include the Middle East, Europe, Africa and several years as a roving foreign correspondent worldwide. She has covered a dozen wars and several revolutions. Until 2008, she covered U.S. foreign policy for The Washington Post.

Wright has also been a fellow at the U.S. Institute of Peace, the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, the Brookings Institution, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace as well as Yale, Duke, Stanford, and the University of California.

Among several awards, Wright received the U.N. Correspondents Gold Medal, the National Magazine Award for reportage from Iran in *The New Yorker*, and the Overseas Press Club Award for “best reporting in any medium requiring exceptional courage and initiative” for coverage of African wars. The American Academy of Diplomacy selected Wright as the journalist of the year for her “distinguished reporting and analysis of international affairs.” She also won the National Press Club Award for diplomatic reporting and has been the recipient of a John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation grant.

She lectures extensively around the United States and has been a television commentator on morning and evening news programs on ABC, NBC, CBS, PBS, CNN and MSNBC as well as “Meet the Press,” “Face the Nation,” “This Week,” “Nightline,” “PBS Newshour,” “Frontline,” “Charlie Rose,” “Washington Week in Review,” “Hardball,” “Morning Joe,” “Anderson Cooper 360,” “The Situation Room with Wolf Blitzer,” “Piers Morgan Tonight,” “The Colbert Report” and HBO’s “Real Time.”

Wright’s most recent book is “Rock the Casbah: Rage and Rebellion across the Islamic world.” Her other books include “Dreams and Shadows: The Future of the Middle East,” which *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* both selected as one of the most notable books of the year. She was the editor of “The Iran Primer: Power, Politics and U.S. Policy” (2010). Her other books include “The Last Great Revolution: Turmoil and Transformation in Iran,” which was selected as one of the 25 most memorable books of the year 2000 by the New York Library Association, “Sacred Rage: The Wrath of Militant Islam,” “Flashpoints: Promise and Peril in a New World,” and “In the Name of God: The Khomeini Decade.”

OPENING REMARKS: JANE WALES



Jane Wales

TUESDAY, APRIL 18
10:15 AM

JANE WALES

Founder, Global Philanthropy Forum

Welcome to the Global Philanthropy Forum. For those of you who are new to us, we're a learning community and we're committed to international causes and to achieving results. We're meeting here in Washington at this time for a reason, so let me get straight to it.

Trust is our greatest asset, right? It's the societal glue on which all cultures rely, and without it we can't get stuff done. Yet trust is at an all-time low; in large swaths of the world, we're seeing declining trust. It's reported by the Edelman Trust Barometer — very discouraging. Here in the United States, Americans report that they don't trust their institutions of governance. They don't trust the media, which holds government to account and gives citizens the information that they need to be effective citizens. But far more consequential in my view is that they report that they don't trust each other, and it's hard to imagine how a society coheres, how it solves problems, meets opportunities, seizes opportunities absent that trust.

This isn't a recent phenomenon. It's a trend, and it's not tied to any one single event. I suspect that the biggest driver is the information revolution and economic globalization — the way in which they combine to decentralize authority; but we also know that it's an opportunity for political opportunists to appeal to our worst instincts, to appeal to our darkest side, to take advantage of divisions and exploit fears of one another in order to achieve political gain. That too is not entirely new, but it feels at a height at this point. And we're speaking as elections are going on. Now that's the bad news.

The good news is that a loss of trust — this trust deficit — is not inevitable. It doesn't need to be permanent, and in fact building social capital is very much the reason civil society exists. That's what it does. And so civil society, philanthropy, can work with government actors, in essence working to model collaborative problem solving to get stuff done and in the process rebuild our faith in one another and our faith in the system.

In the next three days together, we're going to focus on issues that are both causes and consequences of the trust deficit and think through together how we can address those particular issues, those particular problems. We learn about strategies that work, and we are introduced to individuals who are making a great big difference.

I'm going to ask something of you, and that is that our format this year is to have working groups. We're trying to make sure that each one is small enough, which is why we reached out to ask you what your preference was, so that we're sure that people roll up their sleeves together, that everyone participates, that everyone can talk. We've indicated in the program some of the folks who will be in those working groups; you have a sense of what company you'll be keeping, but they won't be traditional speakers in the sense that they give a lecture and you politely listen. It's much more of a conversation. You'll find that your colleagues are great listeners and learners, but nobody is an observer. So we ask that you engage in those working groups so everyone can learn from you.

WHO IS US? PLURALISM, PROBLEM SOLVING AND CITIZEN POWER



Jane Wales, Eric Liu, and James Goldston

TUESDAY, APRIL 18
11:05 AM

JAMES GOLDSTON

Executive Director, Open Society Justice Initiative

ERIC LIU

Founder and CEO, Citizen University

IN CONVERSATION WITH JANE WALES

Founder, Global Philanthropy Forum

JANE WALES

Obviously, the disaffection that is being experienced out there, that loss of trust, is not driven just by economics, right? It's not driven just by inequality. It's also driven by what I think is a much more powerful force, and that's a sense of identity — that sense, as immigration comes in, et cetera, that the culture is changing on us. I should probably say that I think most of us assume that the societies that are going to fare the best, that are going to do well, are those that have a tradition of pluralism; that is to say, there's an environment in which individual communities can, with their own distinctive cultures, live side by side in a larger, shared society. So what we want to look at now are the questions: What are the conditions under which that commitment to pluralism can be built? What are the conditions under which a commitment to pluralism can wane? And what is the role of the citizen in trying to ensure that we do have that kind of dynamism in societies?

We're going to hear from two people. One is Jim Goldston. Jim is at the Soros Foundations, the Open Society Foundations. He is a practitioner of international human rights and criminal law. He runs the Open Society Justice Initiative. He has argued cases before the European Court of Human Rights and before various United Nations bodies. He's been a prosecutor at the International Criminal Court and worked with the OSCE (Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe) on matters of justice, as well. Jim will be able to talk to us a little bit about the state of pluralism.

We're then going to turn to Eric Liu, who is a colleague of mine in a different life. He's not only the founder and CEO of Citizen University but he's also at the Aspen Institute, where he runs a program on citizenship and American identity. He's written more books than I could possibly run off — Eric, I don't know how you write this many books. I urge you to look at his bio to figure out what your book-buying list is going to be after this conference. At Citizen University he teaches civic leadership on the side at the University of Washington. He hosts Citizen University TV. He's a regular columnist for CNN.com, and he was a colleague of mine in the Clinton White House, where he served as both deputy domestic policy adviser and also as a speechwriter.

So is Jim here to take the stage?

OK, I'm going to cede the stage to Jim Goldston.

JAMES GOLDSTON

Thank you so much. Very pleased to be here.

If you type the phrase liberal elite into your search engine, you'll find photographs of everyone under the sun, from Barack Obama to George Clooney and from Donald Trump to Rush Limbaugh. I have a confession to make: By many accounts I am

a member of the liberal elite. Before I even open my mouth, my profession, my education, my urban residence gives it away. And it gets worse. I am, as you heard, a lawyer bringing complaints before obscure tribunals like the European Court of Human Rights, the African Commission of Human and Peoples' Rights and the United Nations Human Rights Committee. The Open Society Foundations — my employer — and its founder, George Soros, are staunch champions of many things, from gay marriage to immigrants' rights, that many so-called populists abhor. Now we're told that people everywhere are rejecting the values and institutions that have shaped their lives for decades, that our faith in open borders, in diverse communities and the free exchange of ideas was misbegotten and that as a result we are left with violent crime, with opiate-addicted youth and with economic despair.

The movement that I know best, human rights, is under siege. For critics on the left, it suffers from association with the prevailing top-down version of globalization — of unfettered markets, little regulation, low taxation — that has brought patterns of widening inequality to many places. For others on the right, human rights are part of an international system that is seen to override national prerogative, to ignore national culture, to demean national pride. And common to both of these lines of critique is a caricature of a movement that is out of touch with ordinary people. Former home secretary and now Prime Minister Theresa May has called for Britain to leave the European Convention on Human Rights because, she has said, "It can bind the hands of Parliament, adds nothing to our prosperity and makes us less secure."

Philippines President Rodrigo Duterte quote, "couldn't give a shit about human rights" because, he explained, he has a duty to protect children from drug dealers. Until this month President Donald Trump consistently dismissed, as essentially none of our business, reports of abuses from Russia to Turkey to other places and, of course, who knows what next month will bring.

It's not just what the new nationalists say; it's what they do — like impose travel bans on Muslims, erode civil and political rights in the name of counterterrorism, restrict funding for civil society organizations, threaten the media, intimidate the courts, indeed even attempt to shut down seats of academic learning: think Egypt, Hungary, Turkey, Poland, Malaysia. Think the United States. It would be one thing if these populist critiques were baseless, but while demagogues use fake news and outright lies to manipulate and confound, they exploit real grievances: Economic dislocation, stagnant wages and declining social mobility are a reality for many. Globalization's fruits are not evenly distributed, and governments have done too little to help everyone adjust, adapt and thrive.

Many societies have experienced increasing heterogeneity of both population and lifestyle as a result of growing migration and the new agency of previously marginalized groups. Now, however, welcome to some, this diversity has aggravated the ever-present human tendency to define terms like self, community and nation exclusively in opposition to a feared or hated "other." Add to these factors the corrupting influence of money in politics and the increasing visibility of injustice across borders and it should come as little surprise that growing numbers of people, disenchanted with traditional parties and institutions, have invested their hopes in unorthodox alternatives, some of whom are charlatans. Not only do populist tropes address genuine concerns but they have power because they often contain a glimmer of truth.

Look again at human rights. Many institutionalized efforts to advance rights, for example, NGOs with professionally trained staff and boards depend for financial support on a small coterie of private foundations and individuals, most in the United States and Europe. However well-intended, these donors are the global elite and have been spared the economic hardship that others suffer. Compounding the sense of disproportion, the bulk of rights funding still goes to groups located in the global North, and much of it focuses on issues that may seem irrelevant to people who lack jobs or health care or a decent place to live. Many view it as no coincidence that the most visible sights of the global rights architecture — the United Nations human rights regime, the International Criminal Court — are located in wealthy northern capitals like Geneva and The Hague and New York.

So how should we respond to an explosion of anger that is perversely fueling political solutions likely to worsen its very causes? First, we must recognize that not all disenchantment leads to authoritarianism. In lots of places, people are acting to address injustice with methods and sometimes results that defy the false narrative of anti-rights populism. Take a look at what happened recently on the streets of Bucharest: tens of thousands protested after the government tried to weaken a robust anti-corruption drive that ensnared senior politicians, by pushing through a decree in the dead of night. Within days the government reversed course; the justice minister responsible for the flawed decree had resigned.

In other places too, people are rising up in support of rights and democracy: in Gambia, the small West African nation that recently voted out a dictatorial leader who had held power for 23 years; in Guatemala and South Korea, where citizens demanding accountability have used legal and parliamentary tools to oust corrupt presidents; and in South Africa, where just last week thousands took to the streets to defend the judicial and democratic institutions against autocratic threats. Time and again people are using the tools of law and the ballot to bring about concrete change. We need to highlight, support and learn from these efforts.

Second, we need to do a better job explaining, reminding and relearning how the very things that the populist narrative criticizes actually help people. So what does that mean? It means we can't just assume that people see a connection between the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and their own well-being. We need to show them, to provide facts, to offer evidence, to answer the question What have human rights done for me?

To take one example, what we know today as international justice arose in the 1940s as a means of restoring a nation-state system that had been battered by war and mass crime. The trials of former Nazi leaders at Nuremberg came about not as a product of wild-eyed idealism but through pragmatic insight that new legal constructs were needed to address the unprecedented nature and scale of crimes committed during World War II. Before Nuremberg there was no limit on governments' ability to mistreat their own citizens. Thirty years later Nazi crimes made that legal hole politically untenable, so a new notion of international law emerged. For the first time in history, the charge of "crimes against humanity" appeared in an indictment. US Supreme Court Justice Robert Jackson, who served as Nuremberg's prosecutor, said that the law and courts were not purely intellectual matters. They were the best means devised to subdue violence. And that understanding, as we just heard from Jim Kim, has been confirmed by decades of research documenting the linkages

between justice and human development and the economic, social and political costs of conflict that goes unabated. Just as remembering the Nuremberg trials helps explain the practical value of criminal accountability today, we must look to history for reminders of why other core rights principles matter.

And beyond looking to the past, we must do a better job of ensuring that in practice human rights and the rule of law actually serve peoples' interests. Some of this involves doing more and more effectively what the human rights movement has traditionally done: calling out misogyny and sexism, holding violators to account, and naming and shaming perpetrators. But we must also get better at breaking down the barriers to justice that engender frustration and alienation, and this means broadening access to legal tools to enable people to solve their own problems: like in Canada, where advice offices provide a venue to resolve everyday disputes over rent or claims for social benefits without always having to go to expensive legal professionals; or in India, where villagers are using the Right to Information law to expose corruption; or in Sierra Leone, where community-based paralegals have been offering legal information to help safeguard traditional lands from foreign investors.

And finally, even beyond what legal rights require and courts can order, public policy and common sense demand intensified efforts to address the profound economic dislocations that have inspired so many political earthquakes. The last time bellicose nationalism swept the world with such force it ended in catastrophe. Now we have the benefit of hindsight. Knowledge of that history and what it teaches about the origins of our shared commitment to human rights and the rule of law may be the most compelling reason for hope in this troubled moment.

Thank you very much.

ERIC LIU

Good morning, everybody. I wanted to begin by thanking Jane Wales and the entire team here for pulling us together. This has already been a very energizing morning. And though Dr. Kim earlier was saying that he felt like he was being rather dour and depressing, I actually agree with whoever was asking the question earlier that there was a lot in that discussion that was highly inspiring and motivating. The essential line there was "How do we take the tools of the rich to help the poor?" And I think that's going to be a watchword for me not just over the course of the rest of this day but for a good long while.

I wanted to tell you a bit about the work that I do and provide a little context for the question that I want to pose to us all today. I run an organization called Citizen University. We're based in Seattle, but we do work around the United States, and all of our work is about trying to democratize understanding of how power works in civic life. We do that through a variety of programs and projects that I can tell you about later.

As Jane mentioned as well, we're also colleagues at the Aspen Institute, where I direct a program on citizenship and American identity. And in the course of my work, both at Citizen University and at Aspen, I am traveling the country all the time, working with folks from all different domains of civic work, whether it's immigrant rights, veterans, voting reform and so forth, and across the political spectrum, from Tea Party founders to Black Lives Matter and 15 Now activists to many points between.

And one of the operating questions that is both on my mind fundamentally but also the question Jane wanted me to pose here today for us to begin a conversation on is simply this: Who is us?

Who is us? is the driving question of politics in our time right now. As Jim just spoke about in a global context, the things that we hardly need to rehearse to recite: the surge of nativist, nationalist, populist authoritarianism around the planet, in Europe and Asia and here in the United States. These movements, these leaders who are coming to the fore, who are doing so nakedly and without abashment, are part of a worldwide not only phenomenon but contagion. And at the heart of all of these movements is this obsession not just with sovereignty in the sense of borders and national institutions but with purity.

Think about Brexit. Think about what's gone on throughout western Europe right now. This obsession with sovereignty and borders is really hardly at all about the European Union. There's a deeper question about purity, about What is the meaning of Frenchness? What is the meaning of Germanness now? What is the meaning of Englishness? And because the work that I do is so focused in the United States, What is the meaning of Americanness?

We live in a time not only of the tectonic economic shifts that we heard discussed this morning, not only this unprecedented concentration of wealth and economic opportunity here in the United States but also a corollary concentration of voice and clout in the United States so that, indeed, the rich not only get richer; the rich get louder in American politics. We're living in a time not only where that is happening but where simultaneously the notion of Americanness and whiteness are delinking. And that delinkage is freaking out a lot of people.

What do I mean when I say the delinkage of Americanness and whiteness? I mean simply this: for the longest time, even through parts of my lifetime, the operating assumption was that if you said that someone was an American, the image that popped into the mind of the listener was the image of someone white, most likely someone male and white. That image is shifting. It is shifting in our popular culture. It is shifting in our power structures. It is shifting simply in the demographic statistics of the reality of our country. The year 2040 is now within sight both statistically and in our communities, and that is the year when this country becomes a majority people-of-color country. But just because that statistical moment is on the horizon doesn't mean that the actual shifts in power are at the same pace. And so this turbulence that is driven both by economic and political inequality but also by this deep sense of a fragmentation of national identity that used to be implicitly wrapped around a notion of whiteness here in the United States is creating great, great turbulence.

I want to talk today about three particular notions of national identity here in the United States that help us make some sense of what it means to be an American, what it means to try to answer this question: Who is us? There are three ways of thinking about citizenship in this country: blood, creed and deeds. I want to say a brief word about each one.

Blood. This is the most obvious one. It is the one that in many ways has been discredited but also in many ways today — not only because of the words of the current occupant of the White House but those he has surrounded himself with — has been given a bit more license to be spoken anew now, this notion that says that true

Americanness is rooted in whiteness and that this is a white Christian nation that is being impurified, that is being diluted. That notion of Americanness — which is rooted in a particular fiction, fantasy, of blood — may to many educated liberal elites, as Jim was saying, seem very passé and almost laughable, but make no mistake: it is a folk belief held deeply in the hearts of millions of our fellow Americans. Blood. That's one conception.

What's the next conception? Creed. What separates the United States, in theory, from other countries like the country where my parents were born, China, is that there's not only some base in blood and a territorial genetic notion of nationhood but that what unites, indeed the only thing that truly unites, these United States is a universal creed — a set of ideas that's imbedded in texts from the Declaration, to the Constitution, to Gettysburg, to Seneca Falls, to the “I Have a Dream” speech and many documents in between — that there is this civic religious scripture in American life that is meant to transcend various national origins, transcend various pools and sources of blood and that it is this creed that unites us. And that is a beautiful conception; it's a conception that reminds of what Gandhi said when he was asked once what he thought of Western civilization, and his answer was, “I think it would be a good idea.”

What do you think of the American creed? I think it would be a great idea. I think it would be great if we were to live up to the American creed. I think it would be great if we actually did put muscle and money behind ensuring that there was liberty and justice for all. But we have yet to live up to that creed fully. Even though we keep making progress and every generation pushes closer, we have yet to actually fulfill the words of that universal aspirational creed.

Which brings me to the third and final notion of citizenship here in the United States: deeds. At the end of the day, if you want to discredit a blood-based notion of citizenship and you want to inhabit and animate a creed-based notion of citizenship, you can do that only by doing that. You can do that only by the actions and the choices and the commitments you make and the sacrifices you are willing to make. Deeds. Are you willing to show up and organize? Are you willing to show up and vote? Are you willing to share with other people what you know about how systems get rigged so that they can de-rig the system? Are you willing and able to serve with people you don't know, either in the military or in civilian national service, to rebuild communities and to build trust and relationships and bonds of affection across various lines of class, race and region? Deeds. Works. This notion of citizenship is one that is more challenging, frankly, than even the creedal idea because it depends on us deciding every day whether or not we are going to show up.

And so in summarizing this notion of citizenship as either blood, creed or deeds, I want to describe in closing a broader notion as well. When I think about beyond the United States but just in our times right now — citizenship in any country — I often describe citizenship in my work as the following equation: Power plus character equals citizenship. What I mean by this is this: power — literacy in power. Do you know how to get stuff done? Do you know how to move other people? Do you know how to mobilize money, ideas, crowds, social norms, state action, reputational force, actual physical force? Do you know how to move these sources of power through the various conduits that make up what we colloquially call the power structure? Most everybody in this room does. You wouldn't be in this room if you didn't. But the question for us is, Do you share that knowledge?

This brings me to the character piece because literacy in power alone, while necessary for meaningful citizenship, is woefully insufficient. We have evidence all around us in national politics today of people who are highly fluent in power and deeply deficient in character. Character means a grounding not just in personal virtue and individual virtues like perseverance and diligence but in what I call “character in the collective.” Do you have a mindset of mutuality? Do you believe and practice reciprocity? Do you actually commit yourself to a shared idea of shared responsibility? Are you a pro-social member of the body? This notion of citizenship has almost nothing to do with documentation status. It has to do with whether you are a contributor, whether you show up. And it reminds us that there are many people in this country and around the world who have the documents but don't live like citizens and many people who lack the documents but do. Power plus character equals citizenship.

And this leads us to the closing thought I want to share with you, which is simply this: When you realize what your stores and stocks of power are — and in this room those are giant stocks, those are big mounds of capital: money capital, relational capital, intellectual capital — when you take stock and inventory of those big mounds of capital, you face a pretty simple binary question as citizens, whether of the United States or other countries. The binary is this: Shall you hoard or shall you circulate? That's it. You are philanthropists. You are people who work in philanthropy, so it might be said, Of course you are not hoarders; of course you are circulators. But I want to push one level deeper. I don't mean circulate just in the sense that you regrant the wealth that your benefactors or you have accumulated. I mean deeper circulation. I mean you commit to sharing what you know about how stuff works with people who don't yet know how stuff works.

I want to close, again, with what Dr. Kim said in his conversation this morning. He was speaking specifically about the tools of high finance and capitalism, tools like hedging and so forth and high-leverage ways of mobilizing capital at great scale with very little money down. He was talking about the ways in which the rich use those tools to get richer and how his watchword is to use similar tools and strategies to help the poor get richer. I invite you as citizens, whether of the United States or any other country, to take that not only literally but also metaphorically: The tools that got you to where you are, the tools that put you in elite circles, the tools that have led you to be leaders in a philanthropic sector that both has and hordes various kinds of capital. What ways are you going to use these tools to ensure that more people who are right now on the margins and angry and unsure of themselves and unable to answer the question Who is us? without trying to tear down somebody else? Are you committing yourself to circulate that power with those folks? If you do, if we do, together we can create a different story of us that is inclusive, that has integrity and that finally is affirmative and not about scapegoating.

Thank you very much.

JANE WALES

So, Eric, you're reminding me of a New Yorker article that I must have been 14 or 15 when I read it. It said, “We are a white Anglo-Saxon Protestant (WASP) country inhabited by none of the above.” And what being a white Anglo-Saxon Protestant meant was a certain set of values, right? But to what extent is culture actually static? Or do two cultures fuse and give you a third that is an entirely different body, as well?

ERIC LIU

For all the wishes that there are afoot right now for purity, I think the United States remains exceptional because it reminds the world that there is no such thing as purity, that culture is never static and that identity is never fixed. The whole point of the United States, when we're doing what we're supposed to be doing, is to show the rest of the world the possibilities of hybridity, right? I think this is the moment that we're in. It's not just a question of inclusion and being nice and letting folks in. It's about saying that the competitive advantage of a country like the United States and the idea of the United States is that it takes sources and ideas and genes and means from the rest of the planet and fuses and combines them into new hybrids that the rest of the world had not yet contemplated: from the mundane to the profound; from, you know, kimchi burritos to things that are far more profound.

Think about our creed. Our creed is not just Anglo — if there is such a thing as Anglo-Saxon. It's not just a Protestant creed. It is a Dutch creed. It is a Confucian creed. It is a Muslim creed. There are ways in which the amalgamation and the hybridity and the mixing of all of these different value systems leads to what we have in the United States.

I'm a second-generation American. I am the son of immigrants from China. And China is rising, and China is powerful and that's all great, but there is one thing that the United States has that China can't ever have or won't in its operating system or ever want to have, and it's boiled down in this way: America makes Chinese Americans. China doesn't make American Chinese. China doesn't want to. It doesn't know how to. It doesn't care to. It's not wired to, right? And a Chinese American is not just a dude who, at least in 2017, is not just a guy who says, "Hi! I would like to act really WASP-y now and would like you to ignore my Chinese features." No. A Chinese American is somebody who says, "I claim this country, and I bring to bear here not only a reverence for what I've inherited from a founding generation that was English in origin but the ways in which I'm going to imbed my Confucian values, my other ways, my kind of relational ways of thinking, of being the son of Chinese immigrants into our mix here and change the very meaning of Americanness. That's what we get to do here.

JANE WALES

I should say that Eric and I were in a meeting last summer in which he asked the group, "What do you have to know to be an American? What says that you understand the culture, you speak the culture?" And the first person said, "jazz," and the second person said, "LeBron James." So it just shows you. Oh, it was fascinating.

I want to, Jim, turn to the institutions on which we rely and the risk associated with discrediting. In fact, two institutions: the media — the independent media — and the judiciary. Give us a sense of the degree to which those two things may be challenged in different societies where you've been focusing, and what does it mean? What is the potential outcome?

I was speaking to a Columbian last night, who said, "To be a judge is not a job that you want your kid to have, grow up to be." So it holds a very different place, or at least held. I think he was speaking more to the past, but it held a very different place in society than it holds here. So talk about both the judiciary and the media.

JAMES GOLDSTON

Thank you very much, Jane. I think those are critical institutions to consider. Just briefly, if I can, before doing that, on the question of culture: while the United States, of course, is special in many ways, the notion that culture is a changing phenomenon is something we see around the world so often. And one of those is what I was speaking about earlier, the understanding about whether someone must be brought to account for horrific crimes. That is, we've experienced an imperfect but nonetheless a revolution in public attitudes about that very fact and that possibility, which suggests, although we have a long way to go, how far we've come in the past 50 to 70 years.

The media and the judiciary are critical institutions, and they are fragile institutions in many societies. We've seen in a number of places, from Hungary to Poland, where efforts have been made explicitly by current governments to effectively weaken the power of the judiciary to act as a check on government, by changing the nature of the composition of the highest courts in the land. On the converse, we have seen in South Africa how an effort by a current government to ensure that it is immune from accountability has been resisted by a court system as a whole that has proven so far capable of withstanding enormous pressure, in part because there is a cultural understanding, a popular understanding, an understanding in the legal community, of the importance of an independent judiciary. That is a trope. It's a phrase. But it actually has meaning. And the extent to which it has meaning in different societies, frankly, I think is a large part of the extent to which the judiciary can survive.

The media, of course, we have seen in different places. Turkey is just one where we've had these election results in recent years, where dozens of journalists have been subjected to pressure and detained and worse. And it's no surprise why that would be the case because the media is so critical in bringing up questions, in raising uncomfortable issues, in holding powerful people — whether in the public sector or the private sector — to various forms of scrutiny and perhaps accountability, and often therefore they're not liked.

We've heard, of course, attacks on the media in this country, where the First Amendment is seen to be sacred. And surprisingly or not, the media has been painted, depicted, as an enemy of the people, and that very accusation in some minds has some strength, which I think also gets to the separation, the divide, that exists between what are called "elite institutions," however necessary they may be, and so-called ordinary people. And deepening those connections to ensure that people have a role in the media, understand what the media is about and have a role in understanding what the meaning of the judiciary is about — that's a critical thing and certainly something where we have a long way to go in a number of places.

JANE WALES

And of course, then there is civil society more broadly. Obviously, the media is a key part of civil society; but as we think about nonprofits in this country, I mean, dating back at least to when Tocqueville was making his observations, NGOs were seen and are seen as an accepted vehicle for the sharing of information but also as a vehicle for collective action. That hasn't been challenged, and most Americans have had contact with a nonprofit and a positive experience with a nonprofit. Where are you seeing a closing of that kind of civic space, and how do you preserve it? Is there a risk of that closing here?

JAMES GOLDSTON

Civil society is kind of part of the DNA of the Open Society Foundations, and throughout our history the support and nourishment and strength and capacity of civil society have been in the forefront of our objectives. I think it really has been extraordinary and disenchanting to see the extent in recent years to which civil society has come under an orchestrated threat in so many countries around the world, where restrictions on funding, restrictions on registration and shutting down organizations is making it very, very difficult and delegitimizing the sector as a whole.

We've seen this in Russia. We've seen this in Turkey. We've seen this in many, many, many places. One of the challenges in fact is What is the financial support base for much of civil society? In many parts of the world, the development of indigenous philanthropy is an incomplete project. And to the extent that that is true — however understandable and necessary it may be for civil society organizations to secure funding from private donors or individuals in the United States or elsewhere, or to some extent sometimes foreign governments — that has left many civil society organizations vulnerable to attack and accusations, however ill-intended and however self-serving, that they are serving foreign interests.

That's a challenging accusation to respond to, however baseless it may be, precisely because, as Eric was explaining, in the United States we have notions of national community, and people should be able to decide to some extent what the form of their community is. Who is active? Who comes in? So getting that balance right — being able to ensure and understanding that civil society plays a critical role and that ultimately it's worth is in the work that it does, the quality of its outreach, its ability to engage people in the societies where it works — that's a real incomplete project I think. In many places we have to organize to fight back right now against what is a very concerted onslaught against the capacity of NGOs to do their jobs.

JANE WALES

Eric, do you want to add something?

ERIC LIU

I just wanted to speak to the second part of your question, which was, Is that under threat here in the United States? Perhaps in some ways it is being menaced, but I am actually net optimistic. I think one of the things that — though he might not seek credit for it — I'm very willing to credit President Trump for is he is responsible, he alone is responsible, for one of the greatest surges of citizen action in this country in half a century. And, by the way, this is not just a Democrat, progressive thing. He has catalyzed people left, right and center: libertarians, who are concerned about executive overreach; reform conservatives, who are concerned about what the depth of this president's commitment is to limited government conservatism; social justice progressives, who are of course concerned about his targeting of disfavored groups.

You have folks all across the political spectrum right now who are organizing, who are showing up, who are for the first time, or perhaps the first time in a long time, learning to re-exercise their citizen muscles: How to knock on doors, how to invite neighbors to do stuff, how to frame arguments in public, how to apply pressure on lawmakers, how to read the map of power either in Congress or in a community about, again,

Who decides? Which of course is the operating question in all of civic life, Who decides? Right?

So I see this incredible surge across the country right now, and some of it is explicitly political or explicitly in resistance to this administration's agenda, but quite frankly it's evolving beyond that, right? If you think about Indivisible, which is the guide that several ex-congressional staffers published on the internet as a Google Doc at the beginning of this year; it's a guide on how to apply pressure to your member of Congress. The guide itself went supernova viral online, but then it spawned more than 6,000 face-to-face, self-organizing chapters around the country in every congressional district in the United States. The ACLU (American Civil Liberties Union), after getting surges of money and volunteer offers from around the country, has decided for the first time to really mobilize a grassroots army — and not just its locally based cadres of lawyers and litigants; now they've launched this campaign called People Power.

All of these movements across the United States right now, to me, are the immune system kicking in like antibodies swarming to a virus. People are swarming to airports. People are swarming to marches. People are showing up in different ways. The story is not yet written, and plenty of things can happen that can unwind that progress, but that progress, that renewal of the body politic, is cross-ideological and cross-partisan, and it gives me some hope.

JANE WALES

I remember back in the 1988 presidential race, one candidate, who turned out to be the winning candidate, accused the other candidate of being a card-carrying member of the ACLU, and we were all horrified. Yet our system remains vibrant. It seems to have not mattered, although he did win, but I don't think that's why he won. But it's a reminder that there have been challenges to the legitimacy of various sectors along the way.

I want to ask one more question of both of you and then turn it over to the group for their questions: the role of race. Jim, I'm going to start with you. Your foundation has been active on criminal justice reform in this country, and what's been interesting about it is that you brought together right and left to try to fight this mass incarceration, particularly of young black men. Jim, talk about that issue. Talk about where the battle is fought. Is it on the federal level? Is it on the local level? Lay the groundwork a little bit for the speakers we're going to have on Thursday, Adam Foss and others, to discuss this issue. Then I'm going to turn it to you, Eric.

JAMES GOLDSTON

Let me talk globally, if I can, and include the US in that. Race is obviously the defining element of American history in so many ways, and you can't talk about criminal justice in the United States without talking about race. I think groups like Black Lives Matter in recent years have really brought home some of the essential truth of what that means. And I think the strength of that movement is something that is really to be applauded. In further agreeing with what Eric just said, I think the reaction to recent political developments here has been invigorating and enlightening for so many. Certainly, we were hopeful, and we had seen in the United States a crossing of party

lines, recognizing that some of the criminal justice solutions that have been pursued in prior decades were not serving anybody's interests and that, for a whole variety of reasons, there seemed to be an effort to get away from mass incarceration, both for its racially discriminatory impact and for other reasons. I think that remains a priority for many. It certainly does for us, and we're hopeful that even in this current climate we can make more progress on that at both the state level and the federal level.

I would be remiss if I didn't say that although these things are defined differently from nation to nation, race and ethnicity are deeply important in different ways in other countries. We've been working with folks in Brazil, with Afro-Brazilians, who have made the treatment by police of ordinary people a priority issue and have developed some really extraordinary forms of activism to mobilize people, mobilize attention and make it a political issue. Similarly, in Europe we've been working for a long time with Roma populations across the continent. There too I think we've seen much more political attention and financial resources going to efforts to address the over-prosecution, over-sentencing of Roma people and their mistreatment in the criminal justice system. So this is certainly a set of issues that, while manifesting itself differently in different places, cuts across many countries.

ERIC LIU

I think criminal justice reform is a great example of several things, not only a very interesting — here in the United States at least — cross-partisan effort to grapple with an issue that had been so racialized, whose very definition was about notions of purity and racial line drawing, but you were nice enough to talk about my books. I've got a new one out called "You're More Powerful Than You Think: A Citizen's Guide to Making Change Happen." And in this book I talk about the criminal justice reform movement in the United States and its strategies, not only as Jim is describing to mobilize strange bedfellows: you know, limited-government conservatives who want to roll back the prison/industrial complex and social justice progressives who want to break the school-to-prison pipeline that afflicts brown and black boys especially. They have an alignment of interests, but what they also share is a literacy in power.

I really want to keep emphasizing this theme. They understand how to read and write power, right? And part of understanding how to read and write power is not just at the level of laws and policymaking and what you have to unwind or rewind or change or amend to shift law and policymaking but also the layer beneath, which is the stories we tell, again, about Who is us? Right? Stories of whiteness and race and about the kind of dangers of blackness are stories that, from the get-go in this country, have shaped our criminal justice system. Chris Hayes has a new book out called "A Colony in a Nation" that unpacks some of that history, going back to the colonial era. This racialized narrative is what undergirds all the policymaking on top, so if you want to be literate in power and understand how to re-rig a game, you can't just work at the surface level; you've got to crack that story underneath and say, "You know what? On this there is a different story of us."

On a different issue, to take us out of us coastal elites, I'm from Seattle, and here we are in DC, there's an organization that I write about in Kansas City, Missouri, called CCO — Communities Creating Opportunity. What they've done is create a really interesting multiracial, multigenerational coalition of faith leaders pushing what they call a "moral economy," fighting against payday lending and usurious, exploitative

forms of lending and pushing for a paid family leave and for a higher minimum wage in that metro area. They've been able to not just push for policies but, again, to change the story of us, which as you know, in Kansas and in Missouri, is a very segregated, racialized story of us. And they've said, "You know what? Let's transcend that story with a story of us, we who believe in economic inclusion, we who believe that we're all better off when we're all better off. And when we tell that story, we can bring folks into the circle and actually change the policy level on top.

JANE WALES

We'll break the rules and take a couple of questions.

BUILDING THE CAPACITY FOR TRUST: THE CHILD



Peter Laugharn, Randa Grob-Zakhary, Carolyn Miles, and Deogratias Niyonzkiza

TUESDAY, APRIL 18

1:10 PM

RANDA GROB-ZAKHARY

Global Head of Education, Porticus

PETER LAUGHARN

President and CEO, Conrad N. Hilton Foundation (moderator)

CAROLYN MILES

President and CEO, Save the Children

DEOGRATIAS NIYONKIZA

Founder and CEO, Village Health Works

PETER LAUGHARN

Welcome to the plenary “Building the Capacity for Trust: The Child.” Also to those of you in the web audience, welcome; we encourage you all to live-tweet. If you do, use the hashtag #GPF17. Get those ideas out there. My name is Peter Laugharn. I’m the president of the Conrad N. Hilton Foundation. I’ve had the good fortune to be working on early childhood for about 20 years, and I believe this is a very exciting time. I hope we’ll let you know why today. The discussion will focus on the importance of investing in the early years. We’ll give you an idea about opportunities and challenges; we’ll paint a vivid vision of what the world would be like if we did invest in young children; and we’ll give ideas for you as foundations and individual philanthropists about what you could do. As you know, later in the conference there are two working groups related to this topic: one on teaching trust and a second on managing the effects of toxic stress.

We’ve got a panel of three very experienced and fascinating people up here. Starting on my left, Dr. Randa Grob-Zakhary is the global head of education for Porticus. She is the former CEO of the Lego Foundation, and she brings two decades of experience in neuroscience, child development and education to the panel. On her left is Carolyn Miles, the president and CEO of Save the Children. Under Carolyn’s leadership Save the Children has more than doubled the number of children that they reach and serve worldwide, with interventions in health, nutrition, education and other programs. And on our far left is Deogratias Niyonzkiza, who is the founder of Village Health Works. Originally from Burundi in Central Africa, his life journey is told very vividly in Tracy Kidder’s book, *Strength in What Remains*. Deo is a leading advocate for the most impoverished.

I’ll take a few minutes to set the scene of developments in early childhood. Then each of the panelists will talk about what they see as opportunities and challenges from their own work perspectives. We’ll have a bit of conversation, and we’ll open up to you in the audience.

In terms of scene setting, I won’t go back quite as far in time as Jim [Yong] Kim did today, with his 170 years of history, but I’ll take you back 60 years. If we look at the 1960s at the beginning of African independence, we had, you could say, a tale of two planets in terms of children’s well-being. Primary education rates were about 7 percent throughout Africa, and we had 20 percent immunization rates for kids in the developing world, compared with 80 to 90 percent in the Global North. And child

mortality was routinely 10 times higher in the Global South than in the North. But the world did something about it.

Starting in the 1980s, there was a huge push to increase child survival. We had the technical capacity. We had the financial resources. We had the nominal political will, which needed a little bit of pushing. What we had lacked until then was imagination — the idea that any of those statistics I just cited could be changed through collective effort. And they all were. Immunization rates in the South rose to parity or at least to 80 percent during the 1980s and nineties through a concerted effort between the United Nations and foundations — and I would like to give a shout-out to the Rockefeller Foundation, which was instrumental in getting this effort up to speed. The international community accomplished something that it hadn't known that it was able to do, and I think there are a lot of lessons in confidence that we should draw from that.

I myself was a young field office director with Save the Children, working in [the Republic of] Mali. We worked very hard to get parents to bring their children to immunization. I did not realize at the time what a global choreography I was part of, but really it was a master lesson in global problem solving, and I think we have that in front of us now.

As early as the 1990s, people were saying, “OK, 12 out of 13 children are surviving. They are no longer dying before their fifth birthday. We should shift our focus from survival to thriving.” And there was the idea of moving from a child survival to a child development revolution, looking not only at physical development but also at cognitive development and social-emotional development — how young children today can be the adults of tomorrow, who will be successful for themselves but will also push their societies forward. But we have to admit that in those 25 years, progress has been slow.

First, it's a lot more difficult to provide child development interventions than child survival. Children are not just pincushions, and this is brain science. It's lingered as an unfunded priority that governments now smile upon, that makes it into all the global goals but that isn't well financed. And I would point out that all Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries spend greatly on their own young children — their children aged 0 to 5 — but none of them has made it a global public policy priority in their global development assistance. But I think, as you heard this morning from Jim Kim, this is starting to change.

You see the World Bank making the economic argument for early childhood, the connection between neurons and the economic development of countries. And Jim didn't go into today how he wants to publicize a revealing list countries' stunting rates as a gauge of their investment worthiness and their future competitiveness, but I think the global economic system is beginning to realize the importance of this investment. We also see advances in brain science and the ability to measure, and we see advances in what we can do to improve children's social and emotional development.

There is a very promising early child development action network coming together between the World Bank, United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF), foundations and civil society organizations, and any of us would be happy to talk to you about that later because I think there is a great generative role for foundations within it. And I think the world needs this revolution. We have important

global challenges out there, most of which we've created either through our management of our own ability to manage conflict or our lack of management of our environment. We need a skilled and emotionally intelligent population going forward, and the investment in early childhood is the best guarantee of that.

So, scene set: important moment. No-pressure panel. But, Carolyn, if I turn to you, what does this moment look like for Save the Children in terms of early childhood? Is it one of promise or one of peril?

CAROLYN MILES

Thanks, Peter. It's great to be here and talk about this particular issue because it's really important for the work that Save the Children does. I'm definitely a glass-half-full person, so I look first at the progress that we've made and whether you're talking about child survival or education or protection of children — those are the three major objectives that Save the Children has. There's been a tremendous amount of progress: We've cut child mortality rates in half and got 65 million more children in school since 1990.

One of the things we still are working very hard on is our third goal, which is changing the way the world thinks about violence against children. I would say we have a long way to go on that one given what's recently happened in Syria. But I do look at the progress. I would say we haven't quite finished the child survival revolution, so one of our top goals at Save the Children is to end the preventable deaths of kids under 5 — get that number from a little under 6 million to zero. And it's totally doable. We know how to do that. It just takes more political will. It takes more resources, and it takes doing the things that we know will work and some innovations in reaching the most deprived kids, the kids way at the end of the line.

On the education piece, our goal is that every single child gets a high-quality basic education. I've been at Save [the Children] for a while — about 18 years — and if I look at the evolution of our education work, we have moved earlier and earlier and earlier, and the reason why we've done that is because we realized that those investments we make in those early years are the ones that bear the most fruit. So if we want every child to get out of primary school — and this is our goal globally: learning how to read and write and have basic numeracy — we need to start before those kids get into kindergarten, or first grade in some countries. We need to make that investment, and there's a lot of good evidence, as Peter said, that those investments really pay off.

I'll use the Syria crisis as a good example of the kind of work that we're trying to do now, which is not just about getting kids into school but it's really trying to surround children, particularly at a young age, with all the things that they need. We've been working now going on the seventh year inside Syria and in the five countries surrounding Syria. We made a really bold call about a year ago that no refugee child should be out of school for more than 30 days. It is very hard to do, but that's why we set the goal where we did. And that includes young children and the youngest of children. So a lot of our work is about education, and it is about getting kids into school.

One of the reasons why early education is so important for refugee children — and I was really heartened by what Big Bird had to say — is that if you get children into early education, they are much more likely to stay in school. And we know there are now 3 million children who have been born since the Syria crisis, Syrian children both

inside and outside [Syria]. And making sure that those kids get some kind of early education is what's going to really change things for them. So a lot of our work is focused on this area.

This issue of toxic stress is one that I know we've mentioned throughout the day today, and we just completed a study with Syrian families and children inside Syria — 450 interviews that we did, and it included many young children. What we found is that this issue of toxic stress is having a tremendous impact on children. I'll give you a couple of examples.

About a third of the children inside Syria, we estimate, have seen dramatic trauma during the crisis there. They've lost a loved one. They've seen a loved one killed — actually seen it with their own eyes — or they've experienced massive displacement multiple times. One of the children we interviewed in this study — it's called Invisible Wounds because it's talking about the psychosocial issue for these children — one of the little girls whom we interviewed in the study said that she hoped she would get injured so that she could go to the hospital, where she would be fed. So those are the kinds of things that are impacting these children. This is really psychological trauma at a deep level. So this study, for the first time really, outlined a lot of those issues, and we found that many of these children demonstrate the kind of behaviors that happen for any kids who are under this kind of toxic stress: a lot of aggressive behavior, bed wetting, nightmares — those kind of statements like that little girl made to us.

The good news is that there are some — I won't call them simple but relatively straightforward — programs that can be done. One of the programs that we employ inside Syria and in the five surrounding countries is called HEART, and it stands for Healing Through Education and the Arts. It is almost all funded by private philanthropy, and it focuses on engaging young children with art of all different forms. It could be drama. It could be singing. It could be music. It could be drawing, painting and trying to get kids to deal with the trauma that they have been experiencing. And it's been quite a successful program, and we've been able to do some great case studies with children who have gone through that program and what the difference is that it has really made.

But this focus on early education, again, I think is the key. And in Syria we're doing both early education and basic education. Oftentimes we're having to have kids go to school underground because it is so dangerous for children to be at school because schools and hospitals are getting bombed. And then in the five surrounding countries, again, a real focus is on getting kids into early, early learning so that they are much more likely to stay in school. We have seen the effect, as I said, of both the early education piece but also this issue of toxic stress, and I think they're so important, and I know we'll get into more of the details on this in a little bit.

PETER LAUGHARN

Great. Thanks, Carolyn.

CAROLYN MILES

Thank you.

PETER LAUGHARN

The glass is tantalizingly half full and half empty.

CAROLYN MILES

Yes.

PETER LAUGHARN

Randa, let's zero in on the issue of trust that this conference focuses on. You've told me that building children's capacity to trust actually builds and strengthens society over time. How does this work? How do we know it works?

RANDA GROB-ZAKHARY

Thanks for asking that. I want to just kick off by saying, as a former neuroscientist, I was thrilled today to hear President Kim say that human capital comes down to the number of neuronal connections we have. It's the first time I had heard it put that way, and I'm not going to be talking about neurons today, but you'll see there's a link between the neuroscience and trust.

So to Peter's question, I thought it might be helpful if we set the context in a little more detail about how societies' capacity for trust can be built, first by thinking about how it's built in children — particularly in early childhood, where we know the opportunity for building trust and the skills that trust is based on can be either very robust or very damaging, depending on the situation. So I'm going to speak briefly about the link between early childhood and trust, then about the impact of stress — toxic stress in particular — on that link and finally the link between capacity from an individual to trust and what that means for society, as our organizers have nicely laid out in the narrative for this event.

Trust is simply a reflection. It's not simple, but it is essentially a reflection of two socio-emotional competences: empathy and attachment. And these are recognizable to many of us. They are two socio-emotional skills that happen to be robustly developed in the early years of life. Now most of us in the room, if not everyone, has heard many times, in this event but also before it that the early years are critical, that what you don't build you can't build back, and that's pretty well known for traditional academic skills. Everyone knows that. But what's less known is the criticality of those early years for human formation, for values, for character and things like empathy and attachment that lead to trust. So that part also reminds us that — just like learning to read, write and count — competencies related to social and emotional development, number one, are developed and, number two, are cumulative. They build on top of one another, so what you have at age 3 does not shoot up at the age of 15. It's cumulative. And the last is that they are malleable. Just like certain academic or so-called academic skills, social and emotional skills are malleable by experiences.

So what I'm saying, in other words, is that the capacity for trust is built on skills that are shaped by experiences. Trust can be shaped by experiences, and that's great if we're in a nurturing, positive environment, but it's terrible if we're in the opposite kinds of environment that we heard about from Carolyn and from Sherrie [Rollins Westin, executive vice president for Global Impact and Philanthropy, Sesame

Workshop]. I also had talks this morning with two people I'd never met before, who coincidentally talked to me about their early-years' experiences that are directly the reason for what they are doing today. So what happens in those situations when we are challenged?

We've heard "toxic stress" used today quite a few times. Again, I'm sure that many of us in the room understand what it is. For those who don't, I'd like to just lay it out so we all know what it is and why intervening can help. There's a spectrum of stress, and most of us experience some kind of positive stress. So there's a spectrum of stress that moves from positive to tolerable to toxic. Positive is like what we feel before we come onstage: a little bit of nervousness. Maybe you didn't. Maybe I did — a little bit of sweaty palms and heart racing. It goes away. It's not a big deal. Positive stress. Tolerable is what you have, for example, if you lose a loved one in the family or you know someone suffering a chronic illness or you have an injury. It's a terrible stress, but it is not prolonged, and you have the buffering of support around you, of supportive relationships. Toxic stress is very different. It is prolonged and significant stress in the absence of supportive relationships.

So if we go back to positive stress, could you imagine this little blip we get in those chemicals? Could you imagine if that were prolonged? You'd stop feeling it. But you could imagine that there would be ripple effects in your body, from brain down to toes, of those stress signals. And it's the prolonged effect of those signals that causes the negative effects of toxic stress. Some of those effects, you heard today, are cumulative and they are life-long. What does that mean? It means, as many of us know, that it will increase your potential for heart disease, for diabetes, for mental illnesses. But it also affects your ability to learn and not just learn academic skills but also learn these social and emotional competencies. Toxic stress reduces the ability to form attachments and relationships and to be empathetic.

So you can see here how we're building the story of How does toxic stress have anything to do with trust in an individual? And to just drive the point home, it's a small example but I'd like to just drive this point out to the audience. Peter, I'm going to ask you to make a face. Make it really exaggerated so that everyone can see. Can you see, guys? Can anyone shout out the emotion. That's not good. Sorry. Try harder. OK — that's good. That's good. Do that again. Good. What emotion is he trying to express? Anybody? I heard "anger." Right? Good. That would be sad if it were your happy face. So, anyone listening and not watching, Peter just furrowed his eyebrows and tried to tauten his face.

PETER LAUGHARN

Turned red.

RANDA GROB-ZAKHARY

But I would suppose that anyone who was assessing what his emotions were, you were reading his expressions; you were linking them to your own experience, and there's a part of cognitive processing. You're understanding what it is that he's going through, and you're reflecting that — that he has anger. Interestingly, if I asked Peter now to make a neutral face just like you are doing, children in adversity will be more likely to rate him as having an angry face, even when he's not angry. Why does that happen?

It's because when someone is exposed in a prolonged way to these chemical stress signals that we talked about, they are working on a rapid threat assessment and response rather than deliberate intentional assessment and reaction. So, he's more likely to be viewed as being angry or posing a threat. And you can see how that can lead to a diminished capacity for trust in an individual. If a child is going through that, and they have diminished capacity for trusting and for forming relationships, you can imagine how a diminished capacity for attachment leads to how they interact with adults and other children in their environment, including schools or learning environments of any kind, formal or informal. Trust is reduced.

And there is a neurobiology of trust in schooling that we don't need to get into today, but there is a trust deficit that is impacting not just learning outcomes but life and livelihood. So you can see the concrete link between trust in an individual, lifelong outcomes and societal trust. These are inseparable is what I am trying to say, and I think the science gives us an understanding of why. I share that science because it also gives us hope that there are ways to intervene. And a big reason for having that hope is philanthropy. Philanthropy has made significant contributions in the past 10 to 15 years in understanding when interventions are most appropriate, what those interventions can be and how they can be made. And not only that, philanthropy has also helped package all of what I just said into advocacy points and policy points that can be shared with key influencers to move changes.

And I think that I've taken my time. I'm happy to share some concrete examples, but we might get to that later in the session. OK.

PETER LAUGHARN

Thanks, Randa, and I'll remember to practice my angry face.

RANDA GROB-ZAKHARY

Thank you for going along with that.

PETER LAUGHARN

We'll move now from science and theory to really field-level reality. Deo, you come from Burundi, which is a country that has known the same sort of ethnic strife as its neighbor Rwanda. Can you give us some examples in your experience of where working with young children helps improve that situation and helps prevent the sorts of violence that we've seen?

DEOGRATIAS NIYONKIZA

Thank you. As you said and maybe all of you know, we are in a country that has been completely forgotten. The tragedy started in Burundi in 1993, and the children of Burundi have been going through a lot. When we started the Village Health Works in rural Burundi, there were all these children running around. Most of them were born in internally displaced camps, and others came back from Tanzania, from refugee camps, with their mothers or relatives but without their fathers. You can imagine what that kind of exposure to violence, to despair, does to a child.

Where do we begin in this kind of situation? We opened the clinic and every single mother who came with a child didn't talk about her own illness. She talked about

the child. And the child was suffering from kwashiorkor or marasmus. The child was crying and easily irritated, and we started a malnutrition program in this very tiny room. And what we did was feed them because food is medicine — Plumpy’nut [fortified peanut-based paste] and that kind of stuff. Then the children started looking at each other. When they were in the room, they couldn’t talk. One thing led to another: How do we get some local balls so they can play together? There were no toys coming from China or any other place. We used what was there. And they started really talking and playing.

They say language is caught, not taught. We didn’t have their mothers because many of them left the children there to figure out how to make both ends meet at home, and they had us and themselves. So we took advantage of that opportunity, which was painful to not know if the child is going to talk to us. But with time it evolved to creating this kind of friendship among the children, whose parents — some of them — hunted each other, killed their family members and neighbors. So what is the child learning from parents even when that child is not sick? “Don’t talk to that child of your neighbor because this and that is what happened during these times.” So instead of engaging in the conversation, you are overwhelmed by fear, atrocious fear. You run away from that child as if you are running away from a beast.

But because they were in the same condition — disease, immune system infections that came after or a lack of food were just overwhelming — they had no other choice but to be together. And that kind of terrible situation was an opportunity for us to actually make a difference and give them hope. Parents, mothers, would come to see their children, and we have just one tiny place. You have to sit down together. You don’t have a place for Hutu or a place for Tutsi or a room for another child — just here together. So as they watched their children play and talk, the parents started talking to each other. There was no one in the middle telling a mother or a father, “You are a Hutu. You are a Tutsi. You are different.” They interacted with each other.

I can tell you so many examples. One is this woman who talked to another woman. They were coming to see their children. They are talking. The children are playing. And she told this story about how she saw the brother of the other one raping her sister. And said, “I never thought that you and I would ever, ever sit down again.” But what happened? And the other woman said, “We were in the bushes actually because we were running away from you.” So the story came out that both women were victims of a story that was not true, that was dividing them. And all these years, all they were telling their children was how to run away from one another or be aggressive to defend yourself.

So you can imagine being in a country with years — decades — of violence and the lack of livelihood and childhood. How can anyone hope for a better future when we feel so completely abandoned? But that’s not a death sentence because what has been happening where we are has really inspired so many people and called other people to say, “Actually, what is happening? What can we do when we come together to do good and to reverse these dehumanizing conditions?”

So this is how we started Village Health Works — as a health organization; but as we saw parents coming for care, that led us to creating a food security program because the children and their own mothers are suffering from malnutrition. Speaking of Plumpy’nut, you give a Plumpy’nut to a mother and say “Go and feed your child.” And then the mother is eating the food of the child before the child receives something.

You can see the humiliation, the shame behind all that, which leads to mental health issues — depression and not being able to talk to a child because you are in despair.

So when we talk about a holistic approach, you know, “You do health.” But what is health? It’s important to think about food. It’s important to think about play with the children. It’s important to see how we can hope for a peaceful society. It starts when children are still really, really young.

We have a lot of parents who abandoned their children because they couldn’t feed them. They couldn’t do much; they were watching them wasting away, and some community health workers rescued these children. When the parents came to see them at Village Health Works, the children recognized them and ran away from their parents. And I asked one kid, Sayeed, “Why are you running away from your parents?” And he said, “How can you love someone who hates you?” The pain, the feeling of that kind of statement from a child and a parent is overwhelming; it’s just beyond what I can put into words. But this is not a natural disaster; this is a man-made tragedy because we have the resources and the knowledge to prevent these tragedies from happening.

So this is what we have seen. We integrated music — drumming — so that we can attract more children from the community who are not sick, and they watch and they talk to each other, and that kind of trust has been growing like a wildfire in a community that has suffered so much, where people have been taught for so long how different they are from one another. And the children tell me all these stories — what’s happening in their homes, domestic violence. Why do they tell me that? Because they know that we have put together a team that truly loves them, that cares for them, that helps them with homework and after-school programs and all that.

So we hear a lot of these kinds of tragedies, but it’s not a too-hopeless situation to actually reverse. There’s so much each one of us can do here. Whether you are from education, a social worker, physician, nurse, research — if we all link arms together in a very holistic way, a compassionate way, as a community, we can really, really turn these things around. It doesn’t take that much time. We’re seeing this at Village Health Works, and we’re always so honored to share these kinds of stories coming from a country where you hardly hear anything good coming out of that country. We have wonderful, wonderful stories to tell, similar to everything you were saying, and we’ve learned that every single child, every human being, is a child that deserves our attention and our love. And in the end, it actually helps us personally. When you love, you are doing a favor to yourself somehow more than to someone else. I am very hopeful that we can create a better future in the world.

PETER LAUGHARN

Thanks, Deo. I think you’ve given us a real strong image of both the opportunity and the challenge. Children bring us together. And people will go to great lengths to make sure that their children are safe. That’s something that can build stability, but the very same people can also instill intolerance in kids. I think we see that the way the children are treated is a gauge of levels of trust in society.

I’ll just ask a couple of questions, and then we’ll open things up to the audience. Carolyn, I want to start with you. We always say the evidence is really good for investing in early childhood — a seven-to-one return on investment. So if it’s so good, why aren’t we doing more of it? Why do we have to pass the hat around each time?

CAROLYN MILES

I think our biggest challenge with investing in early childhood is that we still think of it as a luxury. We still think of the basics — food, shelter and basic education — as the things that we should be giving to every child. And beyond that, even here in the United States — where we work in 16 states in poor rural communities — pre-school is considered a luxury. So what we have to do is change that mindset. We have to change the mindset: Every child needs to have an education starting at the age of 3 or 4, and we need to empower every parent to be their first teacher in terms of making early childhood the most important thing that we do. And I think it is this feeling — and I hear it from people all the time when I talk to them about particularly the early childhood education — that in our international work, people kind of say, “Oh, OK, but isn’t it most important for you to invest in basic education and making sure that kids have enough to eat and making sure that they have shelter and those things?” So I think we have to do a better job of making the case that we are going to be so much more successful in all of those things if we really invest in those early years, and we haven’t been successful yet in changing that mindset.

PETER LAUGHARN

Sure.

RANDA GROB-ZAKHARY

In addition to what Carolyn cited as the critical reason for why this is still an issue, there is also a structural component in many of our systems, particularly outside the US. Early childhood is not typically contained within the education department. Even in the wealthy country I live in [Switzerland], it’s part of social welfare and sometimes it’s lumped with care for seniors, seen as a provision for babysitting, and not managed by the same sectoral channels as education. And I think that structural change could be something interesting to consider as we go forward.

PETER LAUGHARN

Randa, let me ask you a question from the perspective of Jim Kim. Clearly, he’s a very, very strong proponent. He is also an advocate of strong focus and would be one of the first to say that the expanded program of immunization worked because there was a single outcome with a single measure, so he has pushed very strongly on the reduction of stunting as a proxy indicator for cognitive development. I know that you’re very interested in socio-emotional development, but is that a nice-to-have or is it crucial, and what message should be given back?

RANDA GROB-ZAKHARY

Thank you. I think that’s a great way to bring up something that everyone in this room can take action on, which is correcting the misunderstanding that so-called soft skills and hard skills are in competition with one another. I think if there is one message to take home it’s soft skills through hard skills. Soft skills through hard skills. That means learning about empathy, relationships, compassion, tolerance — even resilience. It’s not outside of math or history. It can be done through that. It can be done in the way that the curriculum and pedagogy are set up and delivered.

Especially in this room, I think there are a lot of people who have corporate backgrounds, who have marketing experience, finance experience, so let’s look at this business case. Let’s start by establishing that we have one set of skills, skill set A, that we know at age 4 is more predictive of your life outcome than skill set B. Employers say set A is much more important for how people perform on the job than skill set B. And we also know that if you invest in skill set A, it will help skill set B but not vice versa. Skill set A is so-called soft, non-cognitive skills, and skill set B is traditional academic skills. That might shock some: soft skills in pre-school are more predictive of life and learning outcomes than traditional academic skills, and investing in them boosts academic learning. So if we recognize together that soft skills and non-cognitive skills are actually very hard skills that are critical for success, that would be a wonderful take-home message.

PETER LAUGHARN

Great.

Deo, you’re looking at an audience that has both skill set A and skill set B and also a very strong drive to make good, positive change in the world. We’ve just laid out that this is a crucial moment. You heard it from Jim Kim this morning. So, Deo, beyond perhaps supporting Village Health Works, what would you recommend to the folks in the audience that they should do?

DEOGRATIAS NIYONKIZA

I think it’s simple. When it comes to child, to trust, to thriving, what are the risk factors? I think it’s important to know what the root causes of these problems are.

Take income, for example. Today we have, if the numbers are correct, 200 million children who are unable to achieve their fulfillment potential because of lack of food. Do we have people here who really are into figuring out what nutritious food elements are, who are into nutrition, food security? Take lack of education. Do we have experts here in early-childhood education? Take infectious diseases. One of the most unforgiving and horrible diseases is diarrhea, which has to do with unclean water and lack of sanitation; that actually affects the brain development of a child. Look at the numbers: a child, in a Third World country at least, is exposed to this diarrhea disease. Imagine what it does to the brain, knowing what you know now. How many people here are investing in making sure that humanity has access to clean water. Focus on that if this is your passion. Take maternal mental health. Before the child is born, a lot of mothers are worried, What am I going to feed my child? That leads to depression. That leads to hopelessness. Who talks to a mother who is concerned about whether her pregnancy is a death sentence because she may need a C-section and doesn’t have access to that? Where are the doctors, and where are people who are really into health?

So put together all of these risk factors, and you will find where you can make a huge investment. I truly believe that there is no such thing as hope unless we invest in the future, the children, who are really the hope. There’s no chance we can hope for a peaceful world, a prosperous world, unless we combine all of our energy and resources to actually come together as one community — a compassionate community, a positive community — that is capable of looking into all of these problems as a golden opportunity to make a difference and to reverse these dehumanizing social conditions.

That is what I would do if I were you. And I truly hope that you do — globally — because the world has a lot of problems, and we are seeing all of these tragedies in Syria and other countries. If there is one thing you can learn from that, it is that we are truly one humanity. A child from Burundi is like a child in Syria, like the picture of this child you saw three years ago washed away by the sea. If you didn't cry, I don't think that you should be here. So this is what I can tell you.

PETER LAUGHARN

Thanks, Deo. So now let's open this up.

SPECIAL ADDRESS

LUIS ALBERTO MORENO



Luis Alberto Moreno

TUESDAY, APRIL 18
2:15 PM

PETER LAUGHARN

President and CEO, Conrad N. Hilton Foundation (moderator)

LUIS ALBERTO MORENO

President, Inter-American Development Bank

PETER LAUGHARN

The next speaker whom I have the pleasure of introducing is the president of the Inter-American Development Bank [IDB], Luis Alberto Moreno. The IDB works to improve lives in Latin America and the Caribbean through financial and technical support to countries working to reduce poverty and inequality. It helps to improve health and education and to advance infrastructure. During President Moreno's tenure, the IDB has undergone a profound transformation of its organization, a significant generational change and a record increase in the number of women in leadership positions at the institution. Before joining the bank, President Moreno served as Colombia's ambassador to the United States for seven years. Please join me in welcoming President Moreno.

LUIS ALBERTO MORENO

Thank you. Good afternoon, everybody. It's a pleasure to be here. I know you had Big Bird, and it's kind of hard to compete, but I'll do my best. I'm happy to see many faces — Sherrie Westin, whom we had the privilege of working with over the years, and all of you.

To us at the IDB — at the Inter-American Development Bank — this forum is an annual opportunity for all of us not only to reach out but more importantly to learn from others in this very unique community. Every year Jane and her team do a fantastic job of highlighting not only global themes but more importantly challenges that call for action. I'm delighted that the topic that you've selected this year is the child because, as we all know, this is an area of focus that certainly we at the bank have, but more importantly it is something that truly has an impact on development.

As such I'd like to take this opportunity to discuss with you not only the well-being of the children in our region, which is Latin America and the Caribbean, which is fundamentally our area of work. As everybody here understands, the experience of children during their critical initial phase of development will have tremendous repercussions throughout their lives and across all of our societies. And with this in mind, I would like to explore and talk to you about what it means today to be a child in Latin America.

There are about 50 million children under the age of 5 in all of Latin America and the Caribbean. In broad terms, these kids today have a much brighter prospect than those who were born a generation ago. Infant mortality, for instance, has fallen by 55 percent. And a child born today can expect to live eight years longer than those who were born in 1990. These kids will almost certainly live in a home that has access to safe water, since the penetration or the coverage has risen to about 96 percent of the total region's population. And they are more likely to grow up in a middle-class

household, even though one generation ago half of them lived in poverty. They will be part of smaller families, as the fertility rates have dropped to 2.1 births per woman from about 3.2 births per woman just in 1990. And finally, they are more likely to learn to read, to write and to do basic math, as primary education today is basically universal and pre-school enrollment is expanding every day.

That said, if we look more closely, our youngest children still face immense challenges. They will grow up in the world's most unequal region, in terms of income distribution. Those born into families on the bottom rung of the middle class are unfortunately vulnerable to falling back into poverty. And nine out of 10 infants under the age of 3 continue today to lack access to formal early childhood development services. The latest statistic is particularly worrisome because of what we know about the impact of proper nutrition and early stimulation during the first thousand days of life. If we don't fix this, the huge gap between the haves and the have-nots in our region is likely to continue to expand. And not only that, this is where all the elements of violence are bred into a child; so we'll find it increasingly harder to catch up to countries that are far ahead of us in terms of developing and investing in their human capital.

So how can we turn this situation around and effectively empower our region's youngest citizens?

First, we can encourage governments to ramp up their spending on early childhood development services. In recent years countries have devoted more resources to pre-school, but we still spend too much on older kids. In fact, for every education dollar spent on children under the age of 5, more than \$3 are spent on children ages 6 to 11. There are cost-effective solutions, such as sending social workers on home visits to train parents on how to properly stimulate their children. Jamaica, for instance, obtained remarkable results on a very interesting pilot project back in the 1980s, and now Brazil wants to do many of the lessons there at a massive scale, potentially reaching millions of its poorest children.

Second, besides the expansion of coverage, we have to strive for quality, and we must improve teacher and also caregiving training so that they can provide meaningful and effective services. If not, we'll just be warehousing our kids. We did a big study in Ecuador that showed that a great number of teachers can make a huge difference. In fact, being exposed to an exceptional teacher can even help kids overcome the negative impact of a bad teacher.

Third, we must emphasize the critical nature of relationships, whether they are at home, at a daycare or at a school; building a positive bond between the child and the caregiver, as we all know, is essential. This investment will pay off in cognitive development — benefits that will last well into adulthood.

Fourth, and perhaps more importantly, we have to take action. And there is not a country that won't solemnly swear that early childhood development is its top priority, yet it often seems to be an orphan issue, with no one having overall responsibility for its proper implementation and supervision. This lack of ownership leads to poor coordination among government agencies, which in turn hinders the quality of services and produces poor results. And this doesn't exempt the rest of society from shouldering its share of responsibility.

Now we all must do our part. Citizens can contribute not only by holding governments accountable but also by championing early childhood development. Companies can

provide and, or subsidize quality daycare services for their employees. Foundations can also help pilot innovative alternatives. And universities can carry out research that helps expand the knowledge of what works and what doesn't. And we can all do more to push gender parity — especially to promote greater male involvement in child rearing. That, certainly for Latin Americans, will be a big revolution.

Now this forum's second theme, which is about trust, really resonates with us at the IDB, as it weighs heavily, not only in economic development but equally in social and institutional development. It's pretty settled that trust is the driver of economies, as countries with high levels of trust tend to experience higher and more stable growth. And there is plenty of research by economists about this very issue. Unfortunately, our region is the only one in the world where trust continues to decline. In fact, Latin Americans have less trust in public institutions than they did, say, two decades ago.

Yet while the recent wave of uncovered corruption, and scandals, throughout our hemisphere will probably weaken that trust in the short term, I'm positive that over the long term they might lead us to better outcomes and to a rebuilding of trust. And in that context, I truly believe that we're at a turning point in Latin America, where no longer are societies willing to ignore dishonesty and corruption in government. And every day that message is coming loud and clear, as we are largely a middle-income society that not only has middle-income spending habits, but, more importantly, middle-income or middle-class values.

The challenge therefore will be to transition from the reactive protests that we witness almost daily in our streets, to really address the root causes of corruption by building more inclusive and transparent public institutions. We at the IDB devote billions of dollars every year to this very cause and to supporting the kinds of institutional reforms that can make precisely that difference. That sounds like a lot of money, but we think it's not enough. That's why we value partnerships so much. And just as trust is essential to engaging constituents, it is critically important to engage partners, as well, because once we establish that trust there are no limits to what can be achieved by working together.

Now let me give you some examples of how we have built trust, more importantly, and collaborated with partners to promote early childhood development. Karen Spencer, who will speak later in this forum, leads an organization called Whole Child International. With support from another IDB partner — the government of Korea — Whole Child has piloted new, effective and low-cost approaches to improving child care in Central American orphanages. Not only did this partnership engage caregivers, but they also worked with government officials and administrators to raise awareness of the importance of evidenced-based practices.

In another example we worked with Shakira — you all know Shakira, I'm sure — and the ALAS (América Latina en Acción Solidaria) Foundation to recognize outstanding individuals and organizations in the field of early childhood development. And in a broader alliance, we have involved the Gates Foundation, the Fundación Carlos Slim and the government of Spain, who have backed a very interesting, results-based, financing mechanism to encourage countries to improve maternal and child health care. The strong partnership we have built with these actors has done a great deal to improve the lives of families across Central America, directly benefitting more than 1.8 million women of reproductive age and children age less than 5 years, while indirectly

benefitting an additional 4.5 million people in this region, but more importantly concentrating in the poorest 25 percent of the region.

Now that example is where trust was a key ingredient in making this partnership work and, more importantly, allowing innovation to occur. Change can be, as we all know, a scary thing and certainly in the public sector — we all know how risk averse they are. So it's very important for us to find partners precisely willing to take the chances on new approaches. Over the past year, we have been working closely with the FEMSA (Fomento Económico Mexicano, S.A.B. de C.V.) Foundation, the Open Society Foundations, the Maria Cecilia Souto Vidigal Foundation and Porticus, among many others, who think about how we can collectively build trust and generate innovation. Specifically, we're looking at how to finance new approaches that will allow us to scale up solutions in key aspects of early childhood development through improving service quality, training parents, mainstreaming early childhood development into traditional health and nutrition spaces, and plans that can generate better data and research on these topics.

And as you can see, we have much more work to do. In many ways we're still a very young region — a region full of promise and opportunity — but we'll have to work much harder to make this true for all of our children. Making quality early childhood development universal is the key to their success and that, of course, should be our goal.

So I want to, again, thank you all for giving me the opportunity to come here, to invite you to be very much a part of this challenge. My colleagues are here. They are happy to work and network with you and look at opportunities that you might want to develop together in Latin America. And certainly, I look forward to many of your discussions and, more importantly, to successful partnerships. Again, thank you very much for having me.

CITIZEN POWER, WAGING PEACE



Alaa Murabit, Nicola Benyahia, and Sanam Naraghi-Anderlini

TUESDAY, APRIL 18

8:15 PM

NICOLA BENYAHIA

Founder and Counselor, Families for Life

NANCY LINDBORG

President, United States Institute of Peace (moderator)

ALAA MURABIT

SDG Global Advocate and High-Level Commissioner, The United Nations

SANAM NARAGHI-ANDERLINI

Cofounder and Executive Director, International Civil Society Action Network (ICAN)

NANCY LINDBORG

Good evening, everybody. That was great. I think we should do another round of applause for Butterscotch. She was fabulous.

It's great to be here with everybody tonight. My name is Nancy Lindborg. I'm with the United States Institute of Peace — that building with a roof that looks like a dove right on the Mall — which is dedicated to looking at the practical ways in which you can prevent and resolve violent conflict. I'm delighted to be here tonight. And for those who are joining us in the livestreamed web audience, you can join the Twitter conversation with hashtag #GPF17.

I know we'll have a wonderful conversation this evening with our three panelists, whom I'll introduce in just a minute. I want to set up the conversation tonight first by congratulating the Global Philanthropy Forum and the indefatigable Jane Wales. Thank you, Jane. I think this is the perfect topic for right now, given what's happening both domestically and globally, so I really congratulate you.

When you read the papers and look at what's going on around the world, we do have this uptick in civil wars. We have new and virulent strains of violent extremism. We have 65 million people — a historic level of people — who are displaced around the world by violent conflict. And right now we are faced with the terrible specter of four concurrent famines — in Somalia, South Sudan, Northeast Nigeria, and Yemen. Each of them is caused by terrible, terrible governance, where there are weak and illegitimate governments that are repressing their people and otherwise creating the roots of this level of violence that's going on. These are violent conflicts that will not be solved by the usual world of diplomats negotiating treaties, and the question is: How do we go forward? What are the solutions to these kinds of conflicts that will take the citizen action, the ground-up efforts, that are absolutely vital?

I'm honored to be on the stage today with three women who are working to make this a reality, and we'll hear from them. I'll introduce all three of you and start at the end: Alaa Murabit. Alaa founded the Voice of Libyan Women, which is an advocacy group for women, at the age of 21. She has a fabulous TED (Technology, Entertainment, Design) Talk that I urge you to take a look at, and she is a strong champion for women's participation in peace processes and conflict mediation. We also have with us Nicola Benyahia, who as a mother experienced firsthand the issues of violent extremism; instead of collapsing into hate or anger, she took that experience to found

Families for Life and is devoting herself to looking at those issues. And then on the far end we have Sanam Naraghi-Anderlini, who is the co-founder and executive director of International Civil Society Action Network, or ICAN; she also established the Inclusive Challenge Fund and has put a lot of energy into determining What are the practical tools for engaging civil society?

So, Sanam, let's start with you. In the face of all of these challenges, where do we find the hope and the courage — that I know you're a part of making happen — to address these challenges?

SANAM NARAGHI-ANDERLINI

Thank you. It's great to be here. And we've had our coffee, right? So we're all awake slightly after a long day. It's been brilliant.

First of all I wanted to thank Jane Wales for inviting me. And to have Big Bird. I wanted to tell Big Bird that I think I learned English in Iran, age 3, from watching Sesame Street. So it's important. Yes. We used to sing all the "One of These Things (Is Not Like the Others)," and all of those things were in Tehran.

I was a refugee at the age of 11 from the Iranian Revolution, and I was always interested in How do you prevent a country going from dictatorship to democracy without going through violence? That's really what drew me to this work. In the 1990s, in my 20s, I had the audacity to think that we could actually prevent wars, and I joined an organization where we were doing this work. And very quickly I realized that actually, because we're talking about civil wars, the international system doesn't allow for interference in the internal affairs of governments — the UN system, the Security Council and so forth. If you see a country going toward war and conflict, it's only the civilians on the ground who are going to be pushing to prevent it. And when you look deeper, you realize it's the women on the ground who are often the first ones to stand up and say, "We don't want war. We want a political solution. We don't want violence." And yet they are consistently erased from history — even the Nobel Prize.

We've all heard about the Nobel Prize. How many of you have heard about Bertha von Suttner? She was the pacifist who was the inspiration behind the Nobel Prize, right? She's been erased from our histories. ICAN as an organization is dedicated to elevating the voices of women peacemakers in countries affected by conflict and crisis and extremism. We have a network of independent women-led organizations now in 27 countries. We do not have offices anywhere. We have one office here in Washington, DC. It's one room in the Carnegie Building. We have a staff of six people because we don't think we need to have offices anywhere because our partners are on the ground and all of the resources that we try to generate should be dedicated to them. So we have a fund, which is about channeling money to the ground, and we call it Investing in Trust because they have the trust of their communities. They have access. They know what's needed. They can see the changes, and the money we enable to get to them is really the icing on the cake. They are going to do the work regardless of whether we support them or not, but when we give them the money the impact is that much greater.

So we do the funding. We convene them once a year because it's really important for people to have solidarity and know that there are others like them. To do peace work is extremely dangerous. Every single one of my partners has had a death threat,

either from their governments or from an extremist movement in their country. They continue to do the work because they care. It's very emotional. It's a lot of solidarity. It's a lot of serious issues, of analysis. I mean, the depth of analysis that they can give you in terms of what is going on and the dynamics is extraordinary. And there is also a lot of joy and loving and laughter because that's what women do when they get together. We have a lot of fun together.

And then the third piece of it really is that we can channel all the resources to the ground. If our policies at the international level are messed up, we can't put the burden on women to fix it. And to that point, just to give you the numbers, for every \$1 that we spend on peacemaking, we spend \$1,885 in war-making or defense or security. Now imagine if we made that \$10 to \$1,885, right? What a difference that would make.

When we talk about the problems that we are dealing with right now, it was interesting for me to hear the World Bank because they don't actually acknowledge the fact that we are living in a state of extreme capitalism. When eight men in the world have the same wealth as 3.6 billion people, and when for 30 years we've told governments, "Don't invest in education; don't invest in health care. Privatize, privatize, privatize — but spend a lot of money on your military," as we've done in this country, no wonder the health sector and the education sector are completely messed up. And no wonder you get extremist or ideological movements going in and providing education because people actually want education for their kids. But it's creating social fragmentation on the ground. It's creating fragmentation among the elite to the grassroots. And we're seeing our societies unravel in these ways. And instead of us working for the economy, economic policy should be working for us. That's what feminism tells us, right? And yet the World Bank doesn't seem to get it, so we need to be talking about that.

If we're talking about Yemen — and I'm British and I live here, so I pay taxes in two countries, which bothers me enormously because both of them are war-makers in Yemen. At the moment our government is fueling the fighter jets of the Saudi Arabians to drop bombs on Yemen, right? We can't say we care about famine in Yemen if we're literally fueling the war. So these are the kinds of issues that we bring to the table because our partners bring them, and we have the privilege of living in a country, so far, where our freedom of speech is allowed, and we have the privilege to have access and create the spaces so that our partners can speak this very uncomfortable truth to the powers that be.

We created something called the Global Solutions Exchange last year with the Norwegian government as a way of enabling civil society — women and youth groups especially — to have direct access to the UN and to governments to talk about education and economic policy and security policy and to go deep into these issues because otherwise they may think that they're listening. We have a lot of rhetoric about how important women are, but the reality is that women are not included and less than 1 percent of the resources that are dedicated to women's organizations actually go to women's organizations in countries affected by conflict. And that less than 1 percent doesn't make even a blip on the scale for those who are actually doing peace and security work. So that's why we try to channel the resources we can.

NANCY LINDBORG

Thank you. And just to pick up on your last point, there's a study that I'm sure you all are very familiar with, for the last 156 peace processes that indicates that if women are included, they are 35 percent more likely to last 15 years or more.

And, Alaa, I know you've been very involved with looking at how to enable women to be more included in these peace processes. How do you raise their voices, including in some tough places? What do you see as the most effective ways?

ALAA MURABIT

I have to first thank you so much for having me. I think it's a hard sell to come after Butterscotch because I'm not nearly as talented, but I'm excited to be on a panel of all women, which is quite rare in almost any conference, but I do think it's indicative of the peace-building leaders. I really do. I think if you look around the world at civil society, the vast majority are women. If you look around at people who are propagating peace rather than conflict, the vast majority are women. The challenge comes in enabling — and it's not necessarily even enabling; that's an awful word to use. The challenge comes in creating institutions and structures that support and recognize women's leadership. We have not done that institutionally.

With the Voice of Libyan Women, when I founded that in 2011, everyone in Libya was euphoric. It was post-revolution. The attitude was fundamentally different than it is today, and even then we had significant pushback. Women during the revolution were seen as equal partners. Immediately following the revolution, they were told to return to their previous roles, be it mother or teacher et cetera. Their leadership was not recognized in that political and institutional way, so we started doing political empowerment seminars and tried to get women to run for office — and some did. We did economic leadership and how to write your CV (curriculum vitae). We taught English and IT (internet technology), but the same faces kept coming. It was always the same families — people who already had the buy-in or the support of their family or their local community. So we began to ask ourselves — at the time I was in my fifth year of medical school — What are the people around me, what are the girls my age who are telling me, "It's great that you're doing this. I wouldn't do this. But I'm really happy you're doing this." How could I get them to come and show up?

A lot of them said, "Listen. I agree with what you're saying, but you're not talking to my dad or my brother. Like, I agree with you. I'm already saying yes. But the people at home who are telling me I can't do this are not listening to you. You're not having conversations with them."

The second thing, which turns out I could not argue with at all, was God. Everybody kept telling me, "But God says — you know, it's wonderful that your family is OK with this, but I just believe that God does not think that that's what I should be doing." And a lot of that came from false interpretation. A lot of that comes from the manipulation of faith. And faith, like any other tool that can support political and economic gain, is manipulated every day in every religion. Islam is not unique in this.

We have a unique history more recently with certain countries that have manipulated faith for their own political gain and their own economic gain in the region, and that has translated into a step back for women. It has translated into more insecure

environments. And there's actually a direct correlation between the insecurity of women in a community and impending violence, and that's something we need to pay attention to. In 2012 we were saying that it's more difficult for us to drive at night. And we had been saying this since the beginning of 2012. We're feeling more uncomfortable. We're getting stopped more. And nobody was listening. And I remember I had conservatives, on one hand, saying it was wrong because I was a women's rights organization, and I had liberals, on the other hand, saying it was wrong because I was strengthening religious leaders. To this I argued, "You can't strengthen people who are already stronger than you. I'm the weaker one in this relationship in the way society looks at me."

So we went to religious leaders, and we sat down with them for nearly six months to start a campaign called the Noor Campaign. And noor in Arabic means "enlightenment." And the idea behind this campaign was to take the same verses and the same sayings of the Prophet that other people — those political and religious leaders — were using to say, "You should not be a leader," that women were not allowed to be heads of state, or that women were not allowed to work out of the home, or that education was not supported or that domestic violence was supported. We were taking those same verses and putting them back in context because it's impossible. I'm a scientist by nature. I can bring a million statistics. But if somebody is saying, "You know what? This is the word of God," statistics tend not to really break that barrier. And so for us, it was very important to be able to use that same messaging and say, "But you're actually using it wrong, and you're taking it out of context and you're misinterpreting it."

For me the number one way we can get more women's inclusion is by being honest about the very foundation of the challenges. As Sanam was saying, you can't go into a community and say, "We're going to build peace here" if you're still dropping bombs. It's unrealistic. You cannot say, "We're going to talk about peace building" if you are supporting a global military infrastructure. I mean, the amount of money that we put into that daily — you cannot say, "We're going to support countering violent extremism" if you are still allied with countries that export it as part of their foreign policy. You have to pick and choose. I think it's time for us to start saying, "Listen. A huge part of women being involved in peace building and security is having women involved at the very basis of creating a lot of these personal status laws, a lot of policy in the region; that means we have to start talking about women's interpretation of faith. And we have to start talking about the state's control of faith and interpretation of faith. And those are very sensitive conversations that politically a lot of people don't necessarily want to have."

NANCY LINDBORG

Thank you for that. And that's a wonderful lead-in to what I know Nicola has devoted her life to in terms of working with families who have been at the victim end of the violent extremism. Nicola.

NICOLA BENYAHIA

Hi. And you, as well, because it's the first time I've been to the United States. And, yes, you've been very welcoming. I heard all the stories you could think about before I came here, all the scare mongering and everything you can think of, but I

was determined to come here. I thought it was really important, especially at the moment with the way things are. I thought, No, I have to come. I don't want to miss an opportunity like this. So thank you for that as well.

Yes, I set up Families for Life very recently because I've been experiencing extremism within my family. It's a support organization for counseling families who either have been affected by it, or they're concerned about any sort of possible signs that their loved one may be showing, or they're actually in the radicalization process, or they've made that decision and obviously gone over to either Syria or Iraq. So it's really to help them.

The reason I set it up was because when my son went missing in 2015, we knew that he was changing, but we couldn't pinpoint it and say, "Yes, oh this is definitely a radicalization." I think there's a very fine point between mental health and a teenager just being a teenager and radicalization. I was just his mother at the end of day. I wasn't somebody who was an expert in radicalization. I wasn't somebody who was particularly looking for these things. I was just trying to be his mum.

So in 2015 it was just a normal day, and he left our home and he left his room exactly as he left it. His bed was unmade. His dirty clothes were on the floor. So you can imagine when he doesn't return — not even a toothbrush is missing, and he's got nothing missing from his room — and he just doesn't return; you just have utter, utter panic because it's something that comes like a bolt out of the blue. It really does. People sometimes look at me sideways and think, Sure there wasn't any sign? It really, really was a shock. You literally go into a trauma when you experience it.

Obviously, we alerted the police straight away. And one of the initial things I said to the police was — because I was in a very emotional state I couldn't think straight; I had four daughters as well to think about — "I need support through this." And they just looked at me blankly and said, "What support?" And I thought, I don't know. I'm just saying I need support. I wasn't emotionally right. How could I know what I was asking for? I just knew there was something I needed, but I couldn't say what it was.

I looked all over the UK, and there was absolutely nothing in the UK. Then I had to broaden my search into Europe, and that's when I came across an expert in Germany called Daniel Koehler, and he was literally a lifeline to me. I remember sending this email to him. And when we talk about This is trust, I remember thinking, I don't know who this German guy is, OK? I could be emailing absolutely anybody, and I kept it in my draft box for several days because I was so scared of sending it, but I thought, I have nothing else. I was at a loss. I was not hearing from my son. The police were investigating, and it was ongoing, but I still needed answers, so I sent this email to him.

His email back to me was a couple of paragraphs, and I remember it was this absolute sigh of relief because it was just simple in the fact: He didn't judge me. He didn't blame me. He believed me. And that was the biggest thing. As soon as he said he believed me and that there was nothing without outside help that I could have done to fight this — for me, I knew I could trust this man. I knew I could wholeheartedly trust him because I hadn't heard that from anyone in Britain. I hadn't heard that from the police. So that began that relationship, which was absolutely crucial in getting me through the coming months when my son eventually did contact me after about two and a half months of missing.

He contacted me and said that he was in Syria. And that started my journey, which was another journey for me because then it was How do I maintain this relationship with my son? I was his mother, but he'd joined a terrorist group. He was an extremist. It was very difficult to differentiate them because at the end of the day he still was my son, but I couldn't ignore the choice he'd made and the impact it had on me and the rest of our family. So, like I said, Daniel Koehler introduced me to a mothers' network in Europe, who, because they'd experienced extremism, helped me through it.

Throughout that communication I was guided on how to maintain communication with my son, but it was very difficult because I also knew my son was going to die. There was no doubt. Things were intensifying in Syria, so I knew it was only a matter of time. Every day it was just an extra day thinking, Is tomorrow the day he's going to die? And that's what I did: I prepared myself for his death basically because I knew I didn't have time on my side.

He was there for about five months, and then he was unfortunately killed by an air strike, and all you get is a phone call. You get a phone call, saying, "Is this Rasheed's father?" I remember it was my husband who answered, and he just said, "Yes, it is." And he said, "Unfortunately, your son's been killed." And then you don't get anything. There's no body. We don't know where he's been killed. In the UK we don't get a death certificate because he's not recognized as being dead. I can't actually apply for a death certificate for seven years, so I still get letters. Unfortunately, although my son is dead, it doesn't stop. The story doesn't end because I still get letters. I get letters from his bank with his name, and they're constant reminders. He used to be asthmatic, and I also get six-month appointments for his asthmatic clinics. I recently got a letter saying, "Congratulations. You've graduated from college. What are your next steps?" And that is the most awful thing you can still get, and I can't stop any of that for at least seven years.

With all that I was going through, I knew there were families out there who were suffering as well because I can't share this. It's such a taboo subject. I couldn't share and put that phone down and say, "OK, I'm going to phone my family. I'm going to phone my friends. I'm going to say my son's dead." I couldn't share that. I couldn't tell anybody but maybe a handful of selected people I could trust. So it was very, very difficult, and I carried that for a long, long time. But I found it increasingly difficult. I kept looking at my daughters, and I just thought, What role model am I that I'm just silenced? I'm just feeding into these extremist groups that want us to be silent so the circle can be replicated again. And I thought, No. I'm not doing that — not for my daughters. I don't want them to go through the rest of their lives with this veil of guilt, this shame, when they have done nothing wrong. I didn't want them to have to carry the choice that their brother had made.

So that's when I decided to go public. I thought, I have to set up this organization to encourage other families. Through my experience, not just what I've been through, I know exactly how it feels — but also the fact that I'm a therapist. That's my profession. The goal was to encourage families to come forward. What I found through traveling all over the world, trying to give this awareness, is that a lot of researchers keep telling me what I feel, what I experience — and they've even written that they had interviews with some of the mothers, to which I'm thinking, We never had an interview with you, and you're telling me how I feel and what I think. And I thought, No. We need to encourage families to come out. We need to stop this being a taboo subject, and we can actually talk about this.

To get the real solutions, it's the families that we need to draw out, encourage them to come forward because only then do you really, really understand what drives young people or individuals down the route of any radicalization or extremism. And I think that's what is most important for me: to be a role model for my daughters but also to bring out families because, like I said, they hold the key to how their family members became radicalized. They might not see it themselves, but I'll see it through supporting them. It can be drawn out in the same way it was with me. It was only after my son got killed and everything that I learned about radicalization; then I understood, on reflection, and put all the pieces together.

NANCY LINDBORG

Nicola, thank you for sharing that very powerful story with us. We're seeing in many countries that it is the women who are on the front lines of the radicalization that's happening in their families. A question for any of the three of you: How do we help empower women — whether they're family members or community members — to help on the prevention? You said you had no sign. Are there ways in which we can help women get more active and more knowledgeable on the prevention side and to build the kind of trust, where you've got the opportunity to work with — whether it's religious or legal or security — officials to try to get a more productive approach for dealing with radicalization?

Sanam, I see you shaking your head.

SANAM NARAGHI-ANDERLINI

That's actually what a lot of our partners are already doing, and I'll give you examples. In Iraq we have a partner in Basra. Her son went and joined one of the militias, and they were basically pumped up with this ideology that you're going to fight this cause and then you're going to go to Heaven, and jihad is this. Because she is trusted in her community already — because they know her because she's been helping widows and children for 20 years — when she picked up this issue she was known; what she started doing with the young men was to say to them, "Jihad isn't spilling blood on the streets. Jihad is giving blood in the hospitals. God doesn't want you to die and go to Heaven. God wants you to do his work here on earth." And she provided them with the opportunity to have a sense of belonging, a cause, a sense of dignity, and it was doing community work.

We've been supporting her work, and at some point I said, "In three months you managed to deradicalize 150 young men." And I did a cost thing: It was \$160 a head. \$160, right? So it's not the money we're talking about. Imagine if she would have had 20 times that amount or whatever the resource. And it's not to say, "Oh, she's fantastic here so now we have to scale her up across Iraq," because she's trusted in Basra. What she could do is maybe work with women in Mosul or women in other places, to scale across and have many, many small initiatives that have a human dimension and a personal dimension.

Same thing in Pakistan. I brought this bag because our partners in Pakistan work with the women and the daughters in the families that are at risk of radicalization, as well as the young men, and give them psychosocial, emotional, religious

literacy, civic education — all these things — and economic skills. They learn how to sew and embroider. Every year when we have our annual conference, I order my bags from the Mothers of Taliban in Pakistan. It's \$8 a bag. It's much nicer to give it to them, for them to know where it's going, than to order it from some online site, where who knows where it is? These people are there and, as Nicola says, she can do it because she's authentic.

What our job really has to be is to recognize that they're locally rooted; we have to globally connect them and amplify their voices because we're still struggling at the international level. I still hear people say to me, "Prove to me that women matter." That's what they say. And I say, "The proof is this: Number one, extremists want to recruit women because they are incredibly good social networkers and they can draw other people in. Number two, every single woman who stands up to give an alternative vision in their own communities is targeted. You don't go and assassinate people if they are not effective, right? So, if those guys get it and if they are selling a message of aspiration and women's empowerment, which is actually for their vision, why is it that at the international level we still have effectively latent sexism and racism because somehow we don't really believe that women in Nigeria and Pakistan, et cetera, can really do stuff.

That's why I call what we do "investing in trust." I realized at some point that our donors were talking about "Our appetite for risk is really low." And I kept saying, "What's risky? Who's risky here?" And I realized that essentially when they are looking at the Global South, they are thinking either incompetence, corruption or terrorism. And I don't see it that way. I see positive. I'm like, "These are people who care. They are on the ground, doing the work whether you have the money or not. We should be investing in the trust that they have." So it's the positive framing that is so important, and we have to change our own mindsets. The problem is much more here than it is over there, I think.

NANCY LINDBORG

And we need the positive frame in light of the headlines.

So, Alaa, you mentioned the work that you did in Libya with some of the religious leaders, the religious literacy. This is part of the issue, I think, that we're addressing. Tell us how that worked. What impact do you think you were able to make by focusing in on working with the religious actors?

ALAA MURABIT

I think it created a very significant impact. I mean, both locally — it was the first time these conversations were being had — but even internationally. Within a year we had the United Nations doing their Faith in Women Committee (Women, Faith and Development Alliance), which they previously had told me would be an awful idea. I think it showed that it was a conversation that needed to be had.

I'm just going to go to something that Sanam was saying or really your question about how we can engage women and how we can institutionalize that engagement. I think a huge part of it is, let's say you have gangrene on your leg and you go to the hospital and you go to the doctor and the doctor puts a Band-Aid on it and then you go home. Pretty soon you're going to have to

amputate your leg, right? That's not a viable solution. And that is how we look at a lot of these problems. We look at the challenge of extremism, or we look at the challenge of any type of insecurity: food insecurity, water insecurity, a health crisis, et cetera. We do look at those as Band-Aid solutions, and we try to plug in some sort of fix.

For example, I could not count the amount of times people would say, "Well, this worked in Somalia, so it will definitely work here in Libya" or "This worked in Sudan" or "You know, we tried this in Iraq." And I'm like, "It's not the same. It's not a copy-paste solution. It's not a Band-Aid. What we need to be doing is going in and looking at that root problem. We need to be debriding it. We need to be taking everything out." And that does come down to the fundamentals of health and education and security.

I know that sounds insane because we've been taught to think security means missiles and bombs and defense and armies, but we know that that's actually incorrect. I mean, the more governments securitize, the less trust and legitimacy their citizens have in them. That is an incredible statistic. So the more you say there is a war on drugs, a war on poverty, a war on terrorism, a war on Ebola, a war on whatever, and the government cannot actually "protect" citizens to the degree that they feel protected, they lose faith in their government. It is practical and smart governance to seek out local peace builders. It makes the most sense. You're not helping anybody out on the ground. You're helping yourself. You're giving legitimacy to your own government, be it in the United States or Canada or the UK.

My research has been on the effects of securitization and how they impact the nation-state and how relative deprivation leads to radicalization in communities. A lot of people used to say, "Poverty breeds extremism," and that has been proven to be untrue, or "Illiteracy breeds extremism," and that's not true. We find that radicalization can happen at any age group, at any literacy level and at any economic level. What it comes down to is the sense that you deserve more and that you're being given less because of your skin color, or your religion, or your race or your last name. It's what we call "relative deprivation" — that you see other people getting despite the fact that you've worked just as hard.

A lot of that comes from inequality, be it health inequality or educational inequality or just social inequalities. And the way you address that is by taking money out of your defense budgets and putting money into your health care budgets or by investing in local organizations that prioritize that. Because, unfortunately, what I find is when we talk about preventing violent extremism, everybody wants these really quick solutions without realizing that this is a generational challenge. This is a societal challenge. This is going to take quite a bit of time. And it's about rebuilding educated, healthy, equal societies. And that is where we need to get to, and we need to start first and foremost with women because we see the treatment of women as being the single largest indicator of where a society will go. And to actually do that, we need to have those institutions and establishments created.

So, if you have organizations working on the ground, it's about seeking them out. It's about saying, "How can we be of service to you? How can we ensure that your work is more possible?" And for organizations and individuals in this

room who have access to governments and access to forums like this, it's about amplifying the voices of people working locally and saying, "You know what? There is going to be a panel on radicalization. Why don't we have a mother in Pakistan who has been working on this for 20 years come and tell us what we can do better and how we can be of service?" Because at the end of the day, security is different for everybody. If that's what the Noor Campaign and Libya have taught me, it's that I looked at security as being able to get home safely every day. My parents looked at security as my sisters being able to go to school. The local militias looked at security as all the soldiers coming home alive. Security does not mean the same thing to every person. And it's about ensuring that you have enough people there, that security is as inclusive as possible.

NANCY LINDBORG

So, building on that a little bit, you know there is this whole concept of the state/society relationship, and when that falls apart is when you are more likely to have violent extremism, possibilities of civil war or displacement of people due to violence. And there is increasing scholarship that helps us look at various indices: treatment of women, ability to deliver services to your people, security, et cetera. But we're still not very good at getting ahead of the crisis that we can see is more likely to happen. This whole notion of being able to prevent the kind of crisis that will turn into violence and tear apart communities and societies — the four famines, the civil wars — for the three of you, how have you seen the work that you're doing, the role of women, being important for that preventive function? How can that help us get ahead of these crises so that we don't always end up in this reactive dynamic, where we're reacting with military action or peacekeepers or gigantic packages of humanitarian assistance?

ALAA MURABIT

I'll just hit on girls' education as one aspect. If you're looking simply at girls' education, if you educate a girl for an extra two years, you're looking at a 3 percent increase in the GDP (gross domestic product) of a country. You're looking at her having fewer children, and her children are more likely to survive because she'll vaccinate them. You are looking at numerous studies, which have culminated in Paul Hawken's Drawdown, that have said that girls' education and women's reproductive education are the single most important things to combat climate change. Those are the most cost-effective solutions to combat climate change.

If you're talking about peace treaties, you had mentioned earlier: 35 percent more likely to last 15 years. What's most interesting is that 90 percent fail within five, so that's why it's such a drastic difference. There's an incredible amount. If you're talking about corruption, 30 percent of women parliamentarians mean there's a significant decrease in corruption. If you're talking about health practitioners, the most well-appreciated health practitioners are actually women. Women in conflict zones are actually considered to be better doctors and nurses to have around than men. People trust them more in terms of being able to create relationships, in terms of being able to have those networks.

So the evidence is there. I don't think that's the challenge. And I honestly think we go backward every single time we ask, "Well, why do we need the women?" I think the question should be: How do we institutionalize women's roles? Because

we know we need the women. And we don't ask, "Why do we need the men?" Nobody ever asks that. Nobody says, "Well, what do men bring to the table?" We have structures and institutions that have been built and shaped by men and in their likeness. And what we need to do is create that space for women — in particular young women — because often when we talk about women we are talking about older women, and when we talk about youth we are talking about young men who we're worried will pick up guns.

NANCY LINDBORG

Nicola?

NICOLA BENYAHIA

It's interesting that you say we're not looking ahead and we wait for a crisis to happen. Interestingly, when I went through what I went through in the investigation of my son, one of the things that really got me throughout the investigation was that I kept saying to the security and the police, "Why do you wait for a crisis to happen and you just respond. All we're doing is responding every time something happens — we just respond. We are not actually looking ahead." And I said, "Unfortunately, the extremist groups are looking ahead, and all we are doing is playing catch-up. We need to be planning in the same way they do, actually looking ahead for our young people and seeing what makes them tick, what's going on for them. Why are they feeling marginalized from society, and what are the gaps that they're trying to fill? And we need to obviously have that solution and that counter-narrative for them."

But it's definitely certainly about the mothers, I think. It's about getting the message out there and getting them to talk about this openly, and I don't think that's happening at the moment. At the moment, in the UK certainly, I think we hit a period where we became quite complacent. Things weren't hitting the media about people going to Syria, so we thought, Oh, we're OK here — until we had the Westminster attack recently, and then suddenly we're talking about the subject again. And we can't keep carrying on like that where we're just responding. We have to keep this topic going so it's not a taboo subject.

NANCY LINDBORG

And, Nicola, we at the US Institute of Peace have looked a lot at gender roles and how men and boys are stuffed in the man box with the valorization of violence, as we've seen. So it is both girls and boys that we need to be thinking about as we look at the future.

NICOLA BENYAHIA

Absolutely, it's both. The women, particularly young girls, are used as propaganda for ISIS (Islamic State of Iraq and Syria) or any extremist group. But the way they attract them is very different from the way they attract the boys. It's not necessarily that they attract the boys or young men with violence. It's usually the adventure of it or the sense of belonging. With girls it's more of that. Yes, it is the belonging but it's also about that romantic side because quite often when you have young girls you do start to think about the opposite sex. You do start

thinking about your future. And that's what they sell for these young girls, as well, so it can be very different. That's why we do have to look at the risk to both girls and boys, but we have to find the solution differently to see what it is that's drawing them in.

NANCY LINDBORG

Sanam?

SANAM NARAGHI-ANDERLINI

I'll give you four points, alright?

Number one: In 2012, when we had our first forum of women from 15 countries from the Middle East, North Africa and Asia, we were looking at what was going on, and one by one they said to us, "The Salafis are coming." The Libyans said, "First they came after the dead" because they destroyed the shrines and all the ancient relics. "Then they came after women." And it was the day that they attacked the US compound in Benghazi and Ambassador Chris Stevens was killed. The news picked up the Ambassador Stevens event, right? The women had been targeted long before. The women in Benghazi had warned the ambassador not to go. They knew. Nobody listened to them. Nobody listened to them afterward.

I was at the Trusteeship Council at the UN last year, and we were talking about conflict prevention. I've been in this business for 20 years, so now we're seeing the cycles. Twenty years ago we were talking about conflict prevention; now we're talking about conflict prevention. Early-warning indicators — "Those are very important" they told me. And I said, "Well, here's an early-warning indicator: There's a Turkish academic who is in jail right now, facing seven years of solitary confinement because she signed a peace petition. That's an early-warning indicator." I didn't know that in the audience there was a representative from the Turkish mission. He stood up, "Why are you naming and shaming us in this Trusteeship Council?"

"Look, I'm not naming and shaming anybody. You want an early-warning indicator. That's your early-warning indicator! You want to know what's going to be the next country? Look at our report on Uganda. We published it this year. The signs are all there. It's just that we don't want to see them." So that's the number one: Women are targeted. That's the first, earliest sign.

Number two: When we warn, nobody is listening. Nobody is listening, right?

Number three: There is a tendency to think of peace as a political issue. In the philanthropic world and others, I've found this. But to me it's like saying you're a painter and you have a canvas, right? And you want to do education work, or you want to do health work, but if your canvas is shredded apart, every dollop of paint you put on it is going to fall through. It's going to drip down if the actual canvas of peace isn't strong. So peace is not political. It's the baseline of what we need. And we have grown up. We've been privileged enough over the past 70 years for most of us to live in peaceful societies, more or less. The wars have been somewhere else, right? We take it for granted. We can't do that anymore. It is shredding as we speak. Every day since 2011 — since 2001 but since 2011 — it's been accelerating, so we need to put the emphasis there.

And one of the things that I would say to this audience is that it's not enough just to write a check. It's not just to put your money where your mouth is if you care about this issue. It's actually to put your mouth where your money is. And by that I mean that some of you in this room have access to the World Bank leadership, right? We don't. They don't respond to our emails because we're women's organizations and we're advocates and what do we know about anything? But if you are supporting this kind of work, open those doors to let the experts in. When we bring together the women's groups that I work with and are in this, they've been doing civic education, peace education for 20 years. They are deep, professional specialists.

In fact, civil society has become the private arm of the social welfare state. So you have privatization of telecom and so forth, but this sector has become the other side because governments don't have that expertise anymore. When I talk to diplomats, they've had different posts, you know; they're two years here and three years there. I've been in conflict prevention and peace building for 20 years. That's what I do. I work with women. That's what I do. And it's the same with many of us, but it's not recognized as an expertise — especially when it comes to women. It's like "Oh, you're a woman? You can talk about gender issues." I mean, there's a lack of respect for the depth of expertise that these people are bringing, and we need that to be recognized and heard. It's literally to sit and listen. Sometimes I feel that we are heard, but that they're not listening. Sometimes they're listening, but they just don't hear it because there is so much prejudice about, Oh, it's a young woman, for example, or It's a woman who comes from some other country. What do they know about security issues? So it's that shift in paradigm, and we need all the help we can get because if we don't have peace, education, health, all this other stuff is going to go by the wayside.

ALAA MURABIT

But not just listen. I just want to add it's not just listening though. It's that we're in the room and we get to architect the projects. I always hear people say, "Well, we're going to go to the local community, and we're going to get their feedback." And they bring a whole project they've already written up and then ask for our feedback. And that's not how it works. It has to be that we're in the room and we get to build the projects and we are architects of it because we know the local community the best. So it's not just listening.

NANCY LINDBORG: RIGHT

Absolutely.

I want to thank our panelists. Thank you for the work that you do and for the hope that you bring despite the challenges that you've outlined. I understand that you have an early morning tomorrow, and it will be an invigorating day to build on a lot of these ideas. Please join me in thanking our panelists.

SPECIAL ADDRESS AMBASSADOR CARLOS PINZÓN



Ambassador Juan Carlos Pinzón

THURSDAY, APRIL 20

11:55 AM

AMBASSADOR JUAN CARLOS PINZÓN

Ambassador of Colombia to the United States

JANE WALES

CEO, Global Philanthropy Forum (moderator)

JANE WALES

Last night we had a conversation about the role of individuals in forging peace and in sustaining peace, and of course peace is personal and so is war. As you know, Colombia has endured a 50-year — a half-century — civil war and just recently was able to reach a peace agreement with the FARC (Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia, or Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia) — not easily done in a civil war. As I say, war is personal. Every family has had an experience. Every family has had a family member kidnapped, a family member killed. Under those circumstances it's very, very hard; nothing could be harder than forging a peace. But because with extraordinary skill and, I should say, some empathy, President [Juan Manuel] Santos' administration was able to end that 50-year war, and the FARC is demobilizing, is returning to normalcy. Quite rightly, President Santos was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for achieving this peace.

The man I'm going to introduce to you is going to be much better at telling this story because he lived it. He also had a big role in creating this peace. So while President Santos rightly got the Nobel Prize, it would be a mistake to underestimate the role that Ambassador Pinzón played when he was minister of defense and when he was chief of staff to the president. In both instances his highest priority was to bring the civil war to an end and find a peace agreement with the FARC. Not only did he lay the groundwork for peace in those past roles but he is now the Colombian ambassador to the United States; his task now is to gain the support of the US government for the implementation of the peace plan. So as we move from Plan Colombia to Peace Colombia, it is his job to gain that support for implementation, and of course we all stand with him. So please join me in welcoming Ambassador Pinzón.

JUAN CARLOS PINZÓN

Buenos dias. Good morning, all.

Jane, thank you so much. What a kind introduction. You're very generous for introducing me and to spread the word about Colombia. That's nice of you. What a great opportunity to be in this 2017 Global Philanthropy Forum. And, by the way, allow me to congratulate you all for what you do, for taking care of other people, for trying to literally make the world better, for investing your time, your resources, your will, to do things that somehow make other people's lives better. This is what I value about this philanthropy forum. I think this city is full of events, you know? Today we have spring meetings here in Washington, so we have World Bank, IMF (International Monetary Fund) meetings. We have conferences almost every day in any venue of the city. But there are not so many events in which you gather people who are willing to put as much effort and resources as you can to contribute to the life of others. So thank you again. I feel very, very humble, very honored to be here with you.

Now let me talk about Colombia. I feel very happy to know that I'm not the only Colombian in the room. I learned some nights ago that when this event was going to be launched, several Colombian fellows were going to be part of this. I have a special regard for Alejandro Eder over here, who maybe some of you have met already. And there are several others in the room. I mention Alejandro because Alejandro was a real player. He was a member of the negotiating team, and he was the head of the agency that reintegrated members of the different criminal organizations, having disarmed them [after their] demoralizing [of] Colombia. I'm pointing him out just because you have the great opportunity that when I leave, he will have the real questions to respond to. He is here, as well as several other Colombians who are doing a lot of efforts, a lot of projects in the country for a long time; they are here with you and are ready to engage, and I understand they are trying to connect with all of you for the same purpose.

The story of Colombia is a beautiful story; it is a story of hope, and it is a story that lets you believe that sometimes impossible things can be done, that sometimes challenges that apparently are impossible to overcome can be confronted, can be tackled. Colombia was the most violent country in the world, according to many experts, by the end of the nineties. We had the two most violent cities on the planet: Medellín and Cali. We were really losing control of the state in parts of the territory in the southeast part of the country. In the southwest we have a lot of presence of guerillas from the FARC and ELN (Ejército de Liberación Nacional).

Most of these guerillas were Marxist guerillas from the Cold War era. And as opposed to all other guerillas, when the Cold War ended they got stronger because of drug trafficking. There are very few guerillas in the history of the world that, instead of getting funds from the outside, were funding even NGOs in different countries of the world. How rich they were, precisely because of kidnapping, of this business of trafficking, among many other criminal activities, including extortion of Colombians. In the north we have a counter-reaction to that. We have the illegal paramilitary groups confronting these guerillas but trying to take control using corruption, doing the worst kinds of human rights violations and funding themselves as well with drug trafficking. So really the country was in the middle of a very complicated situation.

I always like to remind, especially those of you who are American citizens, that you must feel proud of your country. We like your country in Colombia. We are thankful to the United States of America for different reasons, including national strategic interests. The United States came to the support of Colombia, and with Colombian authorities we crafted a program that we called Plan Colombia. Plan Colombia is far from being a perfect policy. Plan Colombia is far from being without mistakes. But the implementation of Plan Colombia, there is no doubt, contributed to the transformation of Colombia in a way that has not been seen in many other policies.

The plan, in essence, allowed us to enhance our capabilities on security, on development and on justice. It was not just a security campaign. It was a multilayer campaign that, more important than all, instead of replacing Colombian institutions was crafted to enable Colombian institutions. It allowed Colombian institutions to learn, to get stronger, to get the capabilities that were required to start this process off: taking back our own country for our own citizens, defeating crime and violence and making the presence of the state an opportunity for development for the rest of

the country. And that's how it happened. Plan Colombia paved the way to end the conflict. Plan Colombia has paved the way to get to peace.

After 15, 20 years, Colombians did their part. And of course I'm the ambassador of Colombia, so you have to discount me by definition. You should not believe everything I said, you know, because I am not only very proud of doing this — of speaking about my beloved country — but also because I tell this story with a lot of passion. But Colombians were great. What has happened in Colombia is not the story of one Colombian, of a national hero of this or that color. It's the story of Colombians. In the middle of the struggle, we were able to keep democracy. In the middle of the struggle, Colombians were the ones who chose leaders to confront this situation. With democracy and with institutions, we constrained ourselves of winning on different ways. We constrained ourselves and actually punished misbehavior, and we tried to create a set of values — rule of law and respect for the highest values.

The use of force: I have to tell you, the more that I reflect on my time, the decisions I made and participated in, I always come back to the idea that we did it with a lot of conviction under the law precisely to achieve higher ends. The use of force has limited consequences, but if the use of force can create the opportunity for peace, development and actually better life and prosperity for our country, it's what you have to do; it's what makes sense to do. And I said this because that comes from my own part, but somehow that was the way. We tried every effort.

This campaign started after a failed peace process with the FARC, a very frustrating peace process with the FARC by the end of the nineties. We knew that it was necessary to change the balance of power, and by changing the balance of power we create the conditions for a final political settlement. So that's what President Santos got to. That's what he saw. We were at a point in which we degraded the FARC, and any other criminal organization at the time, mainly to 30 percent of what they originally were. We degraded their leadership. We degraded their man-power. We degraded their capabilities. We degraded their funding in a way that conditions for a peace agreement were set.

And once the peace process started, certain elements were considered key conditions. First and very important was to not change the concepts of democracy, a market-oriented economy or freedom. That was a very key element, and this is the thing we need to endure because that's how we know we have been able to create opportunities, reduce poverty, reduce inequality and encourage prosperity for our own people. That's how investors have come to the country. That's how the economy has been growing. And by providing security, that's how Colombians have found a better life in the past decade and a half.

The second element we saw was to not negotiate with the other side regarding the structure or the future of our armed forces, and the reason was simple: We didn't want what happened in other peace processes because we understand that making peace is beyond having an agreement; it is the implementation of that agreement that matters. In securing peace, what is critical is protecting the people of the country, so we needed to keep the capabilities and of course evolve to those for the new challenges we were going to confront.

And of course we crafted a transitional justice system. Transitional justice is very difficult to understand under ordinary conditions. You know that. I'm just looking to you because what you want as a citizen is that those who offend others, those who commit crimes, be punished. That's what you want in regular society. If you see someone out here killing other people, that person might have any justification, but you are expecting to see some kind of punishment for crossing lines. Transitional justice is a model to pursue that goal but with the constraints and limitations of a political objective, which is peace. And to achieve peace, you need to grant hope for the will of disarmament, hope for the will of demobilization and expect a reintegration.

But on the other side, for those hopes to materialize you need to offer truth, but you cannot offer many, many years in jail in exchange just because you will not get the objective of disarmament and demobilization. And you will have to go after them, and that's where you want to stop. That's where you want to end. But the transitional justice model creates the opportunity for truth, the opportunity for social punishment, if you want, for claiming who did what. At the same time, you want to establish a certain level of responsibility for whoever did crime and finally recognition of those misbehaviors in a way that society can accept, that society can somehow look for reconciliation. That's the way this has been crafted. The better it works, the most visible that peace will be in the future. So that's, in essence, how this happened.

What is Colombia today? I described it as the most violent country in the region, in the world, some decade and a half ago. Today we have the lowest crime rates in 38 years. The economy has been over performing other peer economies in the region — and in the emerging markets, when you average the past decade. The country has been attracting investment. We became one of the most attractive foreign investment countries in per capita terms in the region and in the world.

Colombia has also attracted five times more tourists than we had a decade ago, from 1 million to almost 5 million people coming to the country. The potential is immense on this front. I will set my own goal: 30 million people in the next five years. That's a number we should be looking at after this major change the country is having and the wonders we have. The country has also been able to reduce poverty by half in just one decade and to create jobs in a sustained way for more than five years, and of course that has created a positive dynamic.

Are we out of challenges? Let me tell you: no. We have big, huge challenges. The country needs to, first of all, integrate those areas of the country that are in far lands in a way that people in those areas can connect to the country, can have opportunities. And we can create competition for criminal, illegal economies because those are still there. It might be the inheritors of the FARC or other gangs or other people that will take care of drug trafficking, illegal mining, human trafficking, extortion and other crimes. So we will need to take advantage of the time to precisely connect these communities to the country by allowing them to have alternative development, an alternative economy and an alternative future; if you want, a legal future. That's very important.

But at the same time, we will need to be strong enough to confront those who dare continue to do violence. We cannot be doubtful about it. We have to be determined about it. We will also need to keep attracting investment. In the end it's jobs and it's

training people; education, no doubt, is what's going to give the next generation of people who were expected to be recruited in criminal organizations a future. We need these people to have a connection to the world, an opportunity to have a job, an opportunity to have an income. And having an income and having freedom would allow them to choose for their kids a better education, a better future. This is the challenge we have right now: how to do that and how to do it effectively. And it is not a minor challenge.

This is why we keep thinking that as we value Plan Colombia so much, we have crafted a new program that we call Peace Colombia, and Peace Colombia is an effort joined by Colombia and by international donors, no doubt. We expect the United States, as a partner of Colombia, to be engaged with us in this effort: bringing development, keeping security and somehow strengthening the justice system in a way that this peace becomes sustainable. It's good not only for Colombia and Colombians — no doubt that's the first goal — but if it is good for Colombia, it will be good for the region. It will be good for the values of democracy, freedom and a market-oriented economy. And it is somehow a proven model, to different failures not only in the region but in the world. So it has the benefit of giving an option to 50 million people in Colombia — the third-largest country in Latin America, the second-largest Spanish-speaking country in the world, a country that is three and a half times the size of Germany or of Texas, California, Vermont, New Hampshire and all these states together. So it's quite a big country. It's also giving a geopolitical success of the policy of the United States and the policies of the countries and democracies of the world.

I have to stop, I know. I'll stop in a second. Well, more than a second now.

I think it's important to tell that we have been successful, mainly with taxpayers from Colombia. Let me remind you that I spoke highly about the US support, but let me tell you who paid for the bill in Colombia: 95 percent of the bill has been paid by Colombian taxpayers. By the way, last December there was approved tax reform in Colombia. The additional revenues of this tax reform are planned to fund these kinds of programs that I described, precisely to make peace sustainable.

So what we expect from the United States is what we got during Plan Colombia: a push, enablers, support, friendship, the opportunity and somehow co-responsibility because unfortunately the drug business is not a thing that happens just in Colombia. It's a thing that gets out of Colombia, crosses Central America, Mexico, comes to the streets of the United States, harms people everywhere — but then the cash flow comes from here in terms of money and weapons. So there's a cycle that we need to cooperate to disrupt, more important than all, by using different kinds of policies and approaches. There's no single one. Expecting our people — our communities in Colombia, in Central America and Mexico, in the United States, in Europe or elsewhere — to have less harm from crime and from criminals: That's the logic of all this. This is why we keep expecting this logic of support and effort. Again, moving to the idea that our Colombian taxpayers really need to do what we have been doing — taking care of our own country, for our own future, for our own destiny — but doing this in a peaceful way to the rest of the world and trying to be contributors of peace and stability to the region and, hopefully, to the world.

Let me end my remarks with two comments. First, nothing of this story would be possible in Colombia without the sacrifice of the soldiers, police and citizens who got killed because of their decision to confront different types of criminals and different types of organized crime, terrorists and criminal organizations. That's how we did it. Our soldiers, our police, those people who got kidnapped, those people who kept the country to the future — they deserve all the credit. We have many wounded soldiers in Colombia, and I know I'm here in front of a group of philanthropy people, different organizations and efforts. I'm going to be telling you that one of my future endeavors will be to create a foundation to support the special education abroad, education in the best schools of the world, for orphans of those soldiers and police who were killed doing their part, fighting for Colombia. They deserve that. So what is better than education? And what better way to keep honoring them for the rest of my days than by doing precisely that?

Finally, I learned when I came here that after me there was going to be a musician, someone was going to sing. And I thought, Oh, that's totally unfair when Jane told me that. I said, "Well, I will anyway. I will do my best, but I know I will be boring at some point and I will kind of repeat myself, and that's how you probably talk, too, so having a beautiful lady after me singing, that's really challenging, but I better take it in the best possible way. She's going to sing. I met her some time ago. She went to a residence in one of the jazz events that we have, and she really makes a case. She will sing beautifully, and of course, sorry, but she's Colombian, too. We might get you tired this time.

Thank you so much.

TRUST, JUSTICE AND THE CONFLICT CONTINUUM



Robert Malley, David Miliband, and Yifat Susskind

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19

11:15 AM

ROBERT MALLEY

Incoming Vice President for Policy, International Crisis Group (moderator)

DAVID MILIBAND

President and CEO, International Rescue Committee

JOHN PRENDERGAST

Founding Director, Enough Project

YIFAT SUSSKIND

Executive Director, MADRE

DAVID TOLBERT

President, International Center for Transitional Justice

ROBIN WRIGHT

Senior Fellow, The US Institute of Peace and the Woodrow Wilson Center

ROBERT MALLEY

Good morning again — and great, great music we just heard. Without any obvious transition, we're going to go back now to discussing what you've been discussing for some time, which is interaction of what people — like those who are onstage and those in this room, private citizens, NGOs and others — can do at a time when conflict is on the rise and governments may not be doing everything that they need to do.

We have a stellar panel. I'll introduce everyone as I ask them the first question. We have a great panel. We also have the exact right time to have them onstage because, as I said, conflict is on the rise. After a period of relative decline in the number of conflicts, we're now seeing the highest number of conflicts since 1999, and they are causing a greater number of civilian casualties than they have in the past. Also the incidence of recurrence of conflict — once a conflict ends and it starts again — that's increasing. Between 1945 and 2009, 57 percent of civil wars reoccurred. Between 2000 and 2017, that figure jumped to 90 percent. So, obviously, there is something that's going wrong in terms of our ability not just to end the conflict but to make sure that it doesn't start again. There are other pieces of evidence about how, in fact, we're facing a worse environment, again, as I think everyone here would attest.

The last time the UN declared a famine was in 2011 in Somalia. The last time the UN declared more than one famine at the same time was more than three decades ago, and now we're on the verge of the UN's declaring four famines simultaneously — in Yemen, Nigeria, South Sudan and Somalia. At the same time, we're seeing pressure as all of these conflicts are taking place: more refugees, more internally displaced persons. And this is occurring at a time when countries are closing their borders, sending people back, being less generous in what they will do for refugees and asylum seekers. And all of this is happening at a time — and it's no coincidence — when we're seeing a resurgence of nativism, a push-back against globalism, a push-back against international intervention, international involvement. All of this is happening at the same time. So, more conflict, deadlier conflict, with more humanitarian consequences, in terms of both famine and internal and foreign displacement, and of course greater costs incurred by the most vulnerable populations of all: women and children.

It's clearly a time for a wake-up call, a time to figure out what people who are non-government can do to do more to get governments to do more: to pressure them, to persuade them, to mobilize and perhaps to take action when governments won't. As I said, we have a distinguished panel here, and the reason it's such a good mix is that you have people who have been in government, people who have been in the private sector, people who have been in NGOs, people who have been in the field covering conflicts and some people who have done more than one of what I've just mentioned. So they're perfectly suited to speak about that interaction between what governments can do, how you could get them to do it and what others can do when governments won't do what they need to do.

Let me start with David Miliband, and I assume you've all read the bios. I'm going to say a little bit about them, and I'll take the opportunity to say a bit about me, as well, as I ask David the first question. David is the president and CEO of International Rescue Committee, which is a great organization that's dedicated to providing humanitarian relief and development across the world. He's also was a foreign secretary of the UK, and that's where I first met him.

The question I want to ask David about is precisely this interaction between one's role in government and one's role in the NGO and the not-for-profit community. Just a few words about myself: I've gone back and forth. I was at the International Crisis Group [ICG], which is a conflict prevention organization, dealing with the Middle East. Then I went into government. I served the last three years as President Obama's adviser for the Middle East, and now I've just returned to the International Crisis Group. What struck me — and I'm curious, David, whether it struck you — is how different the languages of both worlds are, when you are in an NGO community or in a nonprofit and in government.

When I was at ICG, I was focused on root causes: What can we do to stop conflicts in the Middle East and not simply kill jihadists? When I was in government, I have to say, the pressures of being in government, of having a responsibility — a political responsibility but also a policy responsibility — it became so easy to just focus on the military side of fighting terrorists. I'm now back outside, back at ICG, and I'm putting on my old hat and I'm focused again on this issue. It's not going to be good enough to simply kill jihadists, and even that may sometimes be counterproductive. You need to focus on development. You need to focus on justice, accountability, inclusive governance. So, from your experience being foreign secretary and then coming to the International Rescue Committee, how do you view the two worlds? And how can one best, coming from the non-governmental world, influence government officials, who have different priorities sometimes and different ways of looking at things?

DAVID MILIBAND

Thank you very much, Rob. This is going to be a good panel because we're going to disagree, which will make for hopefully some light as well as some heat. From my perspective, the language is often the same in the NGOs and in government. The language is the same. And that's a problem because we speak a language that the public doesn't speak. And the great danger is that the NGO community and the governments are in a sort of symbiotic relationship, where we're talking to each other but we lose sight of the wider public, on whose legitimacy and support we depend.

It's interesting for me to reflect as someone who was obviously in a European government, not an American one. I think it was Richard Holbrooke who said that the great danger for America after 9/11 was what he called the "militarization of diplomacy," and I think that's what you're speaking to in the idea that a missile can resolve a problem. And sometimes it can resolve a problem but also create other problems, and sometimes it makes a problem worse. I think that what's interesting to me — looking at your system, just as a reflection — is that often it's the generals who are most clear that a missile isn't sufficient to solve a problem. The generals are often the first to say, "You can't kill your way out of a problem," which strikes me as being right.

My own perspective about the relationship between non-governmental actors and government actors is that it's incumbent on us to do the things that inspire government to think that you can actually solve problems. Given the risk aversion that exists inside government because of the public pressure that they live under, I think it's incumbent on NGOs, the private sector and private philanthropy always to be asking, "Where are we doing the things that government can't do? Where are we taking the risks that government can't take? Where are we setting the benchmarks for enlightened intervention that is long-term, that is sustainable, that government — just because of its short-termism and its crisis management — isn't able to do? My advice is always, "Don't try to persuade government to do something. Go and do something that works and then get government to copy it" because I think that's a more fruitful way of thinking about the relationship.

ROBERT MALLEY

I'm not sure we do disagree, although I think we could have a longer discussion about what I would consider the hyper-obsession sometimes with counterterrorism, which I fell victim to, so this is self-criticism as much as anything else. But what you're just describing, in terms of how you convince governments to do certain things and what works, let's focus on one area that I mentioned earlier: the area of refugees. Because if there's any issue that seems to be running against the tide right now, it's that one because of the retrenchments; because of people's fatigue with foreign intervention, foreign involvement; because of this threat that people associate refugees and foreigners wrongly with terrorism and violence. So focusing on the question of refugees, how do you — and how have you tried to — use what works in your world to convince governments to open their doors to refugees in need?

DAVID MILIBAND

Judging by the policies or the statements of the US government, we're not doing a great job of convincing the US government, I think it's fair to say, at the moment.

We are an unusual organization in that we are crisis-focused. We work to support people whose lives are shattered by conflict and disaster around the world, so we're not an antipoverty organization per se. We're an organization drawn to places of crisis: war zones, fragile states and refugee transit routes. We're unusual because we also complete the arc of help by being a refugee resettlement agency in 29 US cities, so we span the arc of crisis.

I think there are two things that we have to think about really hard. One is that we're coming off a period when Western international leadership defined the rules of

the global game after the Second World War, and it did so in a way that it has now become a victim of its own successes in many ways. The spread of global markets, which was an aim of the rules-based international system, has led to a rebalancing of international power as emerging economies have grown, and that has produced quite a virulent populist reaction in the Western world. So the countries that, if you like, gave birth to the global order after World War II are now facing some of the greatest threats against it. I mean, it's very, very odd.

If you read the president of China's [Xi Jinping] speech to Davos this year, China is now the status quo power of the international system, whereas Western leaders are the revisionist powers of the international system. That's a really significant change. And I do think that we should understand that we're a victim of our own successes in some ways. But we're also the victim of our own failures. Aid fatigue, in a way, is a child of failed military interventions abroad. I don't think we should kid ourselves about that. And some of the animus that's directed toward refugees, or the fear that exists toward refugees, reflects some of that experience over the past 15 years, notably in this country but by no means confined to this country because in Europe there's a similar reaction.

My own feeling about the response is twofold. One, Stalin said that "one person's death is a tragedy; a million people's death is a statistic." And there are 65 million people around the world today displaced by conflict, internally displaced and refugees, and the great danger is that they get dehumanized. So lesson one for me is that refugees and displaced people need to be telling their own story, and we need to find ways for them to tell their own story. They can tell it in a far more powerful way than I can.

Second, we've got to be clear that the international rights that were established after the Second World War need to be preserved, but the international systems that were developed for helping displaced people are just totally out of date. So the assumptions underpinning the international system are that refugees are in camps, that they're displaced for a short period of time, that the main issue is survival. Those things are wrong. It's long-term displacement, on average for 10 years. Sixty percent of refugees are in urban areas, not in camps. And try telling someone who was born in the Dadaab refugee camp 20 years ago that survival is all that matters, and they don't get an education. Less than 2 percent of the global humanitarian budget goes to education, which, if you think about a failure of heart and a failure of head, it's really up to us to take that on. And, frankly, the private sector has to step in.

I don't know if there's anybody here from MacArthur Foundation, but I should do a plug for them. They're doing this 100&Change project: \$100 million to attack a global problem. We're one of the finalists with Sesame Workshop, and our argument is 12 million kids under the age of 8 have been displaced by war. Less than 2 percent of the global humanitarian budget goes to education, yet we know that if you address the toxic stress that the kids face, you can actually help them survive and rebuild their lives. That's a good example of where the private sector or the philanthropic sector needs to come in at scale. We don't need another \$1 million project to address toxic stress. We've got to go at this in a big way that really makes a difference. Just as government is too fragmented in the way it works, in the NGO sector we're often too fragmented, as well. We have to think bigger and bolder and at scale if we're to really make a dent.

ROBERT MALLEY

Thank you, and you made a point about how we need to humanize some of the impact of conflict. I want turn to a great humanizer, Robin Wright, who is a good friend and a journalist. She has written about what she sees on the ground. She was just in Iraq, and she has won many awards for her coverage on Iran and conflicts in Africa. I'd like to ask you, Robin: You just heard what we were talking about, which is the need to get governments to understand what is actually happening and to turn a statistic into a human story. What's been your experience as a journalist but also — because when I was in government, you would call me — as somebody who would talk to government officials, how do you make that link? And what has been the most effective way to mobilize governments to do the right thing?

Robin Wright: Thank you, Rob, and thank you to all of you who are in this room who actually care about the rest of humanity. It's such a rare phenomenon these days.

I thought I'd take you to three places that I've been to recently to illustrate the gap — and I think it is a growing gap — between governments and their own peoples that illustrate the growing problems.

Tunisia is the country we all view as the most hopeful in the aftermath of the Arab Spring. It was the birthplace of the uprising, when a young fruit vendor set himself on fire. I went back a year later, having covered the Arab Spring, and went to the street corner where he set himself on fire. There's a café across the street, and I went to a group of young men and I said, "Well, what do you think a year later? You know? The dictator is gone, and you're working on a new constitution." And they all had a similar answer: "We have far more freedoms and far fewer jobs."

I went back in 2014 as an international monitor for the first democratic presidential election. And the election was the most pristine and hopeful ever in the Middle East. Wonderful. The problem was that the lowest turnout in Tunisia was among the young — the very people who had forced the dictator out, who had mobilized in unprecedented numbers. And the lowest city to turn out for the election was Sidi Bouzid, the place where the young fruit vendor came from. Today the largest single number of fighters who have joined ISIS come from Tunisia — the largest number in both proportion and absolute number: over 6,000. Another 9,000 have been prevented from joining by security forces blocking them at the borders, so this gap is just electrifying.

As Rob mentioned, I actually saw David [Miliband] in Iraq last month, but I also went to Mosul, which is the centerpiece of the war against ISIS now. And what's so terrifying to me — and this is, again, an issue that David works on — is the issue of displaced people. Fourteen years after the intervention of the US in Iraq, there is still no political agreement on how to rule Iraq so that all of its diverse ethnic and religious communities feel invested, involved and represented in government. And this was reflected among the displaced people who had left Mosul. I talked to Shiite, Sunnis and Christians, and none of them wants to go back.

There is this tentative security arrangement for protecting Mosul, but there is no agreement on how to govern it; it's like a microcosm of Iraq. And it gets even more profound because Iraq had 1.3 million Christians in 2003. It's down 1 million since then. And the bishop in Erbil said to me, "We are going to have to change our function in

Iraq after being here for 2,000 years. We're going to have to become missionaries." The Sunnis don't want to go back to a city that dominated them because they find that the government in Baghdad, which is Shiite-controlled, isn't giving it any guarantees. And the Shiites don't want to go back because it's a Sunni city. You're seeing a division of populations that makes the whole challenge for NGOs and the aid agencies almost impossible: to figure out a means of getting in there and doing more than just making sure the people eat every day.

The third country that I wanted to deal with is Syria, which is a place that I've been on the borders — and don't tell anybody — but also inside Syria on and off for the past three years, and this is the country that was the strategic center of the Middle East. It was the melting pot. Ten years ago I spent Easter in Damascus, and the shops in the Old City were all filled with chocolate Easter bunnies and colored eggs. This is a place where you had a real intersection of faiths and ethnicities. And it would have been so easy if Bashar Assad had introduced even marginal reforms to hold the place together. But now, as we know, this is the greatest humanitarian crisis since World War II, with staggering numbers — a half million dead. But there's tragedy for those who are still alive — whether it's the educational level, 5 million kids out of school, two-thirds of the population dependent on international aid for their daily bread and the ethnic cleansing that's gone on. Again, we're seeing across the Middle East this fundamental issue of Can communities even live together anymore? The questions we face are ever larger in the 21st century than they have ever been.

ROBERT MALLEY

Thank you. And we may have to come back to Syria in the question/answer because I'm sure that's on many people's minds. We just heard obviously from a perspective about how we deal with governments and NGOs, and then from the ground some of the perspective and some of the pieces that need to be taken into account.

I want to turn to Yifat Susskind, who is the executive director of MADRE, an international women's rights organization that does a lot of work in Latin America, the Middle East, Africa and Asia, bringing women's shelters in war zones, bringing clean water and maybe other issues that you might want to touch on. What I would like to ask you is, given what we've just heard, how do you connect the narratives between what's happening on the ground and mobilizing governments to do the right thing? What does one do when governments abdicate that responsibility or are not in a position to take it on, to meet people's needs? What are the alternative potential avenues for action? And what in your experience have you found are the most effective vehicles, again, when there is a deficit of government action?

YIFAT SUSSKIND

Thank you, and thanks for this important conversation. There is a lot of untapped potential right now in this moment when governments are abdicating their responsibilities, to put it one way. There's a lot of potential in working at the local level. And we make a mistake sometimes because the crises that we are working to address are so large-scale — wars, environmental disasters — that we tend to think that we need similarly large-scale interventions all the time. And there is a critical role. Sometimes scale is the single most important thing, so there's a critical role for those kinds of organizations to play, but often we miss something equally critical, which is

that a lot of our best solutions are local and small-scale, and we reach people through adapting and replicating what works.

That's a very different model, and one that is important to look at at this moment. What we do when we work with local organizations, with the likes of us in more of a supporting role actually, is create programming that puts local people in the leadership of defining their problems, defining their solutions, and designing and implementing programming with a lot of technical support and access to power and funding that international organizations can provide. What we do when we prioritize the leadership of local people is to leave skills and resources in communities for the long term, and that is how we build resilience.

One of the things that we've seen in more than 30 years of working with this model is that often it's local women's organizations that are particularly critical to community survival and recovery in crisis. And yet I think everyone here knows that that is the sector of all of civil society that is the most underfunded. There's an irony because if you've ever been on the ground in a crisis zone, right after a hurricane or in an informal refugee setting, you know that the first people who are mobilizing a response — long before the aid workers arrive from other countries — are the women. And that's because that is an extension of the gender roles that women play, right? You see it on the family level, and it functions on the community level.

I'll share an example to follow up on Robin's conversation about Iraq. In the ISIS-controlled parts of that country, there have been no government services functioning since the summer of 2014. International aid workers pulled their staffs out when ISIS came in because it was too dangerous for them. Who was left as the front line of defense — the only line of defense — for the local communities were the people who were already there, with women's organizations again playing a very interesting and disproportionate role. The partner group that we work with, a fairly small local group, was able to provide humanitarian aid, set up clandestine women's shelters in the ISIS-controlled zones, create a kind of underground railroad for women human rights activists and LGBT [lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender] people, who were specifically being targeted with assassination by ISIS, to get them to relative safety in Kurdistan, so it was not something that anyone in the international community was able to do at that point.

There are real barriers to working with small local groups in crisis, as well as our own institutional constraints as donors and big NGOs. The counterterrorism financing regulations are a very big problem to supporting those groups. But I will say that those barriers are surmountable. And we see that in our own work and in the work of other international groups that are specifically designed to work well with grassroots groups.

The tougher issue is that we can't work only at the local level because the problems that we're trying to address are often created very far away from the communities that are impacted. We can provide locally sourced food aid from women farmers in Kenya to feed the people coming across the border from Somalia because of this looming famine, and we are; but if we want to actually solve that problem, we need to end the war on terror, resolve the armed conflict in Somalia and stabilize the climate. That requires global governance, so states continue to play a really big role in causing problems and in solving problems.

There are a couple of ways right now to engage well with states, one example being the recent, very successful advocacy of the global women's movement in getting the Dutch government to set up a replacement fund after the US instituted the global gag rule. That's the executive order that defunds healthcare centers in poor countries that so much as mention abortion rights — even if they're using US money to provide other, very critical public health services. And it's great that the Dutch stepped up and did that, but Republican administrations routinely issue that order, and this is the first time that a government has come forward and said essentially, "Oh yeah? You're not going to fund that? Well, we're going to fund it."

They did that, I would argue, because the Dutch, as other liberal governments do, recognize that this attack on women's rights is integral to the rise of right-wing populism and authoritarianism, which they see as a threat. And that provides a basis for an alliance — and perhaps some stronger alliances and collaborations of the sort you were talking about between global civil society and government. The Dutch model, I think, is instructive also for philanthropy, which might not be able to match the scale of government funding; but this particular fund — which is a pool of donor states coming together with a high degree of collaboration from civil society — is a good model right now for thinking about How do we push back? How do we confront?

I'll say one last thing, which is that it's critically important to hold the line on the human rights norms and standards that have been won over the past 70 years and to not allow the bar to be lowered just because a handful of very powerful states have decided that they're no longer interested in meeting this standard. What we're confronting right now is what we all know to be the greatest weakness of the human rights system, which is that when it comes to powerful governments, there are no real enforcement mechanisms, right? It's all social contract. It's all political will. So when, in moments like this, political will drains away, what we're going to be seeing — and I hope for this to be true — is that states were never really the enforcement mechanism for human rights in the first place. The real enforcement mechanism for human rights, including women's rights, is an empowered global civil society that can hold states to account.

So what we need to figure out how to do right now is to support the social movements that we need to hold this line on human rights, and that is a real challenge, I think, to global civil society, to philanthropy, because we've not built the sector in support of social movements. We've built the sector in support of projects and individual NGOs and organizations, so that's a conversation that I'd like to raise and continue here: How do we make that shift to supporting the social movements that we need right now to protect human rights?

ROBERT MALLEY

Thanks. That's actually a great transition to our next speaker because you raise the question of accountability and enforcement of norms, and that is obviously an area where governments have fallen short.

Our next speaker, David Tolbert, is the president of the International Center for Transitional Justice [ICTJ]. He has worked in an official capacity on tribunals that have sought to bring accountability and justice in Lebanon and in the former Yugoslavia, so he is the perfect person to address, first of all, this question that Yifat just raised

about global civil society and its role in enforcing norms and accountability. I also want to ask you, and you could come to it later, for a more principled debate about the role of accountability and how it fares against arguments of stability — the whole old argument about justice versus stability and justice versus peace. To what extent do you encounter people in government or otherwise who tell you, "Yes, accountability is fine, but if it means that we can't resolve this conflict, we'd rather sweep those issues under the rug." That's something we're hearing quite a bit, for example in the case of Syria. So, go ahead.

DAVID TOLBERT

Thanks, Rob. Those are a lot of questions, and if you give 45 minutes, I'll get started.

I first wanted to say, of course, it's an honor to be here, and I'm very pleased to see that the conference is framed around the issue of trust — what we in my field would call "civic trust" — and the critical importance of building trust, particularly in societies that have massive human rights abuses. I think that does go to your second question — the idea that simply sweeping the past under the rug will lead to the past's recurring. I think experience shows that there has to be accountability for those massive human rights abuses. Now the question is sometimes What is accountability?

One of the things that we at the International Center for Transitional Justice work on is a whole range of options or a whole range of approaches that we've seen in a number of other countries. The ambassador of Colombia — I don't know if he is still here — was very eloquently describing what happened in Colombia. Some of the difficult issues and compromises that ICTJ — my organization — has been deeply engaged in is giving advice on the peace agreement and how there can be accountability, some of it criminal accountability, but there are other forms of accountability that I think are equally important. I'm a former deputy chief prosecutor of the Yugoslavia tribunal, so I take criminal accountability seriously; but at the end of the day, there are going to be only a limited number of people brought to the bar of justice, hopefully the most senior and the most responsible. There are other means, such as truth commissions. We've seen some 40 truth commissions around the world, reparations programs that recognize the suffering of the individuals whose rights are violated, reforms of the security sector, the constitution — so there is a range of possibilities here.

Coming to one of Rob's questions — how we move this forward and what some of the key elements are — as we heard from the Colombian ambassador earlier, there has to be some political change. There has to be a political change and an openness. Historically, in Latin America and South Africa we've seen democratic revolutions that have brought to power governments that are willing to address the past and to not turn the page but to deal with the past so that you can have a future based on accountability, which is grounded in civic trust.

That situation is quite different in some of the countries we're talking about now, and what we see is more and more transitional justice and these approaches to accountability embedded in peace agreements, like the one in Colombia. And then, of course, in many places at this point there's no accountability whatsoever. I would really support the idea that you put forward about global civil society and supporting civil society. Civil society is really the demand side of the equation. And if you think

of transitions that have had justice, that have had accountability (and it's hard in countries), they were driven largely by civil society. Whether it's the Madres of the Plaza de Mayo in Argentina, whether it's the Mothers of Srebrenica, whether it's Black Lives Matter in this country, we see very strong civil society movements that are really the engine in some of the cases that already have been talked about today. We need the support of global society to push for accountability in the long term. This is going to be a very long-term process and pressure.

I would also note that governments and the international community have a role to play. My experience and what we see is that that tends to fade over time. There tends to be interest in the beginning in situations, and then over time that interest fades. And that is one of the reasons I think it's so important to emphasize civil society. I think it's also important to remember that when we're talking about accountability, these international experiences are important. International norms are important. But, ultimately, it's in the local context that this is done, so having a very good understanding of the local context, the situation on the ground.

I'll close with one last thought, which takes us away from some of the discussion today, but there has been in the earlier panels a lot of discussion about the US. I was in Columbia, South Carolina. As you may remember, the Confederate flag was flying over the State House until the killings in Charleston; this is very personal to me because my family had opposed secession and opposed slavery, and my grandfather was a lawyer who took on the Ku Klux Klan, so I come very much from that background. But in this country, in this discussion about civic trust between the state authorities, the police and the African-American community, there is no basis for civic trust on the African-American community's side. So we have a serious issue in this country, of a different nature than in other countries and in other parts of the world. But I think we're sitting in Washington, and I should make that point as well because civic trust is very largely missing in a significant part of the population and understandably so.

Thank you very much.

ROBERT MALLEY

Thank you. Our last panelist John Prendergast, another very good friend, and I put him last because in a way he embodies everyone else who is here. He's been in government with me. He's been at the International Crisis Group with me. He's also been an activist in the field. He's worked with celebrities. He's worked on mobilization campaigns. I'm almost tempted to ask you, John, to summarize everything and give us some pearls of wisdom, but I'm going to ask about some projects that you've started and you may want to talk about. He founded the Enough Project, which is an organization devoted to ending genocide and mass atrocities, but he's also been innovative in other things he's done. He cofounded The Sentry with George Clooney, which is an initiative that investigates the links between conflict and corruption and financing. Maybe you could talk to us a bit about the creative, innovative side of civil society and also the Satellite Sentinel Project, which uses satellite imagery to document the commission of atrocities. I can tell you, having been in government, that it would have been extremely useful if we had a tool like that to be able to be much more aware of who was doing what in a place like Syria or Iraq.

Tell us a bit about those initiatives. Pick one if you want and tell us how you've thought about it and how you think, again, civil society and NGOs can do things that governments may not do.

JOHN PRENDERGAST

Thanks, Rob. I want to be one of the first to welcome you back to the nonprofit world, the land of the great unwashed. Don't expect your phone calls to be answered so quickly.

I've worked now for three decades, focused on the deadliest war zone in the world by far during those three decades, which is the region that starts up in the northeast of Africa and Somalia and works its way through the Sudans, Ethiopia and Eritrea, Congo, Central African Republic, Burundi and Rwanda. That's a bracing place to spend your adult life, and you have to take a second and third look at what you're doing and what the world is doing in response to the crises and conflicts that exist there because they have repeatedly defied and resisted the conventional tools of crisis response to the point where — the numbers don't lie — there is simply no parallel since World War II, no remote parallel in terms of deaths or displacement by violence during that period.

And taking a second look at this over the past few years — or a tenth or thirteenth look probably for myself and my organization — we focus more and more on the common theme, which was that the governments that were responsible for these incredible atrocities, again, very few parallels globally in the last half century, were marked by a common theme. And that is that each one of those governments was hijacked by a small group of people internally — mostly military generals and their civilian counterparts and commercial actors and, of course, international facilitators and enablers, in mining companies, in oil companies and banks and in other places — because all of these countries, or most of these countries, are extraordinarily rich in natural resources.

We talk about the scramble for Africa being a colonial phenomenon. The scramble for Africa continues. And it continues in extraordinarily violent and destructive ways. And very few people benefit from this horrific extraction model, both inside these countries and in the international partners. None of the international responses that I've dedicated the past 30 years of my life to — the peace processes, the peacekeeping missions, the international justice — all of this is terribly important. These mechanisms to continue to press and push but without leverage, without the ability to influence the calculations of those who are committing these atrocities and extracting this wealth — and they're one and the same. How are these usual tools going to work? They're not. And the evidence is washing up against the shores of neighboring countries, as people run at rates that are unprecedented. We're seeing now in South Sudan the latest iteration of this chapter, the fastest departure of citizenry from a country since the Rwandan genocide pouring into Uganda.

So what do you do about this? Well, you look for vulnerabilities because we're not going to send in the 82nd Airborne; the 82nd Airborne wouldn't work. You can send hundreds of thousands of peacekeepers to these places, and it won't have an impact. You have to look at where you can alter the incentive structure because the incentive structure now favors mass atrocities. The incentive structure now favors

mass corruption. There are no consequences — not only the legal accountability mechanisms that David talked about but also anything beyond that.

So we looked at the vulnerabilities and found that it's sort of the old Al Capone model. Most of these folks who are committing the atrocities — who have command responsibility for the mass atrocities we see unfolding daily in these places — are the same ones who are benefitting from the mass extraction and offshoring. They don't keep their money under their mattresses. They offshore it into the international financial system, which is a huge vulnerability because almost all that money goes out of the country in US dollars.

I didn't understand this as a political science guy until I learned from the finance guys and the Treasury Department people that when a crime is committed — corruption, theft, whatever — and then money laundering, there are double and triple crimes in all of these things. When a crime is committed with a US dollar, the United States Treasury Department has jurisdiction over that and has the authority to freeze or seize those assets. This is a massive point of leverage that we are simply not using. We talk about, "Oh, we've got to try to prevent genocide. We've got to try to end these wars. We've got to stop these famines." We don't use the most important tool that we potentially can use. And we do use it when it's a national security issue. We use it for counterterrorism. That's been one of the most effective parts of our counterterrorism effort since 9/11: building this infrastructure of financial instruments that can go after terrorist network finances. This is one of the success stories you could see from the al-Qaeda experience. Increasingly, they better understand how ISIS moves its money, how to do that; we don't use that tool.

So we said, "OK. Why can't we use those tools?" Well, the second problem we have in Africa is that it doesn't matter enough. I get it. It's a second-tier continent, second-tier issues, second-tier places. So the US government and other governments around the world — the Brits and others who do have financial intelligence units — can, in fact, track assets, which they do for issues related to counterterrorism; they do it for issues of counter-nuclear proliferation. I totally support that as a taxpayer. I get it. There's no money left over to track the assets of war criminals, genocidaire, people who commit these kinds of atrocities.

So we said, "What if we set up a private-sector, nonprofit intelligence unit that uses the same people you use to track these assets, create dossiers on these war-criminal networks and turn them over to governments? Will it be helpful?" The answer was yes. So we just started this now. We've just started turning over the evidence. That's The Sentry initiative that Rob mentioned.

The focus is to use these tools — these anti-money-laundering tools, the targeted sanctions that actually go after networks and not individuals — and combine targeted sanctions with anti-money-laundering measures. This is the golden ticket, by the way, for providing leverage in human rights. Any of you who care about human rights, take a second look. Go back to school. I had to do it. Learn these issues related to international finance because that's where you can get the attention of these people who are offshoring literally billions — with a b, not millions — of dollars into the international financial system. That is why these crimes continue to occur, I believe. So that's our point of leverage. That's the kind of work that we're investing in now. It's just beginning.

It's hard to say here: Will it have an impact? We're making a bet that this kind of thing — that getting the attention of these war criminals by going after their pocketbooks, going after their international financial footprint — is the way to actually create leverage for the peace processes, the peacekeeping missions, the transitional justice and legal accountability issues, the local stuff that you were talking about earlier, the local initiatives for reconciliation and peace and development — all of these things that need some top-level leverage and support to become successful.

ROBERT MALLEY

If I could follow up, but just if you keep it short so that we could turn to the audience, what has been the reaction so far from the US government or other governments when you speak in these terms? And how do you get them to be more interested if it's not a tool that seems to be predisposed to use? What have you learned over the years that helps in that regard?

JOHN PRENDERGAST

With this particular initiative, it's the combination of a set of folks that politicians are interested in responding to. There are student networks that some politicians respond to. There are faith-based networks that other politicians respond to. There are celebrities — you wouldn't believe how fast these doors swing open in Washington when somebody from Los Angeles comes to town. So it's not just the broader culture. It is definitely on Capitol Hill and in every administration I've ever tried to utilize this tool.

Culminating in a sort of microcosm of this was in September, when we decided, OK. Let's launch the initiative publicly. We brought in a few of the folks who have committed themselves for many, many years, in fact over decades: Don Cheadle and George Clooney. That brought the attention of the cameras, so when we actually walked into President Obama's office that afternoon, his first line was, "You guys have really taken over the press cycle," so he's already noticing what we're doing. Again, it's all the situation we have. We're just using the cards that have been dealt. We don't necessarily believe that this is the right way that media should be focused, but that's what it is.

We presented the argument to President Obama that there were all these tools. He said, "Well, it's the first time I've heard this argument to use these tools." He had Susan Rice and Valerie Jarrett there, and he said, "Let's figure out how we can make this work in one place, South Sudan, which is on the brink of genocide, which has the first declared famine by the United Nations since 2011, and let's see how we can do it." We went to see Secretary of the Treasury [Jacob] Lew, Secretary [of State John] Kerry, Vice President [Joe] Biden — all the key people — and then came back and ended with Susan Rice because she really ran the government. We worked out a plan for how to use these things, and it was just starting. Then November happened, and then January happened, and it's a little unclear right now where everything is going, but we'll continue to press on. Like everyone does in this room, we have all different tricks up our sleeves to try to get attention for the things that we care about.

ROBERT MALLEY

Thanks. I want to turn to the audience unless someone has something burning they want to say in reaction to what they heard.

SPECIAL ADDRESS

RAJIV SHAH



Rajiv Shah

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19

1:30 PM

RAJIV SHAH

President, Rockefeller Foundation

JANE WALES

Founder, Global Philanthropy Forum (moderator)

JANE WALES

I get to make an introduction that I'm really looking forward to making of Raj Shaw. Let me just say that when I first met Raj, it was about 15 years ago and he was a medical doctor who had just joined the Gates Foundation. I was blown away by his insatiable appetite for ideas, on the one hand, and the fact that he was just the kind of guy who gets stuff done. And that combination of pragmatism and intellectual curiosity was striking then, as it is now. And of course when Barack Obama got elected, he tapped Raj to join the Department of Agriculture as the chief scientist and as undersecretary, and then, as you all know, he was the youngest ever to be named administrator of USAID (US Agency for International Development). I've left out a little bit of information, and that is his now being the president of Rockefeller Foundation — I thought, Yes, better get that one in! — and probably the institution best able to exploit all of his extraordinary talents.

Because you can see all of this in any bio you read, I thought I would just make two points about him — point to two themes that have run through his career, at least as long as I've known him. The first is that he is inclusive. When he went to USAID — and it probably was the same at Agriculture — he insisted that everything they do be bipartisan, that they always reach out across the aisle when they were on the Hill. And I hear this all the time from Republicans about how “Rajiv really respected our point of view, listened to our point of view.” You hear that from Democrats as well. And as a result, there was support — good, solid, lasting, bipartisan support — throughout those years, not only for PEPFAR (President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief) but for Feed the Future, for Power Africa, for a number of truly important initiatives, and I really credit him very much for that because of his consistent insistence on bipartisanship.

The other thing, a theme you'll see throughout his life — and we'll look forward to seeing it going forward as well — is that he's inventive. He's extraordinarily inventive. Back when the Global Alliance for Vaccine Initiative — GAVI — was first up and running and bilateral institutions, governments, were making multi-year commitments to advance efforts at vaccination, there was a problem: Governments may make multi-year commitments, but they appropriate only annually. And when you're vaccinating kids or vaccinating around the world, you want some level of simultaneity, and you also don't want to be doing something in one part of the world and not the other part of the world. You can't be waiting for appropriations spread over a multi-year period. So, Raj and others came together and said, “Look, we need a solution. We need a way to front-load that money.” And what they did, which struck me as remarkably clever, was to take those commitments on to the financial markets and say, “Look, we are going to sell these commitments, in essence, as bonds. We can guarantee you that the money will come, spread over time. This is a truly safe bet for you, on the one

hand. On the other hand, you provide for us by front-loading the money. This means that, in fact, not only is it a safe bet financially but you can actually make a difference, an important difference, in this world.”

So that is the kind of mind that Raj Shah brings to his current job and brought to every job before it, this sort of wonderful combination of curiosity and pragmatism. So please join me in welcoming to the stage Raj Shah.

RAJIV SHAH

Thank you, Jane. That was excessively kind, and I wish I could’ve just stayed back there and keep listening to all that. But Jane has done such an incredible job, and I’m so excited to be here with you at the Global Philanthropy Forum, which is such an important venue. And Jane’s leadership has been so critical in maintaining the high level and high quality of this venue over the many years. I see many friends and colleagues in the audience, and I appreciate your friendship and all that we’ve been able to learn and do together. I feel like this moment calls for those friendships to be renewed in a very substantial way. The events of the past year have convinced me that we are in fact living in a deeply fractured world. And like so many others, I’ve been trying to figure out What does this all mean?

At the end of 2015, I was still in government. It was clear that the global efforts to improve the state of humanity had been making very steady and consistent progress. Over 25 years child mortality rates had fallen by more than half; so had the number of people living in extreme poverty and deprivation. And we had achieved two critical international agreements — the UN Sustainable Development Goals and the Paris Agreement on climate change — that were committed to real dramatic results, such as ending extreme poverty and achieving a quantifiable reduction in global temperature rise; like the 2005 Gleneagles summit on ending poverty and the ascendance of the G20 as a forum to address the global financial crisis. These milestones really symbolized a post-Cold War international order rooted in progressive globalism. The idea being, with a more interconnected world all but inevitable, the way to usher that in was to embrace liberal democratic values, advance human rights, work toward more and freer trade and leverage global institutions, public-private partnerships and new alliances as the way to get things done in the 21st century.

Here in this town, a strong bipartisan consensus that Jane alluded to has enabled the United States to be a, and sometimes the, leading force in this global enterprise, bringing a level of peace and prosperity unprecedented in human history. I’ve found that across the political spectrum, from individuals who are very conservative to those who are very liberal, American political leaders have both the heart and the mind for embracing this vision of global obligation and frankly the notion of exceptionalism as the value that underpins it, meaning those who have exceptional wealth and capacity also have an exceptional responsibility to improve the state of humanity. The agreements we reached in 2015 seemed to signal the continued widespread successful acceptance of that approach.

And then 2016 happened. Not three weeks after the Paris Agreement was signed in April, the Philippines elected a man who openly called for extra-judicial death squads to kill thousands of his citizens simply for being suspected drug users. Six weeks later the results of the Brexit referendum shocked the world, as British voters pushed back

against the politics and immigration of European unity, which they felt threatened their sovereignty, their identity and their way of life. Heralding the potential breakup of Europe, the Dow plummeted 500 points and the pound suffered its largest single-day drop ever.

Over the coming months, more cracks and crises appeared. Brazil and South Korea impeached their presidents, signaling a loss of faith and confidence in the leadership of two important regional powers. Meanwhile the number of displaced persons has reached an all-time high, giving fuel to nationalist populist movements already surging in France, Germany, Austria, Italy and elsewhere.

Here in the United States, the outcome of the presidential election clearly surprised even the new president-elect team. While African-American, Hispanic and women voters supported Hillary Clinton at roughly the same rates they had supported President Obama, Donald Trump’s America First message won college-educated white voters by four points and non-college-educated whites by nearly 40 points — a rate we had not seen in many decades. In the Midwest and Rust Belt, it won him the election. And as someone who was born and raised in Michigan and no stranger to politics, I can tell you no one saw it coming.

So what does all of this mean for the post-Cold War trend toward increased global engagement? The answer is, we don’t completely know yet, but it seems pretty clear that the traditional leaders of progressive globalism — the Western democracies that defined many of the post-war global norms and standards of behavior that we’ve been accustomed to for more than 70 years — have retrenched significantly from their historic leadership roles. Today we see nations on both sides of the Atlantic turning inward and cutting foreign-aid budgets at a time when the need couldn’t be higher. Here in Washington that’s meant a proposed budget that would eviscerate the vital investments in our economic and national security made by both the State Department and the US Agency for International Development. We also see this happening abroad, as countries like the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Denmark and Sweden have moved to dramatically cut or redirect their aid funds to pay for domestic priorities.

These are more than budget cuts. They are expressions of values that have dramatic consequences at a time of need, and they represent a departure from how the world tries to solve problems. Although it’s not easy to hear or say, many of us who focused on advancing these progressive global agenda goals must now admit that we missed the rising resentment toward institutions and what many see as an out-of-touch global elite. Gallup polls show that trust in most large institutions — the news media, government, organized labor, big business and more — is at either all-time or near historic lows, especially in the Western world. Here in America, most of these institutions have levels of trust below 40 percent; 26 percent of Americans and roughly 30 percent of Europeans say they’re not only disaffected with their governments but also discouraged about their own future prospects in life, as people who feel left behind in this rapidly changing world are more likely to turn inward and try to protect what they have.

America also seems to be angrier and more divided than ever: 2016 saw over two dozen more hate groups form, and in several areas more hate crimes than in 2015. Even children at relatively privileged schools in Bethesda and Northwest DC — just a

few minutes away from here — have reported swastikas on bathroom walls and words like whites only written on bilingual posters, showing how quickly our kids can pick up on and accelerate racial divides.

So why is this happening? In explaining the root causes of the election results, the economist Nick Eberstadt has pointed to a deep economic condition brought about by what he calls America's Second Gilded Age. Since the turn of the century, while American wealth holdings have roughly doubled, average productivity per capita has grown less than 1 percent per year. And the percentage of Americans employed has fallen so much that if we could magically go back to the level where we were in 2000, over 10 million more people would have paying jobs today.

For many, work is also losing its value as a source of pride, identity and basic human dignity, the absence of which does cause great anxiety and despair. I grew up in Detroit, where people took great pride in working in the auto industry, in building things you can see, feel and touch. My dad worked at Ford Motor Company for more than three decades, and I get how hard it is to ask American manufacturing workers to retrain themselves for kinds of jobs that are actually available in some communities, especially when, as one writer at The New York Times put it earlier, nine of the 12 fastest-growing fields in America are different ways of saying “nurse.” When someone loses a job at their factory and we try to tell them that they need to retrain as a service worker in a new field, that may be a way to solve part of their economic insecurity, but it is in fact asking them to change their identity, and for many people that is very, very difficult to do. Having spent a lot of time listening to families around the world who live in extreme poverty and in communities that have been ripped apart by conflict and crisis, it seems to me that many of the same challenges they report — economic injustice, an unfair social contract, the feeling that the system is corrupt and rigged against them — appear quite similar to the gut feelings driving populism right here at home.

But that doesn't mean these challenges are new. Last week I was in New Orleans and met a young woman who told me that by the time she turned 20 years old, more than 15 of her friends and neighbors — all kids — had been either shot or killed. The lack of hope that leads to kids in her community committing violent acts over sneakers, smartphones and jackets is, in fact, similar to the despair that's led to America's opioid epidemic. In December [2016] a team led by Stanford economist and 2012 MacArthur Fellow Raj Chetty found that for the first time since World War II, American children have only a 50/50 chance of earning more than their parents. That means we're witnessing what happens when a majority of families believe that for the first time in generations their kids are going to be worse off than they were.

So right now, in this moment, we at this Global Philanthropy Forum have a lot of work to do. Can civil society, corporate leadership and community organizations like ours come together to address the root causes of this despair at home and around the world? Can we maintain progress toward our long-term vision of success — ending poverty and its devastating consequences of child death and child hunger, combatting climate change that is happening faster today than even scientists had predicted and creating a better world for all humanity, including those who feel left behind by an economy that's moving forward without them? And can we do it in a way that allows every parent to really believe that their kids will have greater opportunities than they do? Our answer to that has to be yes.

Just look at our history. It hasn't always been the case that we could count on our government to address these collective challenges. Modern philanthropy was, in fact, born out of the first Gilded Age, when government hardly touched social welfare issues at all. When the foundation I now lead was created, the Rockefeller fortune was 2 percent of the US economy and 25 percent larger than the entire federal budget. There was no income tax and hardly any social safety net. When Teddy Roosevelt outlined a vision of progressive government in the 1912 election, he actually called it New Nationalism. He was introducing the novel idea that government should care for the least amongst us. But it took 20 years and the immense pain of the Great Depression before Franklin Roosevelt was really able to put many of those ideas into practice. And the philanthropies of Rockefeller, Carnegie and others stepped forward at that time, both before and after the New Deal, to show the way forward.

When the horrors of World War I brought new forms of human suffering, organizations like ours gave more money to war relief than the federal government. John D. Rockefeller Jr. himself personally led the United War Work Campaign in New York, raising funds to support soldiers and sailors returning home. When Frederick Gates and John D. Rockefeller Sr. exchanged letters in the early 20th century with the goal of bringing science to global philanthropy, their primary focus was agriculture. Sixty years later that big bet paid off with the Green Revolution that saved a billion people from hunger and starvation.

More recently — and this is my new favorite one — as the Cold War was ending and we faced the potential threat of lose nuclear weapons in the former Soviet states, it was research funded by our very own Jane Wales at the Carnegie Corporation that led to the Nunn-Lugar Act, which has of course brought about the peaceful destruction of many of those weapons. And when vaccination rates in low-income countries dipped below 50 percent and over 9 million children under age 5 were dying every year, it was Bill and Melinda Gates who learned about this problem and set out to save those lives. I've seen them sit in the homes of very poor families to listen and learn, and because of their leadership and their efforts, including their money, the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization has today immunized almost 580 million kids and saved 8 million lives. These are examples of philanthropy at its best, focused on big global results, not just efforts that look good or feel good.

Achieving this level of success does require doing things differently. With society so skeptical of our institutions, it's hard to see people trusting us to solve these problems, especially if we seem to be removed from the realities of today or if we fail to be transparent or good partners. If we're going to make a difference in the lives of those we serve, we need to prove ourselves in this moment. And that won't be easy: making big bets, managing real and diverse partnerships, and being transparent and open and honest about what works, what we can do and the limits of our capacities. For example, we cannot fill the funding gap left by government budget cuts. That would be impossible. If the top 50 US foundations combined every dollar we gave in this year, we'd have \$19 billion, still \$6 billion short of what the Trump administration wants to cut from State and aid in this calendar year alone. So instead of trying to replace those funds, we need to explore new ways to seek leverage and impact and results — and that will mean taking on more risk and doing things in greater partnership.

I'm sure many of you want to know, amid all of this, what will the Rockefeller Foundation do going forward? Since I just started six weeks ago, for now I'll say this: Our vision for our future will be grounded in the lessons we've learned from our own history, and it will hopefully reflect the greatest traditions of an institution that I'm very proud and humbled to lead. In fact, for more than a century our work has been remarkably consistent. We've stood for bringing science and innovation to the fields of health, food and economic opportunity all around the world. We've demonstrated a flexibility to rise up to meet the challenges of our time, from funding the League of Nations when our own government wouldn't, to bringing refugee scholars to America, to protect Jewish scholars in particular during World War II, to building greater resilience in the face of a more turbulent world. And our greatest successes have come when we've been animated by big, bold aspirations and willing to see them through over a very long period of time.

That's the lens through which our founder saw our mission. That's the lens through which our program officers see — including one that I'm so proud to be affiliated with, Norman Borlaug, who won the Nobel Peace Prize — and that's the lens we'll apply looking forward. We'll try to listen to the people we serve as best we can. And we'll ask ourselves how in this fractured world in which we're living can we work together — with many of you and others in the sectors of philanthropy, civil society and corporations — to create real meaningful change. We're thinking deeply about how to define our role in global health, including how to address pandemic threats and reduce child deaths, as we know that more than 6 million children a year still die needlessly from simple diseases. We'll continue to invest in agriculture and food security. Here we're trying to understand how we might play a role in reshaping the global protein economy so that we can all feed a population of 9 billion people in a sustainable and different manner. We see a lack of access to power and energy keeping more than 1 billion people out of the modern economy, and we're considering how to expand our own efforts to bring off-grid solar power to villages that are not on grid from Haiti to India.

Here at home we believe that real policy innovations and perhaps real innovations in the structure of our labor market will be required to renew confidence in the American dream and restore hope in communities that unfortunately lack enough of it. And while we don't know yet what our role in that will be, we look forward to working with you to help facilitate that result.

And we're committed to working with those of you in the room and new sources of philanthropy around our planet. The reality is, the global concentration of wealth has accelerated to the point where eight families have the same net worth as half the world's population — a statistic made clear by OXFAM (Oxford Committee for Famine Relief). And as more of the world's wealthiest families and individuals take the giving pledge and commit themselves to using that tremendous capacity for good, we hope to hold hands with others and move forward together to protect the basic values of hope, opportunity, freedom and fairness.

Now saying that we want to partner more is easy; doing it, as you suspect, is much harder. If we're being honest in this field, our egos, our desire for control, our confidence in our own intelligence and our natural desire to go launch programs and then find others to co-fund it, instead of actually talking together about what we can do in a more collaborative way — all make it hard to be really great partners.

We don't have all the answers, but as we're looking around we are seeing signs of success from which we hope to learn. We've looked at how the IKEA Foundation and the Open Society Foundations are reimagining ways to address the massive issue of forced displacement, at how the Omidyar Network is advancing impact investing. We're particularly interested in the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation's Blue Meridian Partners project of capital aggregation to bring people together and pursue philanthropic pursuits in tandem for the purpose of taking other institutions to scale. And we've learned from our colleagues at MacArthur that they are quickly creating a global marketplace of big ideas with the \$100 million prize concept.

I've been here only six weeks, so I don't have a lot of new things to tell you, but I do believe that if we can look at these models of collaboration and partnership and work together to identify new solutions and how we might invest in them to make a real difference, we have an opportunity to deliver extraordinary results along the lines some of us have been able to do over time; but we have the opportunity to do it in a way that helps restore the hopefulness in the future and maybe create a path for public-sector leadership so we can truly address the dramatic consequences of the current fractured world in which we live.

To get there I think we'll have to overcome the challenge that sometimes our field can be too insular. More than 70 percent of the largest 100 US foundations are headquartered in coastal states, for example. One lesson we need to take away from November's election is that we can no longer afford to work alone in closed-off spaces or ivory towers. Everything I know about our past and everything I'm learning about the present and thinking about the future convinces me that we can, together, live up to our shared potential and make a real difference in this moment of need. We at the Rockefeller Foundation truly believe that, and we're fiercely committed to working with you as good partners to achieve it.

Thank you.

PHILANTHROPY, LEGITIMACY AND VOICE: HERE AND ABROAD



Julia Stasch and Cecilia Conrad

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19

1:55 PM

ZIA KHAN

Vice President, Initiatives and Strategy, The Rockefeller Foundation

PATRICK MCCARTHY

President and CEO, The Annie E. Casey Foundation

ADELE SIMMONS

President, Global Philanthropy Partnership (moderator)

JULIA STASCH

President, The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation

IN CONVERSATION WITH CECILIA CONRAD

Managing Director, The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation

ADELE SIMMONS

What a pleasure it is to be here and to welcome all of you. I remember years ago when Jane and I were first talking about forming this organization and how wonderful it has become.

In a rapidly changing world, foundations have new opportunities and challenges. The voice of each foundation and philanthropy more broadly has a huge impact at a time like this. What are the central issues, and how best do donors engage them? What is their voice? Voice matters. But the impact of foundations and philanthropy also depends on the legitimacy of who they are and their relationship with their grantees.

Today we have three speakers who look at the issue of legitimacy and voice from different perspectives. You have their bios in the program, so I will not repeat them.

Our first speaker is Patrick McCarthy. Patrick is president [and CEO] of the Annie E. Casey Foundation, which focuses on kids, families and communities. He has dedicated his career to the idea that all kids deserve the chance to succeed and all parents deserve the opportunities to help them to do so regardless of class, race or ZIP code. Patrick has four kids. All of them have grown up now, but he understands the joys and challenges of parenting. Today he will share with us his thoughts on what it means to put children and families first.

Patrick.

PATRICK MCCARTHY

Good afternoon. I wonder if anyone here has been moved in the past few months to respond to a tweet or an executive order or a budget or a legislative proposal or some pronouncement of a change in policy. I don't know about you, but for me it seems not a day goes by when I don't feel this urge and hear this voice in my head saying, You know you ought to write something. You ought to say something. See if you can get an interview with somebody or rally some folks together to take a stand on this issue. And even if it's a day where I don't feel that urge myself, several times a week now we are receiving requests for us to sign on to public statements or to sign on to letters about important issues.

What I'd like to do in my time today is to drill down a bit on what can actually be a very difficult question for philanthropy, and that is: How do we use our privileged position to speak out on important issues? And more specifically, how do we decide when to use the microphone that we have because we're funders? When do we hold the microphone for someone else who might be in a better position to speak out? When do we pass the microphone to folks who without our support otherwise wouldn't have a platform to have their voices heard? And when do we just leave the microphone on the table?

I think this is something that all of us in philanthropy wrestle with, but the times we now live in make this a nearly daily question. When I reviewed the agenda, I realized that this was going to be a bit of a tough job. This is a monumentally challenging topic, and there really is no right answer or answers. Not only that, this is an audience filled with folks who are at least as qualified as I am — and in many cases more qualified than I am — to hold forth on this issue. Behind me are coming some terrific speakers whom I know you'll all be impatient to hear, and on top of all that we're in the coveted after-lunch spot, when your attention and energy are as high as they can possibly be. However, rather than bail I decided that this was, in fact, a great opportunity to at least raise some issues about an important conversation. I want to share my thoughts on this, again, not because I think I have answers but because I've thought a lot about the questions, as I know you have as well.

What should we consider when we decide whether or not we should be speaking out as an organization? First I should say that this is a discussion that makes sense only if it's anchored in the mission and purpose of one's organization, and since I know Casey's mission the best, that's what I'm going to use as my jumping-off point to set a context for this conversation. In simple terms, the Annie E. Casey's mission is to help build brighter futures for America's children and families. And it's important to know that our founder was a guy called Jim Casey. He was the oldest of four kids back in the early 1900s when his father died, leaving his mother, Annie E. Casey, to be a single parent of these four kids. Jim dropped out of school to help his family make it. And he did this by delivering messages on his bike and working for little companies; then over time he decided that he could probably do better by partnering with some other folks to start their own company and beginning to deliver some packages. And this is the start of what became United Parcel Service, or UPS. So that's where our money comes from.

Jim's whole belief was that it was the strength of his family, the resilience of his mother, that helped him become successful, so when he started our foundation he wanted us to focus on kids and families. We do it in three ways: attempting to strengthen families, especially those families who are at great risk; ensuring access to opportunity for families; and building supportive communities for those families. In short, we have a basic model that kids do well — they do best — when their families do well, and families do best when they live in neighborhoods that help them thrive. Our particular focus is on kids who are at the greatest risk of not getting what they need to succeed, including children born into poverty, children who have been separated from their families by the child welfare system or the juvenile justice system or parental incarceration or more recently deportation, children whose parents are unprepared for jobs in today's economy and children who live in communities that have been shut off from opportunity.

I tell you all that because we cannot do our work unless we understand the influence and the impact of public policy and public systems. Public policy matters for every one of those problems. Public policy makes a difference. In fact, changes in public policy can make things much better for these very vulnerable kids and families, and public policy can make things much worse. So as an organization, we are deeply involved in policy issues and systems change as part of our core strategy. We believe that policy and systems change is the path toward scale. We want to help not just hundreds of young people and families who might be affected by a particular program but rather whole populations of young people and families — literally millions of children and families. Now to be clear: Effective programs are vital, and we do invest in developing and testing so that we can build more-effective programmatic models, but a bad policy or a dysfunctional public system will trump a good program every single time. Therefore we have built an entire infrastructure dedicated to advocating for more-effective policies and systems.

Briefly, that includes our KIDS COUNT project, where we release data-driven policy briefs on a regular basis. We also produce a variety of policy briefs and other practice guides in our various areas of work. We've invested a lot in financial support to advocacy groups at the state level —there is a KIDS COUNT organization in every single state in this country — as well as our investments in the State Priorities Partnership, Partnership for America's Children and others, as well as our investment in national advocacy. We work with national organizations like United Way [of America] and Goodwill [Industries] so that their subsidiaries will support the kinds of changes we want to see. We work with the National League of Cities, the National Governors Association, the National Conference of State Legislatures, et cetera. And perhaps most important, we invest heavily in providing a platform for young people who have been affected by various systems so that their voices can be heard, as well as their families' voices. So we have built an infrastructure to support the capacity to advocate.

But sometimes, and increasingly frequently, we are asked as an organization ourselves to speak out. And the question is not whether we should take a position — we do that all the time. The question is, How do we decide when we take a position as an organization? I don't think I have to tell you that the next 12 to 18 months may be the most consequential for the future of kids and families in this country in many, many years — perhaps the largest shift in social supports and in the safety net that we've seen certainly since the War on Poverty and perhaps since the Second World War. We face not only the risk of budget cuts but also actual structural changes that would be much more difficult to reverse in future years. Since we're a foundation focused on building brighter futures for kids, we recognize that some of these things that have been proposed would affect children's health, their education, financial security, housing, legal status and the odds they'll be able to see their own children grow up to be successful.

Let me tell you a little bit about what we think about when we decided to make a public statement or not — and again let me be clear: I don't know that we've gotten it right every time. These are judgment calls, and it requires balancing lots of things, but hopefully this might spark some conversation in your own organizations. First we need to acknowledge the fact that we have an opportunity as an institution with privilege because we've got financial resources and because of the reputation we've

built in policy advocacy over the past 25 years; and we feel we need to use that position of privilege and modest power to advocate on behalf of folks who don't have that privilege and that power.

At the same time, our work requires that we bring together and mobilize unusual allies, and what I mean by unusual allies are folks who don't necessarily believe all the things that we believe all the time. They may have a different philosophy, a different approach, a different set of ideas. But on a particular issue, we're on the same side. Especially for this reason, we have to pay close attention so that we are avoiding even the appearance of partisanship or ideological bias so that we don't miss an opportunity to build a big tent or a coalition for an issue that's actually going to be critical to children. You know, one ill-considered tweet — just one, imagine — one ill-considered tweet or overly passionate blog or bad use of language runs the risk of alienating potential partners, people of goodwill who would otherwise be on our side in an important issue and, very importantly, folks who can reach policy audiences that the Casey Foundation cannot reach.

Next we need to figure out if we're the best ones to be speaking out or if we should remain in the background and support someone else's voice. Very importantly, we don't want to crowd out or distract from the messages of those partners who are better positioned, better informed, have a better reputation, more standing, more relevance to speak out and those who would be more expert to reach a wider audience than we could do. We also need to be sure we stay in our lane, and what I mean by that is we're an organization that is dedicated to building better futures for children, so when we make a decision to make a public statement, we need to ask, Is this issue central and critical to our mission? And finally, we need to recognize that we need to use our institutional position carefully and sparingly. We should use it so that when we do speak out, we get attention.

In short and in summary: Is the issue critical to our mission? Do we, in fact, have expertise, and are we seen as having expertise? Do we have the data, the evidence and the credibility to be a persuasive speaker on this? And do we believe that our voice, as an institution, is actually going to make a difference?

I've talked about the reasons why we should speak out. I want to now just touch on some wrong reasons, reasons not necessarily not to speak out but reasons that we ought to be careful about before we decide to speak out. There have been times in my career when I have spoken out about something — given a speech, written a blog, done an op-ed or whatever, even an email sometimes — and I've gotten, frankly, a lot of reinforcement for it. You know, it feels good. I even get emails from my kids with the high praise of, "Not too bad, Dad. That's not bad at all." It's the wrong reason to speak out if that's what's driving me to speak out.

If we speak out so that the people who already agree with us will be applauding, the people who already agree with us will tell us that we're right and we've done the right thing, but in the process, we push away others whom we need to convince and who can reach audiences that my blog might not reach, we've not only made a strategic error, we've allowed our own ego and our own impulse to cloud our vision. At the end of the day, we've hurt our own cause. If we're inclined to speak out because lots of folks who already agree with us want us to speak out, we have to ask ourselves: Will speaking out make a difference? Will it serve a purpose, or is it going to make it likely that we'll see things happen that we don't want to see happen? Because at the end of

the day, the constituency that we need to satisfy in deciding whether or not we speak out should not be our impulse and our ego or our need to feel good. It isn't even our friends' appreciation that should determine when we speak out. In the end, it's really only, in our case, the children and families whose futures depend on a strong future, a strong family, strong communities and a strong nation.

Thank you very much.

ADELE SIMMONS

Thank you very much, Patrick.

It's a special pleasure to introduce Julia Stasch, who is providing extraordinary leadership to the MacArthur Foundation. Effective leadership is an essential quality of a strong foundation but also of a strong grantee. This means that it's often easiest to select grantees or stay with grantees whose leaders we know. But MacArthur does more than that. It seeks out grantees from Mexico to Nigeria, from Chicago to India, with leaders who can make a difference and who are not the usual suspects. Julia makes that happen. And of course, we are all waiting to see who gets the \$100 million and change [100&Change] that the foundation will announce in the fall. Julia will be interviewed by Cecilia Conrad, who is the managing director at the foundation and who directs the Fellows program. As Cecilia knows firsthand, some creative people are good leaders and some are not. It is a real honor to introduce Julia Stasch and Cecilia Conrad.

Thank you.

JULIA STASCH

Good afternoon. Cecilia and I are really pleased to talk to you a little bit about 100&Change. A lot of people are interested in what its origin was, so I'll start there.

In the past couple of years, MacArthur has been undergoing a process of change, and that change was driven by the notion that we were doing too many things — too many things to have the kind of impact that the times actually require. So we've been undergoing a journey of bringing to a close many areas of work, including some where we had deep investment and leadership over a couple of decades. What this forced us to do is to become even more strategic, more goal-oriented, more focused on the metrics of success.

There was a moment in a board meeting when it dawned on me that maybe we should step back and say, "Are we missing something? Are we missing the opportunity to communicate a greater degree of humility? Are we absolutely sure that we're the smartest people in the room? Are we sure that the things that we decided to work on are the most important things in the world for a foundation to work on?" So, inspired by that, in the moment, I said to the board, "In the midst of all this strategy, why don't we actually give away \$100 million every three years to an organization that we probably don't know, working on an area or a task whose goals aren't even on our radar?" And being the wonderful board that they are, they said yes. And so what did I do but turn to Cecilia. Cecilia and her wonderful team took that kernel of an idea and turned it into a program.

So talk a little bit about that program.

CECILIA CONRAD

When she came back and said to us, “We’re going to do a \$100 million grant, and we don’t know what it’s going to be for or who it’s going to be to.” Our team started to think about How do you design this program? And we had three critical design challenges.

The first challenge was how to be open. We debated for a while about whether we should put out an open call for problems and then have a process to pick among the problems and then go out and do business as usual to find somebody to address that problem. Or should we at one moment ask for both the problem and the solution? And we chose that last strategy in part because we weren’t sure what \$100 million could do. So we were asking a bigger question than “What do you think is the most important problem to work on?” We were asking, “Tell us what \$100 million can do, what kind of problem it could solve?”

The second critical decision had to do with transparency. We decided early on that part of being open was not only being agnostic about the problem and the solution but also being transparent about the process that we were going to undertake, so we designed a competition with very clear criteria communicated to anyone who wanted to participate. We had a panel of judges who all had to agree to have their names and bios published on a public website. We stopped short of telling each participant who their judges were, but each participant got back the honest feedback from the judges, along with their scores.

And then the third challenge — and this was really, probably, the most critical — is that once we had decided to be completely open, we recognized that the criteria that we defined were really the way we were going to narrow the range and types of proposals we got. So we came up with four.

The first seemed obvious, and that is that it needed to be a meaningful project — a meaningful problem — and the solution needed to have a meaningful impact. The second was that it had to have evidence, what we called verifiability. We were looking for projects that had a strong body of evidence that they would work if they were successfully implemented. So we wanted to know that if we could do this, the project would have the result that you’ve predicted. The next criteria, feasibility, was, Can you actually do it? It’s one thing to know that it would work if you could do it, but can you do it? Does your team have the capacity? Is it the right social and political context for it to happen? And the final was durability. We wanted a project with a plan for sustaining the solution after the \$100 million was gone.

And we got a mix of answers to that question. We got answers that relied on a market kind of source of revenue. We got answers that presumed that if this project were implemented, they could get other philanthropic resources or governments to help sustain it over time. We had projects where \$100 million is what it actually takes to solve the problem, and it’s done. You’re finished. And then perhaps my favorite response to “How will you sustain this over a long period of time?” — and I loved it because it was so honest. It was one sentence: “We will pray.”

JULIA STASCH

Cecilia talked about the need for evidence — and I was actually surprised that this was an area of criticism. We were criticized for the fact that we were asking for evidence, and some constructive commentators actually said, “All right, in your annual essay, Ms. Stasch, you said that one of the most important things for philanthropy to do, particularly in this time when it’s important to continue and nurture and build the trust and legitimacy even of our own philanthropic sector, you said it’s important to take risk. It doesn’t look like you’re living that imperative yourself by asking for evidence.” I felt compelled to disagree. I felt that 100&Change in and of itself is a very risky endeavor.

First of all, the fact that we would concentrate \$100 million in a single grant is inherently risky. You lose all the comfort of a balanced portfolio when you have a concentration of risk in a single grantee or in a single endeavor. And then of course, you have execution risk. We had a complex, multifaceted, very transparent program. That, in and of itself, carries execution risk — the transparency of it. And then the biggest risk, for me, was the notion of scale. The philanthropic landscape is littered with disappointments and failures of initiatives that looked good in one place but didn’t work at all in another place and especially didn’t work in many places. So the idea that we would ask for evidence, not of the ability to be excellent at a \$100 million scale, but enough evidence, enough solid evidence from a variety of sources, that the kernel of the idea was worth the bet of \$100 million.

And then another big risk — I didn’t really understand this risk at the beginning, and that was with so much interest in it, with 1,900 applications, and high degree of interest in it — was that we risked giant disappointment from the many organizations that would not be selected for our single award. Now that is ameliorated by the fact that we heard time and time again from organizations how much they felt that the process of application changed how they thought about what they were doing, increased their aspirations and raised their sights. My favorite was a call I got from someone who, even before the applications came in, said, “I don’t think I’m supposed to tell you this, but it’s been such a wonderful process that even if we aren’t picked, we’re going to do it.” They weren’t picked, but we’ll be tracking to see if they actually do it.

That was a surprise to me, that criticism. And the other surprise to me was how much interest there has been among other funders — the incredible number of requests that have come in to Cecilia and her team, saying, “Send me all the proposals about homelessness. Curate a list for me of all the proposals that are focused in Ghana. Think about how you can help us package and market the proposals that you have to our network of high-net-worth individuals.” This interest made me come to the conclusion that at the end of the day what I’m hopeful about is that our single \$100 million award is the least important thing and that the most important thing is how many of these wonderful ideas can actually be supported at some level. So that takes the desire and the ability to share and disseminate, and Cecilia and her team have put together an incredible sharing and marketing plan.

CECILIA CONRAD

This gets back to the issue of transparency. And I, like Julia, was surprised by the interest. The first call I got about this program from another funder said, “We’ve always been a little bit shy about putting out a completely open call, but we really want to know what you get and will you be willing to share it?” And of course we were willing to share. And so it becomes this recognition that we received 1,904 applications, and 800 of those went to our judges. This is an incredible database of problem/solution combinations. Some of them are \$100 million projects; some of them actually probably need some seed money for more testing, so it’s a huge array.

What we’ve done is to start preparing methods to get that information out and to make it available for others who might be interested. Next week we will have a searchable public database available through our portal for anyone to go to. You can do a text search. You can search by geography. You can search by organization to see the entire database of the 1,904 proposals. We are also going to be working with some other platforms to do more tagging of the data so that you can look according to the Sustainable Development Goals or look according to the Foundation Center Taxonomy or look according to a variety of other ways in which people might want to be able to search through because 1,904 is a lot. There are a lot of projects there to go through, and we are sharing information through specially curated lists. We’re sort of playing around right now with a wiki format, where we can put together little mini wikis on a topic for those who are interested in those topics.

This has now become a really big part of the project. When we first started 100&Change, the notion was that we’ll do this competition; we’ll do it once every three years. But this is a much bigger and longer-term task of trying to manage that information flow and share it with the community because it truly can be a public good.

JULIA STASCH

Talk a little bit about what it’s going to take to get from today to the selection of the 100&Change recipient.

CECILIA CONRAD

Yes. I’m assuming most of the people here know that we have eight semifinalists, and we are working with the eight semifinalists. We are providing them with technical support to really build out their proposals and to develop robust plans for scalability. As for scalability, it could be getting bigger; it could be replicating; it could be finding more partners so that you can franchise. All of that, the details of that, are being worked on now, and those eight semifinalists will be revising their proposals.

In September we’re going to narrow the group down again to select up to five finalists, and they will receive additional support between September and December. And in December, on December 11, we will be having a public event. Our finalists will present their projects both formally, in kind of a talk, but also there will be breakout sessions, opportunities to question them further. We plan to stream this event, and we also are inviting others to come and join us, other philanthropists, others in the sector who are interested in being there. So if you are interested in December 11 — I don’t think this constitutes a pitch — let me know.

JULIA STASCH

What has become our more crystalized thinking about this is that the task after December 11 is twofold. First it’s, What are the lessons from the design and execution of the 100&Change competition that would inform the next version of the competition? But also after December 11, the marketing, the curating, the sharing continues because I’ve been asked now several times, “Does this constitute a new form of philanthropy?”

I want to be a little humble about that. The idea that we would, from a single idea, actually have created a new form of philanthropy I think is way beyond even its aspirations today. But it seems to have tapped into a moment in time when there’s a lot of desire among individuals and families and organizations and institutions and foundations to actually have greater impact. And many of these, including people who represent new wealth, do not have the apparatus to actually source and do due diligence on and select things that they want to invest in; so perhaps something like 100&Change could be a cog in a much broader apparatus that creates a marketplace for these large-scale ambitious projects that can be teed up for people who find them compelling and say, “I want to invest in that.” So that’s a really exciting part of it.

Cecilia and I are going to be flat out through the end of the year on both sides of this task, and we invite you to think about Is there something we could do together to harness the wealth that’s out there, the passion, the energy and the desire to really make this world a better place? If you want to be inspired, go on our website, look at the videos for the eight semifinalists and you’ll realize what a tough selection our board will have. But that just makes it even more attractive to others who really want to make a difference.

Thank you very much.

ADELE SIMMONS

Thank you so much, Julia and Cecilia. It sounds as if you didn’t really expect to have so many opportunities and to learn so much from this, and it’s extraordinary. I think the chance that all of us have to learn from that is amazing.

I now want to introduce Zia Khan. Zia is vice president of initiatives and strategies at the Rockefeller Foundation. He works in New York, projects in Nairobi, Bangkok and more. Rockefeller was among the first foundations to focus on resilience, and it has a huge impact. I know, as I helped the City of Chicago revise a proposal to meet Rockefeller’s requirement that we include resilience. They were right, by the way, and we revised the proposal and we got the grant. Understanding what Rockefeller has learned as a leader in this field can help all of us as we design projects in the future.

Zia, we look forward to hearing from you. Thank you for joining us.

ZIA KHAN

Thank you, Adele, for that kind introduction. And thanks to all the wonderful speakers, who I think have done so much to stir our thinking already.

I’d like to start with a thought experiment with all of you. I want you to imagine that, sitting where you are, suddenly you start to smell something burning and you hear a little bit of murmuring from the crowd as people are noticing this, as well. And then

you start to look around and you see smoke. You don't know where it's coming from. And you start to hear more chatter. People are standing up and milling about, and you're just starting to sense a sense of panic in the room, and also you're starting to panic a little bit. Suddenly, the fire alarm goes off. After a few moments, you look to one door and you see a fireman, and he's waiving everyone through that door, and you look at another exit door and you see one of your friends, who's waiving you through that door. So the question is, Which door do you pick? I think most of you would probably pick the door with the fireman. But let me tell you a little bit more about the situation.

The friend whom you're with is actually someone you've been in these kinds of scrapes with before. There have been many times when you've been in situations, and every time she's been right. You've taken a small risk in following her lead, and it turns out that that was the right thing to do, and you feel trust in her judgment. Now let me tell you more about the fire department. It's had budget cuts. It's laid off a lot of experienced people, and it's continuously being in the news for having failed people who had put their trust in it. Now which door do you pick?

The point of this thought experiment is just to get you thinking a little bit about the relationship between taking risks, how those risks pan out and how that affects how you develop trust.

The question of trust, which is obviously the big theme of this conference, has become more important in what our new president, and my boss, Raj Shaw, has called "our increasingly fractured world," where trust in institutions is fairly low. At the same time, the need for collaboration and working across sectors to solve all the many thorny problems that we face has only gone up. So what I'm here to share are some of the lessons that we have learned about building trust through the work that we've done on resilience and how some of those lessons might be more broadly applied to the challenges that we're all working on.

Let me start with resilience, which as Adele mentioned is something that the Rockefeller Foundation has been working on for a number of years and where we've made a considerable number of investments. In very simple terms, I will define resilience as being the capability of individuals, of communities and cities to sense and manage when they are facing chronic shocks or chronic long-term stresses. One example is the resilience of a crowd when it faces a fire. Another example would be the resilience of a city that is exposed to sudden hurricanes or slowly rising sea levels. Resilience depends on trust. It's a foundation. If we build early-warning systems, people have to trust that those warnings are actually accurate and mean something. If a city is facing dwindling water supplies because of growth and climate change, they have to have communities trust each other in working toward joint solutions, which is particularly hard when these communities may be competing for the very water that's starting to disappear. If a plane lands in the Hudson River and the Coast Guard puts out a call for all vessels to come and rescue people, it has to trust that people will respond to it.

So if resilience is built on trust, how do we build trust itself? One of the biggest lessons from our work is that you have to deliberately take risks. Now we take risks almost subconsciously when we work with people. We count on our teammates to meet a deadline. When they do, we feel more confident in setting a more ambitious

target because we trust that they'll be able to do it. We confide in our friends. They keep that confidence, so then we confide more deeply and frequently.

It may feel that trust just happens when we spend time with people, but one driver building that trust is that we're constantly taking small risks with people, and that leads to positive outcomes and that builds trust over time. The challenge now is that we increasingly have to work with people with whom we don't have a shared history; we don't have the time necessarily to build trust, and we have to work urgently and quickly on really thorny problems. No matter how well intentioned, trust is not always there at the starting point, and often the opposite is true. So how do we accelerate trust building in these conditions? Well, we've learned in our resilience-building work that you have to build in the time and sometimes the opportunities to take risks with each other.

Let me give you an example. Surat is a city in India that experienced a devastating flood in 2006. Surat experiences floods about every five years, but this one was particularly severe. Over 100 people died; thousands were stranded, and businesses and schools were closed for weeks. The sad news is that this was very preventable. Surat sits near a river, and upstream there's a dam. And they manage the dam so that when water levels rise, they will slowly release the water. However, in this case they released the water quite quickly and quite suddenly. Blame went all around, and trust in the system went down.

Now as part of our work on urban resilience, we partnered with the city to create a process by which different communities could come together and work out a solution. We particularly emphasized the inclusion of the voices of poor, vulnerable people, whose needs and concerns often aren't recognized in these processes. So they developed better procedures, as you can imagine, and some technical solutions like using SMS [short message service] texts as a warning system instead of loudspeakers. In 2013 there was another flood but with nowhere near the same consequences, so that was a good outcome. And we've been doing this work globally, as Adele mentioned, in our 100 Resilient Cities effort.

Let me tell you something that was very interesting about this story. I went to visit Surat, and I had tea with the city administrator, and he told me this very interesting story. At one point in time, there was a religious celebration that was happening over a weekend, and during this religious celebration thousands of people go to the riverbanks and place small holy objects into the water. This was happening on the weekend, but just before the weekend they were sensing that the water levels were rising. They had these new procedures for warning people that they were going to institute, but the problem was there was no one around to institute it because the entire city government was on holiday and was by the river, as well.

Luckily, the city administrator had just participated in some resilience-planning exercises with the dam managers. Because in this process they had not only worked out these solutions but also candidly shared their fears and hopes and built trust with each other, he was able to pick up the phone, call the dam administrators and have them cancel or at least manage differently the release of the water. In fact, they were doing something completely differently than the procedures they had designed. My point here is that the increased trust was not only necessary for the city to develop improved plans but it was an asset that could be drawn upon to improvise when

something new was needed. And this really is the core of resilience. It's the difference between building resilience and building technical procedures.

Let me share what that concluded for me in analyzing that work and also the work of others. A couple lessons: First you have to build in opportunities for people to take risks with each other in the process. This often runs counter to our innate desire to have perfect processes, where we actually try to take risk out of how people work together. But if you can have groups take risks with each other and build trust as they're doing this, that helps you lead to more-innovative solutions. Related to that is a second lesson, which is that if at the outcome of the process you've increased trust, you've now created an asset that can be drawn upon in new and different ways.

Finally, let me conclude with the statement that these are easy things to say: "Let's build risk into the process, and let's make sure that trust is an outcome." It's easy to say, but it's hard to do because it's very uncomfortable. It's very uncomfortable to think about trying to do things differently, and sometimes philanthropy errs on the side of taking the safe path. We heard Patrick talk about the temptation to sometimes speak just to crowds who agree with us. And we heard about how MacArthur took a very radically different approach, different from business as usual. I would argue that this is something we have to take on more, and we have to think about What does risk really mean for us?

I think we sometimes confuse funding risky projects with taking risks ourselves, so I would encourage all of us to think about, as we do our work: How can we deliberately take risks? How can we use those risk-taking opportunities for people to build trust with each other? And how do we deliberately focus on the creation of trust not only as a mechanism to develop the innovative solutions we want in our own processes but as assets that can then be drawn upon by others? So in other ways, how do we think about our work to constantly create trust as a public good so that we can incrementally recover from the point that we've gotten to, where trust is so low, where fragmentation is so high, across all the different sectors and groups that we have?

So those are a lot of the lessons that we learned from our resilience building related to trust. We've learned this from talking to so many other thoughtful people and philanthropists here who are doing great work. I just want to leave a thought with you: In addressing the problems of today, how can we deliberately focus on inserting risk-taking opportunities to build trust? We don't know what challenges we are going to be facing in the future, but we can be pretty sure that they will depend on increased trust among all of us.

Thank you very much.

ADVANCING TRUST SECRETARY MADELEINE ALBRIGHT IN CONVERSATION WITH MCNULTY PRIZE LAUREATES



Jordan Kassalow and Madeleine Albright

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19
8:15 PM

LANA ABU-HIJLEH

Country Director, Global Communities Palestine

JORDAN KASSALOW

Founder, VisionSpring and Co-founder, EYEliance

ANNE WELSH MCNULTY

President, John P. & Anne Welsh McNulty Foundation (introduction)

DELE OLOJEDE

Founder, Timbuktu Media and NEXT

JANE WALES

Founder, Global Philanthropy Forum (moderator)

IN CONVERSATION WITH MADELEINE ALBRIGHT

Chairman, Albright Stonebridge Group and former United States Secretary of State

ANNE WELSH MCNULTY

I'm Anne Welsh McNulty, president of the McNulty Foundation. I'm happy to welcome you to this dinner and this celebration of the tenth year of our signature program, the McNulty Prize.

Several of you in the past two days have shared painful experiences that you have had, and that makes it easier for me to share mine: 11 years ago I got a call that my husband had collapsed and died suddenly. He had just had his fifty-third birthday. My children at the time were 14, 17 and 20, and my oldest, Johnny, is actually here with us today. So the question we faced — and I know many of you have faced — is *What do you do in the face of such a loss?* How do you channel the anger and the pain and the grief into something that is perhaps bigger than that anger and that grief and that pain, something bigger than yourself? And how do you manage the missing of this wonderful, charismatic and engaging person and translate that into building a positive legacy? It's really not easy. But what my family and I found and what we did was to create a way to remember John and to remember his leadership, his commitment to developing new leaders and his dedication to creating opportunities for others in the same way that he felt that he had been given opportunities. The way we did that was by creating the McNulty Prize.

All of us here have had this chance to serve others meaningfully. We are committed here to the common good and to sharing in each other's struggles — and I suspect that's why we are all here at the Global Philanthropy Forum. The power of that kind of commitment is really at the core of the McNulty Prize. This prize, given in partnership with the Aspen Institute, recognizes those leaders who have pivoted from success to a role of greater significance, who are consciously using their entrepreneurial talents, their resources, their networks and their wisdom to answer the call; that is, to answer the moral imperative that they feel to try to solve problems and create opportunities.

I would like to show you now a very brief video so you can hear the voices of some McNulty Prize laureates.

Since our first awarding of this prize, we have been laser-focused on advancing my husband John's values, values that are at the core of our entire foundation. And our

director, Aprile Age, is here tonight, as well. Our foundation seeks to develop, drive and inspire leaders to develop their full potential through a host of different programs. Later this year we will award our tenth McNulty Prize. Over the years we have honored more than 40 courageous leaders from around the world, individuals who have answered the call — ranging from fast-food industry executives who realized that they had the tools to ensure that every child in South Africa's school system would get meals so that they would not be hungry and too hungry to learn, and also a real estate developer in Panama City, who saw that local gangs, treated as a whole, would disband if they were given the chance for respect and productive employment. Those are two examples of the kind of work of our individual McNulty Prize laureates, and they have had a multiplier effect on their lives and on the communities affected.

Tonight you will meet three of our laureates. I would like to invite them to the stage, along with former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright.

While they're coming out, I invite you to take a look at the cards at your seats highlighting each of the laureates who is appearing here tonight. Please look at the cards, and we also have the case studies on our website, McNulty.org.

I am honored to introduce Madeleine Albright. As all of you should know, Madeleine served as the sixty-fourth American secretary of state, under President [Bill] Clinton. You may remember that she was confirmed as secretary of state by a 99-to-zero vote by the GOP-controlled Senate back when those things still happened. As the first female secretary of state, she was an incredible pioneer, changing the face of America at home and abroad. And she continues to be a unique and powerful voice for women's rights throughout the world. She is currently the chair of the Albright Stonebridge Group and is also a very popular professor of international relations at Georgetown [University]. In fact, as we talked earlier, a former student of hers by the name of Josh Ossof just finished first in Georgia's 6th district special election yesterday. Possibly, had she personally coached him, maybe he would have gotten the 50 percent. She has been the chair of our McNulty Prize jury for many years, and she has also announced that she is ready to register as a Muslim if needed. In a special display of bipartisanship, her Read My Pins exhibition is currently on display at the Reagan Presidential Library.

I want to recognize our three outstanding leaders. All three of them are doing very different work, but what they share and what all of our McNulty Prize laureates share is that they have all made a choice. Jordan Kassalow, a successful eye doctor on Park Avenue, chose to start VisionSpring, an international organization that has now delivered more than 3.5 million reading glasses to hard-to-reach communities. Lana Abu-Hijleh has chosen to use her platform at a major development organization to engage young Palestinians for democracy and good governance. And Dele Olojede is a Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist and editor living in New York. He chose to return to Nigeria and start a newspaper exposing corruption at the highest levels there and weathering the consequences. And finally, we have Jane Wales moderating. You have all gotten to know and appreciate her role here. Jane has been an adviser, consultant and supporter of the McNulty Prize since its inception. Thank you, Jane, for your ongoing support, for putting on such a meaningful event and providing this opportunity for us.

Thank you very much and enjoy the panel.

JANE WALES

I think it should be said that the whole concept of going from success to significance is something that Anne McNulty has lived. She remains a very successful professional, originally at Goldman Sachs. She was a very successful member of her family in the sense that she was one of the best friends you could possibly have. She had a wonderful marriage to a wonderful man, and it produced three terrific kids: Johnny, Kevin and Brynne, who have their parents' commitment and their parents' exuberance, and they have great values and are great people. So taking the loss that they all felt and turning it into a benefit for the rest of us is pretty damn good.

I'm going to take advantage of having Secretary Albright onstage to just set the scene a little bit. I'm going to ask you about trust, and I'm going to ask you about your role as juror for the McNulty Prize. But I think most folks would assume that as secretary of state and as UN representative, you'd be fairly state-centric, that you would think in terms of interacting with other foreign ministers only. Tell us about your own personal experience with Václav Havel but also your role with NDI, the National Democratic Institute: What have you learned about the role of civil society, or what conclusions have you drawn?

MADELEINE ALBRIGHT

Thank you, and I'm delighted to be here. I have to say, of the various difficult things that I've done in life, to be a juror for the McNulty Prize is really hard because the applicants are remarkable. Of course we're able to choose fantastic people every year, but then you think about all the people who really are great, so it is really hard to do. And you three are very great examples of our having chosen right.

Let me just say that I do think, as I had those jobs, that I had come out of a different culture. In terms of doing politics at the grassroots level and working on Capitol Hill and being very involved in politics and then also as a professor, you realize that while it's nice to have meetings in those fancy rooms with somebody whose name — by the way, it's very easy at the UN; everybody's first name is Your Excellency. But basically, there's an awful lot more to do if you are going to make a difference in society; and what is very important is the composition that society has in terms of people who are the ones who have given up some of their rights in order to exist in a state, a social contract in which a lot is owed to them, and they owe to their governments. And then there are organizations like non-governmental organizations, multinational corporations, journalists — people who are there really fighting on behalf of the people in order to make sure that that social contract works.

And you mentioned Václav Havel because my life really is so peculiar. I was born in Czechoslovakia, and I met Václav Havel in 1990, in fact, when I went there on behalf of the National Democratic Institute. They'd just had the Velvet Revolution, and I said, "I'm from America. I'm here to help. What can we do for you?" And he said, "We need a new electoral law." And we began to work on that. He did not believe in political parties. He believed in civil society. And that is something that I think isn't just government to government but rather civil society and the responsibility that we all have for each other.

By the way, I was just interviewed about him for two hours for a documentary, so I reread a lot of the things that he'd written; obviously, the one that's the most famous

is The Power of the Powerless, of the individual within society who, in fact, has a responsibility to exercise his or her freedom and that that's the power of it — not just bending to the governments. So I do think — as we honor these leaders who understand the importance of individual responsibility, of taking the opportunity to make a difference for others and to understand — that it's important to push the governments in order to get something for one's fellow citizens.

JANE WALES

Now my understanding is that you haven't turned your back entirely on fellow foreign ministers. I think you convened some of them out in California just recently.

MADELEINE ALBRIGHT

I'll tell you what happened. I did love being secretary of state, by the way. This sounds crazy at this point. I invented something really new when I was secretary: the international conference call on telephones. And during the war in Kosovo, I talked to a group of foreign ministers every day about what we were going to do and how we were going to do it. And then we left government, and all of the sudden I got a phone call from Robin Cook, who was the foreign secretary of England. He was out of office, and he was head of the European Socialists. He called me up and said he'd just been in a meeting, and he said, "Madeleine, people are saying terrible things about the UN. Do something." And then I got another call from another former foreign minister who had been foreign minister of the Netherlands, and he said, "I just got a call from one of our colleagues, who said, 'Things are a mess. Call Madeleine.'"

I had no power or office beyond being on the board of the Aspen Institute. So under the auspices of Aspen, we created a group of former foreign ministers; it's called the Aspen Ministers Forum. That's its official name. Its unofficial name is Madeleine and Her Exes. We meet whenever we want to, to talk about whatever we want to, and recently we've been talking about refugees because it is something that has affected everybody. I'm a refugee. I was a refugee during World War II in England and a refugee when we came to the United States. Other refugees that are exes: George Papandreou in Greece and Joschka Fischer in Germany. We have worked very hard on refugee issues. And then we came to Silicon Valley to see how technology could help the refugees in terms of education, connecting people, teaching technology. So that's one of the things I do with my exes.

JANE WALES

I'm going to ask you just one more question before we turn to our colleagues here. We've been talking over the past two days about trust and the decline in trust, and I think we think of trust as our most important asset. It's the glue that holds us together. And yet what we've seen from the Edelman Trust Barometer and other indicators is that there's been this precipitous drop in trust worldwide. And certainly here in the United States, Americans are responding, saying they don't trust their governments; they don't trust the independent media. But perhaps even more worrisome is that they don't trust each other. I wanted your thoughts, Secretary Albright, on the role of civil society in building social capital, in building that glue.

MADELEINE ALBRIGHT

I think the thing that's going on is the whole issue of how people deal with their institutions — the social contract. And I do admit to my students and my friends that this is a plagiarized line that I learned when I was in Silicon Valley: that what has happened is people are talking to their governments on 21st-century technology, the governments listen to them on 20th-century technology and are providing 19th-century responses. People do not have trust in institutions. So how do you get, for instance, from Tahrir Square to governance? And a lot that we learned about how people got to Tahrir Square was through social media and by way of, frankly, disaggregating voices, so it's hard to have political parties. There has to be some other mechanism for people to figure out how they deal with their institutions and, frankly, what is truth these days. How do they get their facts?

Because what is happening is that through social media, people basically listen only to something they already know. And, by the way, many of you are not from Washington. You are lucky because as I drive I listen to right-wing radio so that I hear something different from what I believe in, and I'm yelling and screaming and may get arrested at some point. But I do think it's important to listen to things that you disagree with understand what truth is and how we learn to trust the institutions and trust each other. So that's why I'm so glad to be here and actually [talk with] Lana, who is doing something in educating the next generation in terms of how civil society works. You are a perfect segue trying to deal how civil society works and what your role has been in getting people to trust each other and develop a new set of leaders.

LANA ABU-HIJLEH

Thank you, Dr. Albright. It's an honor to be here with you. You've always been a mentor.

MADELEINE ALBRIGHT

What she just gave me — why don't you explain?

LANA ABU-HIJLEH

You love brooches, right?

MADELEINE ALBRIGHT

I do.

LANA ABU-HIJLEH

I always admired your collection, so I had this made by a Palestinian designer. It's the olive branches representing peace and a coin from 1917 that says "Palestine — hopefully statehood will come soon."

MADELEINE ALBRIGHT

Thank you.

LANA ABU-HIJLEH

Thank you, Dr. Albright. Your insights and the theme of this conference, Jane, cannot be more relevant to the context I live and work in.

I chose over the past 30 years a career with the UN and civil society in the development and humanitarian assistance field because I wanted to help my people survive steadfast the harsh realities of living under occupation. I wanted to contribute to building the foundations of the future state of Palestine — but I wanted it to be a different kind of Arab state. I worked on promoting democracy, good governance, citizenry and good human values because I had hope and trust that our leaders and the world leadership — and we just discussed that — would eventually deliver peace, deliver freedom, justice and statehood and eventually security for all parties of the conference. Well two decades have passed since that peace process, Dr. Albright, as you know, with no real advancement on that level.

Unfortunately, hope is disappearing, and instead of trust, mistrust is settling in. This is something I struggled with all these years. Also our people — the communities I spent all my life serving — are changing. They are losing their trust in themselves and their own ability to effect change. The social and political fabric is weakening what we always relied on. The results of the parliamentary elections we had a decade ago, if I may say here, were a shock to me. I think many people who worked on promoting democracy to the point that we did felt Did democracy fail us? Or are these results a reflection of the anger and mistrust and the disintegrating political, economic and social fabric and process of change and in our leadership? Losing trust in your leadership and their ability to deliver — this is the context I lived in. And the burning questions on my mind that I struggled and grappled with were: What do you do? You just stand on the sideline and remain frustrated with what's going on? Does this sound familiar to the discussion we've been having? This is something we've been struggling with for decades.

That was about the time I saw Walter Isaacson here, when the Aspen Fellowship came at really an inflection point in my life. And the readings we were doing, the discussions we were having with Fellows from around the world, like-minded leaders who do not give up, who move to act in order to build trust again — that inspired me. Although I was doing a lot through my work — first with the UN and then with Global Communities [Palestine], the NGO I work with — I felt that I could do more, get beyond my comfort zone. As a professional in the field, it had become so comfortable to implement projects. I wanted to do something that changes the reality of our future leaders, that gives our youths a chance to govern differently.

Well, Dr. Albright, 52 percent of our population is under the age of 25. This could be a big challenge, or it could be opportunity. I chose to see it as opportunity. So I moved to do an initiative: Establish an organization that provides youths with a platform to act rather than lose hope, feel frustrated, feel they don't trust the future, they don't trust themselves and their agency to effect change. When they engage, I think we create a new reality. So I called it the Youth Local Councils, and these councils are basically voluntary bodies of youths age 15 to 22, democratically elected by their peers. I wanted them to practice real democracy, and they receive a lot of support and training in good governance, value-based leadership, and soft and personal skills. And they take these tools back to their communities and implement projects that

respond to needs identified by them and their communities. And they advocate for policy change.

So, in short, it's not really about the project; it is about engaging these youths in a positive way and providing them with tools, with values that they could carry with them in the future, when they actually take leadership roles. We need leaders who respond and gain the trust of communities, and that cannot just be created by a splash. It has to grow from the grassroots. I'll probably get the chance to tell you more about the work these youths do and the change that affected them and their communities and their lives, and hopefully you will see more of it in the future.

JANE WALES

Thank you, Lana. Not only are these young people under age 25 lacking opportunity but they've been lacking agency, and you've been trying to provide the latter as well, that sense that you can make a difference and that you must...

LANA ABU-HIJLEH

...must make a difference. We've been calling it the "call for action." There is no way that you can — in this world of ours, in the context I come in and now the world, globally — say just we're complaining. We have to do something, all of us. All of us are doing a lot. I'm doing a lot through my work with Global Communities and through my voluntary work and the work I do with the private sector, but I needed to do something that I feel passionate about, that I know is going to affect my daughters, and it's going to affect these amazing youths and what they can also do for their communities, their country and hopefully the globe.

JANE WALES

So, Dele, when we think of civil society, one of the key civil society members is an independent media. You're an extraordinary journalist from your Newsday days, when you got the Pulitzer for your Rwanda coverage but then you started NEXT. You went back to Nigeria, to your homeland. Say a word about your own pivot point. What made you decide to go back to Nigeria? And what happened? What was your goal, and what happened?

DELE OLOJEDE

There are so many things that impel you to do something in your life. Sometimes you've been traveling along a certain path and at some point there is a trigger that forces you to take action about the things you've already been thinking about because your character probably hasn't changed that much, and what is often lacking is the courage to take the jump. So I was lucky that a few things converged to push me in that direction. Amongst them was simply the fact that I felt that I was now deep into middle age, and if I didn't do it now, it would be too late. Then I got invited to be a Fellow of the African Leadership Initiative, which is part of the Aspen Global Leadership Network, and met extraordinary people in a wonderful setting. I'd just won the big prize, and then you start asking, What's next? And then everybody says that you've got to do something that's beyond your comfort zone and so on. I said, "Well, I always thought I was going to do this thing, so maybe this is the time to

jump.” And as I tried to do all the time, with my wife constantly trying to restrain me unsuccessfully, I decided to dive headlong into it.

It takes a certain degree of madness to do this sort of thing because if you truly understood what the risks involved were and the level of stress and danger and the cost to your family and to your happiness, you probably wouldn't do it. So you needed to be a little bit mad and to be constantly angry — and angry in the sense that if you are the sort of person who felt that things could always be better than they were, you would take action.

If you know a few things about Nigeria, you probably know that it is one of the world's most corrupt countries, which means that if you have widespread corruption in a society, it is highly corrosive to the idea of fairness; and if there isn't fairness, there will be no trust. So by the time I went back into Nigeria to try to do the newspaper, the idea was to create an example of a civic institution that could not be bought or sold, that would depend on the honest judgment of its editors and publishers and that the public could go to sleep knowing that if they read something on such a platform, in such a newspaper, it was the truth. And so we guaranteed that, and everything else was secondary to it. The idea was also to show that it was possible in such an environment. And so that was what I wanted to do because when I was a kid growing up in 1960s Nigeria, it was still a fairly sane society.

A story I like to tell about what trust means: When I was going to primary school, my duty in the morning typically was to pick up the morning papers for my dad. There were three newspapers that he picked up. The newspaper vendor always kept all these packs of newspapers at the intersection not far from our house, but I never saw him. He was never there. So you just go there. You pick up the papers. You put the money down; and if it was a note, you use a rock to hold it down so it doesn't get blown away. If you needed change, you picked up change from the coins that were stacked there. And day after day, the reason you knew this worked is that the guy kept doing it; because if people were stealing his money, he will have run out of business. So basic trust that exists in a society can easily erode in an atmosphere of extreme corruption and unfairness, which is the byproduct of corruption.

I felt that the one thing I could be reasonably certain that I knew how to do was to create a newspaper, a news organization that could inform the public very clearly about what was really going on, and with their being reasonably certain that we had not been paid by some millionaire guy to keep some information out of the newspaper or to put some information that was not true into the newspaper. So the idea of trust — which is the theme of this conference — is very appealing to me because I think without that it becomes impossible to face the many big challenges that we face in that part of the world — or in this part of the world, for that matter. And I think this increasing lack of trust, even in a well-settled country like the United States, has now put us in this vise that everybody feels so uncomfortable about. So this is really what it was at its most fundamental. What can you do to make people trust one another again so that they have a chance to work together to resolve the challenges they face?

JANE WALES

And now you've gone to Timbuktu Media, but I'll come back to you on that.

Jordan, there you were an ophthalmologist, doing very well. You had your own eyeglass company. Am I right on that? You had your own company going. What happened? What changed in your life that made you make the choice you've made and create VisionSpring.

JORDAN KASSALOW

Thank you, Jane. Let me start by just saying how honored I am to share the stage with Dr. Albright and these fine colleagues-in-arms, living lives that are so purposeful. I'm really, really humbled to share the stage with you all.

My journey started in Mexico. I met a 7-year-old boy named Raul, and he was from the school for the blind. And when we examined his eyes, we realized that he wasn't actually blind at all. He just needed a really strong pair of eyeglasses. And when I put that pair of glasses on his face, his smile of joy that erupted was unbelievably powerful. I like to say I gave him his vision, and he gave me mine. And in the words of Mark Twain, “The two most important days in your life are the day you are born and the day you find out why,” and that was the day I found out why I was put on this earth.

When I got back to school and looked at the numbers, I realized that Raul was far from alone. There were over 600 million people in the world who were visually impaired or blind — not because of a terrible eye disease but just because they didn't have a simple pair of glasses, a technology that has existed for over 700 years. That's two times the US population — people who are visually impaired or blind for the lack of something that we can source for less than a dollar. I thought that was unacceptable. And, like Dele, I kind of got a little angry at that notion.

As a result, I've started two organizations: one called VisionSpring and one called the EYElliance. Both work to broaden the access of affordable eye care services and eyeglasses. VisionSpring takes an enterprise approach to solving the problem, and the EYElliance takes a system-change approach to solving the problem. Essentially, what we're trying to do is enable children to see so that they can learn and enable adults to see so that they can continue to work. There's a real economic imperative to this: It's not just a health issue; it's, in fact, a global development issue.

And in regard to the trust question — because that's really critical for both of our organizations in slightly different ways — from a VisionSpring perspective, an organization that takes an enterprise approach to solving the problem, we have to gain trust in our customers. And what better way than to brand your products — to stand behind your products with a brand slapped on the product and on the case — than by saying to people that This is a brand that has integrity. We're not just a fly-by-night do-good group of people. We are going to stand by the product that we provide for you. And that product has to be aspirational because we're asking you to pay for it. We're not just giving it to you.

From a donor perspective, we also need to gain trust. And I find the best way to gain trust in our donor community is to share with them the lessons that we learned, and not all the lessons are positive. We've had a lot of failures. I was speaking at a university not too long ago, and a student raised her hand and she said, “How is

VisionSpring so successful given that you've made all those mistakes? You were constantly making mistakes." And I said, "Actually, part of our success is that we learn from our mistakes and we keep going forward with them." And most importantly, the trust is with our local partners because we work through partnerships. And like any partnership, if it's a life partner or a working partner, you have to have mutual goals. You have to have mutual respect. You have to have open communication. You have to see other people's perspectives. You have to respect differences, like you were saying, Dr. Albright. And once you have that trust, you can overcome almost any challenge.

For instance, we are working in Bangladesh with a wonderful organization called BRAC [Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee], and I think maybe people from the audience are also working with BRAC. The minister of finance decided to triple the duty costs on eyeglasses, which just made the product completely unaffordable to our market, screwed up our whole business model. And it could have unwound the entire enterprise, but because BRAC and we had deep trust with one another, we figured out ways around it. We actually ended up building a local manufacturing plant and improved the quality of the glasses produced in Bangladesh over the quality that they were in China. And that way we don't need to import them. Without that deep trust, something that critical could have unwound the entire enterprise.

On the EYelliance side, we're building system-change work and we're working with multiple partners, and trust is the central currency of system change. It requires an honest broker to be a critical element to system change. If you have a leader who is working on system change — no power, no influence on the groups that you're working with — the only way you can forward the initiatives is through having deep trust and for people to feel that you have their interests in mind. So trust is a critical element to all the work that we do.

JANE WALES

What's striking about your model is that you slide back and forth between sectors. And it sounds like what VisionSpring has done because you've got distributors selling these glasses at a very affordable price, but they are making money. So you are achieving two goals: You're providing sight, but you're also providing economic activity at the bottom of the pyramid. Has that been a central aspect of how it's been designed from the start?

JORDAN KASSALOW

That is. We call it our double whammy. We help people earn, as well as see. So we help them. The people who are receiving the glasses are improving their ability to learn and earn. And the people who are selling the glasses — most of whom are women; we have over 25,000 sales agents in 23 countries now selling the product — earn additional resources for themselves and their families. So that was built into the DNA of our model from the beginning.

JANE WALES

And I know that Secretary Albright in the past several years has been working on an initiative that's about bringing investment to the Middle East, so this is something that folks are really working on — and that's one of the ways a difference can be made.

MADELEINE ALBRIGHT

Absolutely.

JANE WALES

Would you agree?

MADELEINE ALBRIGHT

And it's interesting because we had a meeting today. The Middle East Investment Initiative, which provides loans to small and medium-sized businesses to create jobs so that people have the dignity to exist in their societies and trust in each other — and I think leading to a way that civil society can operate. I think all these things. One of the things that I like most is when you can connect dots and really show how one thing leads to another.

JANE WALES

Lana, in your model you invented these youth councils, and what's fascinating to me is that they are basically learning the skills of governance, right? They're running elections. They're responding to constituents. It's all the hard work of governance. It's obviously decidedly local, right? It's all about your relationship to your constituents. But you've also looked at ways to replicate the model beyond. Say something about that.

LANA ABU-HIJLEH

Yes. We started with a pilot in four communities, and we wanted to test that model: Would it actually mobilize youths? Would it gain them the trust of their families, their communities, their local officials? We are part of this society that considered youths sort of on the sidelines and marginalized: You listen to your parents. You don't provide an opinion. You listen to the elders, but you don't have a say in anything. And this way, as I said, you would be marginalizing 52 percent of your population, which is crazy. But after the success in the four communities, we now, after eight years and lots of hard work, are in 20 communities of the West Bank, and we have almost 26,000 young men and women engaged in the organization.

I want to emphasize the young men and women working together because the gender issue was another factor. I really trust in a woman's ability, and many of them took leadership roles on these councils. I want to mention a young woman from a very conservative village in Alar, north of the West Bank. Her name is Basha'er Othman. At age 16 she was elected to head the council, and I've never seen a smarter, more active, more engaged young woman — to the point that the official mayor of the town, who was traveling to go to hajj and was going to be away for two months, asked her if she would run the municipality in his place, and she did. I went to visit, and there is this young woman — I mean she can barely sit on that big chair — and she ran the municipality for two months, doing everything except signing checks because I told her, "No way, OK? You're not yet there." I think this woman could be the future of Palestine. Really, I do believe that.

Dr. Albright, two years ago at Aspen at a dinner at Anne's house, you asked me, "Is this model only for Palestine?" I said, "No, Dr. Albright. I have a dream. And the dream

is called Global Youth for Good Governance because we really need good governance everywhere.” And over the past two years, with the help of my organization, Global Communities, we started to go global. Now we have the first two councils in Honduras. Anybody want to pitch here? We can go to your country. Next it’s going to be Ukraine, hopefully in the next few weeks. And after that, Jordan and maybe Iraq. I’m trying to find the resources.

When you create a community of these young leaders who appreciate good governance, good citizenry, value-based leadership and who one day might be the presidents of their countries or elected officials of some sort, the idea is that they will talk to each other differently: human to human, good governing leaders who have already learned how to respond to their constituency and how to gain their trust and how to gain the trust of all stakeholders at count. So, yes, we went to scale, and the seeds of the Global Youth for Good Governance movement have been planted, and maybe in a few years we’ll see this movement with members of councils from all over the world. Who knows?

JANE WALES

It might be a little dangerous to ask Secretary Albright for advice, particularly if you intend to take it, for sure.

LANA ABU-HIJLEH

More work. More work.

JANE WALES

Lana, and then I’m going to turn to Dele: There are two reasons not to trust your government. One is if it’s corrupt, but the other is if it’s not competent. You know there’s that sense of its efficacy, so are you going after both as you’re training these young people?

LANA ABU-HIJLEH

Yes. About ability, your competency to lead, you don’t wake up and suddenly have it. You practice it. You grow it. You nurture it. And you make mistakes. And you learn from them. And these youths are making mistakes and they’re learning from them. But they’re also very creative, very resilient.

I’ll tell you another story because I love it. The Youth of Bethlehem Council started an advocacy campaign to make our cities friendly for the disabled, a national campaign. What they did in their creative ways was they went to the governor of Bethlehem, and they asked him to sit in a wheelchair for a day and try to go about his business, visiting all public buildings with the media following him. You can imagine how long it took after that for all public buildings to install ramps. This is a small example of capacity to deliver through an innovative way, through a committed way. These youths can definitely deliver on a higher level, on a bigger scale, when they are given that opportunity.

JANE WALES

So you never actually took us to what then happened, Dele.

DELE OLOJEDE

What then happened was that we got deeper into this extraordinary place, teeming with people of all stripes and very badly damaged and hard done by its leadership for an extended period of time. The country was basically broken, and people were not used to the idea of truth tellers sticking their necks out. And it wasn’t that long before we began to expose massive corruption in the oil industry. As everybody knows, wherever there is oil, particularly in countries without strong institutions, corruption and violence and division and avarice follow. They call it the “resource curse.”

And the deeper we delved into that, the more the system rose back against us. They started with attempts at co-option, with massive amounts of money offered as bribes. When that didn’t work, we got threats. Gunmen showed up in our offices in the middle of the night. That didn’t work. And eventually they basically got the banks to pull the loans and the advertisers to flee; if they were able to cut off the oxygen supply, they knew we would have no choice but to fold. So after about four years, we shut down the newspaper.

It was a profoundly disappointing experience initially, until I realized what we had actually unleashed on the country: We had trained an army of young people who are now seeded throughout the system and now actually literally dominate the public conversation in Nigeria today. In fact, last week the core of what used to be our investigations team — which then went on to start a small online platform called Premium Times and which was part of this consortium that broke the Panama Papers — was awarded the Pulitzer Prize. I began to see what we had achieved beyond the actual physical existence of NEXT, to the idea of seeding things and then looking for ways to make sure that those seeds spread and grow stronger.

Part of what we are now doing and partly with very strong support from the McNulty Foundation is putting all of our archives back online at NEXT — all the extraordinary work that we did, that our young people did then, which included making sure the constitution is followed and a president is installed constitutionally and the old one, who was no longer able to perform his duties, steps aside. Basically, he died, so the new guy came in. We got people fired. We got political systems changed. And also, of course, we made ourselves targets of these things. But the important thing was that we had been able to demonstrate that if we didn’t let fools just rush in, it is possible for the country to begin to see what was possible. So our main achievement is that we now have all these alumni of NEXT, who call themselves NEXTERS, who are doing all these extraordinary things in the country. So once the archives go up — a number of them already are threatening to rally and start writing on it again and not just have the archives there. So we’ll see where that goes. I am also cooking up a few new things as a restless soul who can stay alive only if he makes a little bit of trouble.

JANE WALES

Would you like to make any major announcements?

His current endeavor is called Timbuktu Media, and I’m sure it’s called that because nobody actually knows where Timbuktu is, but go ahead.

DELE OLOJEDE

Actually, the holding company for NEXT was called Timbuktu Media.

What I'm working on now is to transmit from being very neck deep in the serious muck that Nigeria has been, to going up — maybe at least 10,000 feet — and beginning to do more long-form journalism about the African world. I have found that, as much as I love playing golf and drinking the occasional glass of wine (maybe not that occasional), what really makes me feel alive is to go back to writing and to getting people together to explore ideas, so we are slowly building that. Hopefully by the end of the year, a first edition of what we propose to call AFAR would come out. AFAR is a name chosen because that's the name of the depression in Ethiopia where Lucy was found, so a sort of nod to origins but at the same time the idea of being able to consider an issue from a bit of a remove, of a distance, so that you have better perspective.

I was way deep in the weeds before, and now we want to have a little bit of perspective in pushing the ideas that hopefully will push the African world forward over a lifetime. I'm a very dostoevskian kind of guy. I would like to see the lambs and the lions lie together while I'm still alive. I don't want this to be in some future kingdom, so there is no time to waste.

JANE WALES

I'm going to close off with you, Jordan, because when Dele said, "It makes me feel alive," it did make me think of Jordan because the first time I met you and you were describing VisionSpring to me, you just lit up. This is a calling for you. It's a business. It's practical. It's producing wonderful outcomes, but it also makes you light up, so I want to know something about that and then, finally, I want to ask you about how you scaled your model.

JORDAN KASSALOW

Absolutely. It is my passion work. I realized that one's heart is really the motor for sustained action. Unless you find something that touches your heart deeply, it's hard to persist and face all the obstacles that you're going to face in order to build something of significance. I was lucky because of Raul to find something that really moved my heart at a pretty young age, and I've just sort of followed that. But I also talk to students a lot, and I tell them how important it is to prepare your heart for those moments because those moments can happen; if your heart is not prepared, it might not change the trajectory of your life. And so having a prepared heart is a really critical element that I always talk about when I talk about my work, particularly to younger people.

In terms of the scaling of the model, when we won the McNulty Prize we were helping about 50,000 people at that time, and I'm very proud to say that this year we're on pace to reach 1 million people, which we're very proud of. Thank you. But I mentioned the number earlier — 600 million [visually impaired or blind] — and that is a drop in the bucket. As we say at the Aspen Institute, we try to make a significant dent in the problems that we try to solve. And I realized that taking an enterprise approach model, like VisionSpring, is wonderful, and I know we're going to go from 1 million to 2 million to 5 million. I have no doubt that our organization is going to do that, but that still leaves us far short of the overall problem.

So how do you look at the problem in its entirety? Like Rajiv Shaw was saying, "How do you take big bets? How do you solve a problem not in little, piecemeal ways?" The EYelliance is really trying to do that: to break down barriers between the public and private sectors, between NGOs and governments, and to think about how to break those silos and think of vision not as a separate silo but as a critical input to global development in a whole bunch of ways.

For instance, if I'm talking to people who are motivated and moved to ensure that every boy and girl on this planet has an education yet 20 percent of them can't see properly, they're not going to reach their goals unless they partner with us, and we help them enable those children to see. If your goal is to have a more productive workforce and just putting on a pair of glasses increases your [workforce's] productivity by 34 percent, as our research shows, we want to make sure that people who are interested in the labor force and factory manufacturers, that those people can see properly so they can be 34 percent more productive. If you're interested in reducing traffic accident deaths — because it is one of the leading causes and rising causes of fatalities in the developing world — and 30 percent of road traffic accidents have a visual component associated with them, it's in your best interest to partner with the EYelliance and become part of the EYelliance so that we can work with our membership to solve that problem with you. We're trying to blur the boundaries of sectors, as Dr. Albright was saying, connecting all these dots that haven't been connected before in order to effect large-scale change.

JANE WALES

I think what you see in all three of these is a commitment to systemwide change, whether it's sight, whether it's the skills of good governance or whether it's the appetite for an independent media. Jordan is also Secretary Albright's eye doctor, just to show that dots are always connected.

MADELEINE ALBRIGHT

I was actually going to talk about that. Just visualize: I'm there looking through those things, and this man is saying, "Wouldn't you like to understand more about what it is I'm doing in giving glasses to people who can't see?" And then he shoves something in my eye and says, "Don't you think you really need to be a part of this?" And aside from the fact that he's totally gorgeous — that also adds to the whole thing, you know. So, no. He's been a very important part of my life, and I do think that he is compelling in what he does and cares about.

What I find so great about listening to everybody here is, first of all, as we choose the McNulty winners, one of the questions is, Can you scale this? so that it is something that really enlarges the vision in every single way. And each of you has done that. I think that's what's so important. The other part in listening: It has no boundaries. You asked me initially about trust and institutions. I think what has to happen in the 21st century: no boundaries. And you all are developing networks of people who are prepared to help each other. Lana, what you're doing now in scaling what you've done I think is remarkable because you are creating a whole new generation of people, and they will know each other and they will not be as stupid as some people we know. I think that it is fantastic what you're doing. And I have to say, Dele, for me, I have always thought about the power of the media. I actually wanted to be a journalist.

DELE OLOJEDE

It's not too late.

MADELEINE ALBRIGHT

It's a little bit late. But I do think that what is so essential at this moment is for people to know the truth, and it can come only if really honest and decent and trusting journalists can put it forward. Otherwise we really will not know how to do the other parts of this. And so I think, the three of you, it's just great to listen to and the scaling. And when I think about the questions that one goes through in choosing the McNulty winners, the laureates, it's really We know why these three people and others are there and have made it. So congratulations to all of you.

JANE WALES

As we celebrate them and their work, I want to give a special thanks to Anne McNulty for inventing this contest but also to Johnny, who's stood by your side throughout. All three of your kids have been hugely supportive of this, and I know that's made a huge difference throughout. So thank you. And let's applaud the tenth anniversary.

RACE, JUSTICE AND LEGITIMACY IN AMERICA



Adam Foss

THURSDAY, APRIL 20

9:00 AM

CARROLL BOGERT

President, The Marshall Project

ADAM FOSS

President, Prosecutor Impact (moderator)

GLENN E. MARTIN

Founder and President, JustLeadershipUSA

ADAM FOSS

This morning we're talking about something that has not really been covered here at the conference, and that is race disparity in our country and what that means for outcomes for young people. First I want everyone in the room to just look around. No — actually do it. Look around at who is here representing global philanthropy worldwide. And now think about who is not here and think about where they might be. You all are wonderful people, very talented, very committed to these issues. The population of people who are *not* here are no less talented, no less intelligent, no less motivated. They are just impeded from being here because they are physically behind bars or there are consequences in their lives of our justice system that keeps them from being here; this is happening in our country.

Fifty years ago people who looked like me lived in terror, the kind of terror that we ascribe to other countries — Syria, Turkey, Iraq, Afghanistan. They were bombed and battered and bruised. They were segregated. They were separated. They were denigrated. They were murdered and lynched without the protection of law enforcement and, indeed, sometimes with the complicity of law enforcement. And today we sit back and we look at the images of that period of time and we think to ourselves, *How could we have let that happen?*

How *could* we have let that happen? How could we have let four little girls get bombed in a church and nothing come out of it? How could we let a 15-year-old boy get battered beyond recognition and killed and nothing happened? How could we let people get mowed down by firehoses and attacked by dogs and nothing happened? Children getting arrested coming out of school and filling up jails — how could we have let that happen? How could we let people stand around and watch as our brothers and sisters were hung from trees as if it were a public assembly. How could we have let that happen? I never would have let that happen.

If we're going to trust each other, if we're going to have truth and reconciliation, we need to state the obvious; we're kind of doing that right now. There are 2.3 million people in our jails and prisons, and despite making up only 14 percent of the population, almost 50 percent of the people in jail and prison look like me. One in three black men born today will spend some time in a correctional facility in his lifetime. The two men that you have on the panel today have already done their time. One in three black women has a relative in prison right now. There are 7 million people under correctional control in this country, one misstep — and I say *misstep*, not *misdeed* — from being incarcerated. Seventy million people have criminal records; that's one out of every four Americans, and there are 50,000 collateral consequences to convictions that impede people from successfully reentering society.

There are more African Americans in prison now than there were slaves on the eve of the Civil War. There are more segregated schools in this country than there were on the eve of *Brown v. Board of Education*. There was more representation in the United States Congress during reconstruction than there is now. And yet here we sit, talking about solving problems outside of our borders. Who are we to go clean other people's houses when ours is such a mess, and we can't trust each other enough to talk about it?

It's time for a new civil rights movement. This isn't a secret to anybody. African Americans have been saying this for decades. And a lot of the inertia is blamed on a lack of leadership. We're looking for another Martin; we're looking for another Malcolm; we're looking for another Rosa — somebody, anybody, to take us to the promised land. And yet nothing happens. So I challenge the folks in the audience. It's not a question of who is going to be the next civil rights leader. It's a question of *What am I going to do, in my individual capacity, to right these wrongs? Not What am I going to do next year? Not What am I going to do in Q3 [third quarter] or Q4? What am I going to do tonight* to have a realistic conversation about the state of our union?

There's something that each one of you can do at any point in time because it's not just about the back end and people who are going into the prisons; this is about what happens when you are born. We know that a child in utero whose mother is suffering from toxic stress inherits that toxic stress, and that is a direct pathway to the criminal justice system. We know in our communities in Massachusetts, for example, that 75 percent of the children who are locked up in our Department of Youth Services have had, on average, three interactions with the child welfare system by the time they were 3 years old. I'm going to say that again: 75 percent of the children who are locked up in our Department of Youth Services, in our juvenile jail, had on average three interactions with the child welfare system by the time they were 3. Those are babies telling us, "If you don't do something, I'm going to end up in jail." And we wait.

Those children, by the time they reach the first grade, have heard 30 million fewer words than those in more affluent suburbs. Put in another way, those children, on average, from the time they were born until they reach the first grade have been read to for 18 hours. In the suburbs that number is 2,400 hours. That gap in literacy, that gap in cognitive development, that gap in just the physical and emotional support provided by a parent creates a direct pathway to the criminal justice system.

Those children then go on to middle school and, having not learned how to read, they have a really hard time learning from reading. And what do we do as adults? We punish them because they are acting up in our classrooms, because they are walking around, because they're a behavior problem. They're the class clown. We punish them.

Then those children go on into high school having not learned to read and hence unable to learn from reading. The chance that they drop out of high school is through the roof: 68 percent of state prisoners are high school dropouts. That is not just a correlative factor. That's a causal relationship. But we wait.

Because when they drop out, those kids go out as adolescents and they find other people who are just like them. They find other people who aren't judging them for their deficits. They find other people whom they respect and they're loyal to and they love, and they get that love back. And in the suburbs, we call those things a team, a troupe, a club. But in my neighborhood, we call that a gang. Despite the fact

that it's completely normative adolescent behavior, we label it, we racialize it and we demonize it. And because their lifestyle is decided by who lives and who dies — *Am I going to walk down the street and get killed? Are my friends going to walk down the street and get killed?* — when they respond to that with violence, something that they've learned in their own homes, then as adults we say, "Now I have time for you. Now I have resources for you." We send them to our criminal justice system.

We spend all of our time, all of our resources and all of our energy locking that person up for the rest of their lives at a cost to all of us. We need to have this conversation all the time because 50 years from now we're going to be looking back on this time, and when that time comes it's not going to be the words of our enemies that remember the silence of all of us. So as you listen to this panel, I want you to think about 50 years from now: How do you want to be remembered? As the person who did lots of things all over the world but ignored what was going on in your backyard? Or do you want to be remembered as somebody who got fed up that this is happening on your watch and you did something because you were one of the new civil rights leaders of our time?

Thank you. Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

So here we are at the plenary session "Race, Justice and Legitimacy in America." I would like to welcome our web audience, as well. Good morning. Thank you for being there, if you're there. If you're live-tweeting, please use the hashtag #GPF17 for all you kids.

I have joining me on the panel today two amazing speakers, one of whom is a close personal friend. The second of whom I hope will be my close personal friend. Their bios are in the book, but I'll start us off here.

First I'd like to welcome Carroll Bogert. She's the president of the Marshall Project. If you all have your phones out — I see some of you do — I would like you to go ahead and download or follow the Marshall Project. The Marshall Project seeks to create and sustain a sense of national urgency about the criminal justice system. It's real news. And it's the youngest news organization to ever win the Pulitzer Prize. Ms. Bogert was previously deputy executive director at Human Rights Watch, running its award-winning global media operations for 18 years. Please give it up for Carroll Bogert.

And before this next individual comes out — he's very handsome — a year ago this individual stood on the steps of City Hall in New York City and said he would have Rikers [Island Prison Complex] closed in 12 months, and everybody laughed in his face. But we are happy to report that a couple of weeks ago the mayor said that he was going to do that, and it is in no small part due to the efforts of this man. Glenn Martin is the founder and president of JustLeadershipUSA, an organization predicated on the belief that the formerly incarcerated can best contribute to effective policy reform. In 2016 his efforts were recognized with the Robert F. Kennedy Human Rights Award. Prior to founding JustLeadershipUSA, he was the vice president of the Fortune Society, one of the most respected reentry organizations in the country. Please give it up for my brother Glenn Martin.

Hi. So, really small issue that we're going to deal with this morning: race, justice and equality in America — new hot-button topic.

Carroll, I would like to start with you. What's the problem?

CARROLL BOGERT

Wow. I actually think you just did a masterful job of laying out what the problem is and socking it to all of us to get busy on a solution. That was an amazing litany of statistics, but I think they add up to, as you said, what the Marshall Project is trying to do, which is to raise and sustain a sense of national urgency about this issue. It goes on in the background of our lives constantly in our society, and it's something we've been able to ignore; it's particularly something that white people have been able to ignore because it's not impacting white communities in the same way — and that is something we simply cannot tolerate.

I spent 18 years of my life at Human Rights Watch. There are colleagues of mine from Human Rights Watch here. It's one of the great NGOs of the world. It has impact all over the world. But I couldn't not spend some part of my life engaged in the most critical human rights struggle in the United States, which is the criminal justice system. When you look at human rights abuse around the world again and again, it is in the justice sector. It is in the sector in which the government arrogates to itself the right to use violence against its citizens and to take away their liberty. It's not surprising that that power is often abused. In this country it is also abused regularly and in ways that we too often ignore.

So how can journalism help? I was a foreign correspondent before I came to Human Rights Watch, and I remained a journalist, kind of, in my bones, but I am also a human rights activist. And in many countries around the world, these are same thing. If you go to a country that's living under dictatorship, the journalists there are human rights activists. They have to be because the essential human right of freedom of speech is rapidly taken away in situations of authoritarian rule. And I think we're seeing now — not to go superpolitical on you so early in the morning — but we do have an administration that has identified journalists as enemies of the people. And, frankly, as someone who lived in the former Soviet Union for five years, that's a really creepy term. It signifies the importance of media in raising issues that are critical of governance.

As an advocate at Human Rights Watch, I was aware — and I was in charge of — making media coverage central to our advocacy. Yes, there are many things that advocates do in closed-door sessions with policymakers that have nothing to do with media. But a lot of where Human Rights Watch derived its impact was from being in the press day after day. And what we're trying to do at the Marshall Project is keep issues of the criminal justice system in the media day after day. So we're a newsroom. We have 10 reporters. We're still small. And we work in partnership with mainstream media: *New York Times*, *Washington Post*, NPR [National Public Radio] and smaller publications, the *New Orleans Times-Picayune*, *Vice* (a great partner, actually), *Wired*, *Ebony*. We do long-form investigative journalism, and then we publish it with mainstream media who have a bigger audience than a startup media organization like ours can have. And it does have impact.

Sometimes it's direct impact. We published a story with the *Washington Post* about a month ago now about the phenomenon in many states in this country: If your kid is sent to jail, you, the parent, will get a bill. You'll be asked to pay for their lodging and for their incarceration. You can imagine what this is like for families who are already struggling with poverty...

ADAM FOSS

Yes.

CARROLL BOGERT

...to additionally be asked to pay the state for the trauma that their child was experiencing in prison. The lead example in the story — the first paragraph — was about a guy employed by the City of Philadelphia who was making \$319,000 a year, and it's his job to sit across the table from these impoverished parents and say to them. "OK, you owe us now." We published the story in the morning; it went live on the *Post's* site at, whatever, 4:00, 6:00 AM. By noon the city of Philadelphia had announced that it was abandoning that practice. So sometimes...

ADAM FOSS

Can we give it up for the Marshall Project?

Glenn, I want to turn to you first. I know you were behind the curtain, but I also want you to observe the room and talk to me about what happens when we let formally incarcerated people run wild after we close down Rikers.

GLENN E. MARTIN

Why did she get the softball question?

That's a really good question, actually. Let me give you a little bit of history of the Rikers campaign because when people hear me say we should shut down Rikers... First of all, it was a very lonely place a year ago when I first said that. But as someone who first went to Rikers at age 16 for a shoplifting charge with \$1,500 bail and was there for two days, I think the judge was trying to teach me a lesson. And on the second day, on my way back to court, I was in a cell, a cell that was meant to hold about 20 people. There were about 50 people in there. This is a jail that had 22,000 people at that time. It was always meant to only hold about 14,000. So you can imagine what that was like. People were double-bunked, triple-bunked and so on.

So I'm on my way back to court, and a young guy walks up to me, another child — I'm deliberately using the word child because we were both children — and he said, "Give me your jacket." And if you know anything about Rikers Island, they call it "gladiator school" for a reason. You have two choices: predator or prey. There's not much in between. We started to fight, and by the time that fight was over, I got stabbed four times in that cell, the last time in my neck. It was a pen that was melted and fashioned into a knife, and yet I emerged from that fight realizing *I can survive in this jail*. And so that really is the lesson New York City taught me as a 16-year-old child who was trying to figure out my identity and where I fit into this world: *This is what New York City has for me*. And yet Rikers is every jail. And every jail is Rikers.

When I decided to launch this organization and figure out how we were going to help decarcerate this country, because I'm located in New York for me it was an easy decision to decide that we would take on the most bold and audacious campaign. Why? Because when we listened to people who've been harmed most by the criminal justice system, they were clear with us that reform wasn't good enough and that this particular institution had shown itself to be resistant to reform. We spent \$209,000

per bed per year to abuse our children in this place. There are 10 jails; 80 percent of the people there are innocent — just charged with a crime, not convicted; 89 percent are people of color. So when people say, “Well, how can you do that?”

ADAM FOSS

Can you just say that again?

GLENN E. MARTIN

Sure.

ADAM FOSS

Because we're in New York City, and there *are* white people there.

GLENN E. MARTIN

Yes.

ADAM FOSS

Can you talk to me just about that percentage that you just said?

GLENN E. MARTIN

Sure. I'll restate those statistics. I think I sort of brushed over them: 80 percent of the people who are sitting at Rikers on any given day are just charged with a crime, and they spend anywhere from a day to six years charged with a crime, not convicted. So the punishment is in the process. No matter what happens at the end of that experience — if the DA [district attorney] drops the charges, if the person gets convicted — the fact of the matter is that they've already been punished. And for me that punishment was four stab wounds that I still deal with today. I'm standing in line at the supermarket, and I feel the pain in my back from where the pen punctured my muscles, you know, 30 years later.

We built a campaign that invested in the leadership of people like me, people who have been through the system. Why? Because we knew they would show up. And, most importantly — and this is what I appreciated about your talk — first of all, all the statistics; I just have to keep scratching off all the things that were going to make me sound smart. Thank you, Adam. But when you got to the point of humanizing the issue, when you talked about the community you're from and how people engage in the very same behaviors that other folks engage in and yet it's defined differently, that really resonated with me the most; because the problem with our criminal justice system is that you don't get to the point where you criminalize 70 million Americans unless you dehumanize them first.

And so we have to spend a ton of time rehumanizing folks in the criminal justice system. Right now we talk about *prisoners, convicts, ex-offenders, inmates*. You can put those things in a cell for 23 hours a day. Those are not *brothers, sisters, uncles, aunts, children*. Those are inmates. What's an inmate? Put an inmate in a cell for 23 hours. I'm okay with that. Spend \$209,000 per bed per year, locking it up because I'm scared of that. So that's what's been so amazing about the system: its ability to cause

so much human carnage and at the same time have so many Americans be OK with it because it's not our sisters and brothers; it's inmates and convicts and prisoners.

ADAM FOSS

Carroll, Glenn's point about words — it's something that's really important, especially in this conversation where we have racialized a lot of the criminal justice system. Can you talk a bit about the media's role in that happening? What is failing right now in the media and how you look at this issue differently?

CARROLL BOGERT

Yes. I think it would be worthwhile — and maybe somebody's already done a PhD [doctor of philosophy] thesis on this — to look at the media coverage in, say, the 1990s, when the '94 crime bill was passed and a lot of mass incarceration really got turbocharged, and to really analyze how bad media got us into this mess and how crime scare television, in particular, drove this kind of politics because I think it did. I can't prove it to you, but I'm sure if someone did that academic study, it would bear those instincts out.

We struggle sometimes with issues of the lexicon, of what terms to use. We don't use the term *ex-con*. We were in San Quentin about a year ago, meeting with a group of inmates, and they were discussing how they wanted to be called. What term did they want to be used for them? And one of the young guys was advocating for the term *incarcerated Americans*. And we were like, “You know, that's a little bit cumbersome.” And an older guy said to him, “Dude, we call each other ‘inmate.’” So this is a constant struggle to find the right kinds of words to describe this problem and to do it honestly and not to demonize others. And I wouldn't say that's an easy issue.

ADAM FOSS

Yes.

GLENN E. MARTIN

Can I follow up on that just really quickly?

ADAM FOSS

Yes, please.

GLENN E. MARTIN

I think the transition I've seen over the past few years with respect to media is that the media has spent a lot of time reporting on crime, right? If it bleeds, it leads. But what I've seen more recently — and obviously the Marshall Project has led on this — is that now we're reporting about the criminal justice system and the juvenile justice system. Those stories weren't happening before. We weren't educating Americans about how this system operates as a human grist mill essentially. And instead what Americans were hearing is not the formerly incarcerated person who did six years in prison, earned a college degree, and now employs 20 people and runs an institution. What you hear about is the guy who got out and screwed up. And that's always going

to happen. That story is always going to be available. I find that the media now has finally realized — I don't know if there was a sort of "come to Jesus moment," if you will — but definitely there's been a turning point where the media understands the importance of writing about the system.

CARROLL BOGERT

I think that's true. I hope that's true. But I would say that this issue is coinciding with another huge crisis in our country, which is completely separate, which is the crisis of the media. So we have twin incredibly important challenges right now.

One is there is no commercial model that really works to support serious investigative journalism. It's just too expensive. You know a couple of the majors — the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* — manage to fund it, but the *Washington Post* has Jeff Bezos' money and the *New York Times* has some issues of its own. Everybody is struggling to find the wherewithal, the reporters to cover stories. And investigative stories, in particular, take months; sometimes you have reporters working on a story for years.

Then at the same time we have this crisis of legitimacy. We have a president who is calling us enemies of the people, and we have a trust issue. I think I would analogize it to the way people feel about their congressman. Like, if you ask people, "How do you feel about Congress?" almost all Americans will say, "Oh, my God. It's a nightmare. They can't get anything done." But when you ask people, "How do you feel about your individual congressman?" A lot of people will say, "Oh, I love my guy. He's great." So I think that's also often true of the media. People demonize the media: "The media are a nightmare. They're silly. They're superficial. They're terrible. But the thing I read, I really like." Having said that, we do face a real crisis of people lining up behind the media that support their point of view. *The New York Times* is doing a good job covering the criminal justice system. The Marshall Project is doing its best. But what about those local TV stations or the talk radio that's not focusing on this issue? How do we get other people to care?

ADAM FOSS

I don't want to absolve all these smart people of their responsibility in this. How important is the media when you look around... I mean, look in this room: There are like five black people here. Drive through DC and go from one neighborhood to this one, where life expectancy goes up by 10 years; drive through neighborhoods where at all hours of the day there are people in the streets who are looking for opportunity, looking for employment. And, finally, this lexicon of *low-level nonviolent offender*, which has taken on such a nice ring in the wake of the opioid crisis. How much do we hide behind the nonreporting of these issues, and how much are we just ignoring a problem that's been there forever?

GLENN E. MARTIN

I've been out of prison for 15 years, struggled with all the collateral consequences that anyone else with a criminal record would face in this country, all the way up until two and a half years ago being invited to the White House and being unable to get in as a result of a 21-year-old conviction.

ADAM FOSS

That's in the United States, right? I just want to make that clear.

GLENN E. MARTIN

It's right down the block.

ADAM FOSS

Alright.

GLENN E. MARTIN

We had a black president at the time, who cared about this issue, who invited me to the White House. So everyone gets a life sentence in our criminal justice system. That's worth saying. I don't care what you get when you stand in front of that judge; the collateral consequences, the scarlet letter of a criminal record means you actually never get away from that. At sentencing there's this ceremony that knocks people down a few notches: *You're no longer like us. You're going to go to this institution. There's going to be barbed wire and a wall, and you're going to stay there, and you're different from us.* There's no ceremony to bring people back up. We leave them there. So that's worth saying out loud.

I've been out for 15 years. It took me about that long to demystify how to get into spaces like this. The same racial bias, the same systemic inequities — all the things that we fight as folks who want to see a better world exist in the space of nonprofit/philanthropy. I mean, I run an institution with a \$3.5 million budget. Half of that is funded by one funder, which means the other half is funded by the other 27 funders. Imagine what it's like to navigate those 27 relationships to raise \$1.5 million. And yet I've worked at larger institutions, run by Ivy League-educated white colleagues who are doing amazing work but who get much different outcomes when they are engaging philanthropy. So the thing I'd like to plant in the minds of the people in this audience, whether you're working domestically or internationally, is that the people who by definition make it to your front door may not be the people who are closest to the ground.

At JustLeadershipUSA we say people who are closest to the problem are closest to the solution but farthest from power and resources. And in addition to our leadership training to invest in the leadership of people most impacted, we spend a lot of time thinking about proximity of people who have been devastated by the criminal justice system to people who have the resources, the wherewithal, the access, the power, the privilege, to help them solve those problems. How do we bridge that gap, including bringing in people like the secretary of state; Darren Walker, the head of the Ford Foundation; like all these relationships that it took me 15 years to develop? I don't want to see that happen for other leaders across the country who have great ideas about how to end mass incarceration. I hope that that's one important takeaway that this audience gets from this conversation: not only to invest in institutions that exist that are doing good work but also to figure out how you create a space for people who are closest to the ground to have the sort of access that took me more than a decade to get.

ADAM FOSS

I really appreciated what you said earlier about still dealing with your wounds because one thing that really bothers me about the conversation around criminal justice — and to be fair, the last administration perpetuated the issue for me — is that it was framed around low-level nonviolent people. And the new thing in criminal justice is segmenting the populations of low-level nonviolent to violent offenders. Given what we know in this audience about toxic stress and about young people dealing with violence, could you just briefly touch upon — we have a couple of seconds left — how we get beyond that conversation and really talk about driving down prison population?

GLENN E. MARTIN

Sure. My organization has the goal of cutting the number of people under correctional supervision in half by 2030, and people are like, “How did you get there?” Part of it is that people directly impacted felt as though the field was highly incremental, not being superbold and didn’t have the sense of urgency that the communities most impacted want to see coming from the field. And the other part was I had a 3-year-old son at the time, Joshua. And he’s going to be 18 in 2030, and he has a one-in-three chance of going to prison. I think of the wounds I carry with me, but I also know that this stuff is generational for poor communities and communities of color. So for me, I wanted to wake up every day with the urgency of not having Joshua experience the sort of trauma that I experienced years ago, that I continue to carry with me today, and for him not to have his physical being have to deal with the trauma of the experience in the criminal justice system.

I think that one of the most important things I bring to the table, as someone who is sort of a spokesman for this issue, is that I went to prison for a violent crime. I mean, I went to prison for robbery. I was sitting on a panel next to the Manhattan DA about three years ago, and he stopped me in the middle of my talk and said, “Well, you said a lot about reentry and people coming home and the supports they need and so on, but what about the victims?” And I was like, “DA Vance [Cyrus R. Vance Jr.], with all due respect, I didn’t learn how to pull a gun on someone until someone pulled a gun on me.”

ADAM FOSS

Right.

GLENN E. MARTIN

“And when I was a victim of a crime, you didn’t have a lot of interest in me. I wasn’t a deserving victim.”

ADAM FOSS

Right.

GLENN E. MARTIN

“And you know what happens when people are victimized? It turns into trauma, and that trauma calcifies, and then it manifests itself as offending behavior and then we spend \$209,000 per bed per year.”

ADAM FOSS

Right.

GLENN E. MARTIN

So until we bridge that — and I think the media is doing a pretty good job of helping make that bridge — I think we don’t get to the finish line because we continue to hold on to the narratives that we’ve been given that helped us get where we are today.

ADAM FOSS

And then when somebody does offend, we send them to a place that obviously treats that trauma and doesn’t teach them a bunch of negative bioadaptive skills to be out in the street.

CARROLL BOGERT

You caught the irony there, people.

ADAM FOSS

Yes. That was sarcasm.

I’m going to give you the last word before Q&A. Given everything that you’ve heard, what is one ask that you would have of the audience when they leave here today?

CARROLL BOGERT

Go to prison. I’m not kidding. It’s not that hard. Go to prison. It’ll be one of the experiences of your life. It’s not that hard. San Quentin’s like in Marin. Sing Sing, you can take Metro North. Wherever you live, it is possible. Go to night court. Just go look. Because I work at the Marshall Project, I read about this stuff every day. I write about it myself. When I go to a prison and I see how many black men are there, it’s just a different feeling to see it. It hits you in the gut. You can’t believe your eyes, and you won’t be the same afterward. Do that. The people in prison are invisible to you. You’ve got to go. And you can do it.

May I just say one other thing, which is these two men, well, I don’t have to tell you how great they are. You just listened to them. They have incredible...

ADAM FOSS

Yes.

CARROLL BOGERT

OK, yes. They're really great. And they have an incredible, powerful voice. And they have the stage here with you. There are many, many, many people who have no voice. And one of the definitions of being in prison — 2.3 million people behind bars right now — is they have no voice. You don't hear them. They're not in the national conversation. One of the things I like best at the Marshall Project is that we have a weekly column called "Life Inside" that's written by generally somebody who is incarcerated. Let's give them a voice. Listen to their experience. Know who they are. These are our fellow citizens. You can go. You can meet them. You can see them. You can be in prison yourself and hear what it's like.

ADAM FOSS

I was a prosecutor for almost 10 years, and in that time I met about five criminals.

Go to prison and see what we're doing, and if just the humanity of it doesn't strike you, understand that you are consumers of the criminal justice system. You are paying for everything that is happening. And if you are OK with paying for something that has a 70 percent failure rate at a cost of \$80 billion a year, I would suggest that philanthropy and anything that has to do with money might not be your thing. That's what we're doing. And 100 percent of the black men on this stage who have spent, for me, a little bit of time but for Glenn a lot of time are here in this conversation; and to Carroll's point, think about everything that you are leaving on the table, with 50 percent of that population being locked behind bars and not in the room having this conversation.

We're going to open it up for Q&A.'

TRUST, IDENTITY POLITICS AND THE MEDIA



Uzodinma Iweala, Malika Saada Saar, Abdalaziz Alhamza, and Ben Rattray

THURSDAY, APRIL 20
10:40 AM

ABDALAZIZ ALHAMZA

Co-Founder, Raqqa Is Being Slaughtered Silently

UZODINMA IWEALA

CEO and Editor-in-Chief, Ventures Africa; Author, *Beasts of No Nation*; Producer, *Waiting for Hassana* (moderator)

BEN RATTRAY

Founder and CEO, Change.org

MALIKA SAADA SAAR

Senior Counsel on Civil and Human Rights, Google

UZODINMA IWEALA

Good morning, everybody. Let's try this again. Good morning, everyone. You guys are acting like people didn't fly from all sorts of places here to talk to you today. So good-morning to us.

Today we have a wonderful panel that in many ways is a continuation of the discussion that you heard earlier. We're talking about some, again, light topics: trust, identity politics and the media. You know, small things to discuss, each one of them on their own probably a whole session, but we're going to try and really think about those things with you, for you guys up onstage today. I think what we're going to do when we're talking about identity politics, trust and the media today, it's really a discussion about *What kind of world do we want to live in? How connected do we want to be?* We have onstage a set of people who really think through these things and have created organizations or work for organizations that are really thinking this through. I'll make my introductions brief because you have their illustrious bios in your packs.

On the far left, we have Ben Rattray, the founder of Change.org, which is one of the largest social engagement sites on the web. We have Abdalaziz Alhamza, who is a cofounder of the collective Raqqa Is Being Slaughtered Silently, which reports on issues in Syria from a nonpartisan perspective. And right next to me, I have Malika Saada Saar, who is the senior counsel on civil and human rights at Google.org and also a longtime activist in the space of gender-based violence.

With that I'm going to quickly just throw out the first question in our discussion about media. You know, I think we can't really talk about this issue until we have an understanding of what you really think. What is media for right now? I'll toss that out. Why don't we start with you, Malika. What is the media for? What is the purpose right now?

MALIKA SAADA SAAR

Sure. I will answer from the perspective of the new media, the move away from what has been the traditional media. There's an Ethiopian saying that the story of the hunt is told by the hunter, and I think what new media allows for is the opportunity for the hunt to be told from the perspective of the lion. We see how we have the emergence of bloggers and digital-based movements that have come out of the experiences of people of color and people of color who have otherwise been marginalized in

the popular square conversation, individuals who but for new media their voices would not be at the center of the conversations that we're having today. I draw very significant belief and hope and inspiration in just what we've seen the past couple of years in terms of *Who is telling the story?* Who is producing and reproducing the narrative?

We're looking at not only new digital thinkers who are coming out of communities of color but also the way that Black Lives Matter started as an online letter to black folks, or how the Women's March began as a Facebook post, and really thinking through these spaces of voice and participation and inclusion and a new level of representativeness that would not otherwise be available to us if we continued to be stymied in the old paradigm of media and of who owns the narrative. So I think that, for me, what new media is and where we are today, with all of the problems that are without question there, there is also this remarkable moment that we've had where the narrative has been overturned and owned and claimed by communities who have usually been at the extreme corners of the conversation.

UZODINMA IWEALA

Really interesting, and I actually didn't think about that — that up here we're all new media people, which I think says something about the conversation, the space in which we operate.

I'll toss it over to Ben to follow up on that in terms of if it's about broadening conversations — that's something that you do. How would you speak about that?

BEN RATTRAY

We think about this in two ways. On the traditional side of things, I think traditionally people thought about media as a mechanism through which to advance transparency and truth. And what is most powerful now and what is happening — to some extent because of the mobilization that everyday citizens can enable, either through just raising their voice or actually mobilizing movements — is that many of the times that they have impact it's because the traditional media changes its own narrative informed by what other people, other citizens, are doing. We get asked this on a regular basis; the case is we're disintermediating the media. Citizens can publish effectively pieces of accountability, mobilize hundreds of thousands of others and create change. It happens. But the traditional media plays, I think, an instrumental role in, if not deferring to, at least covering and amplifying the movements that people are enabling through social media. And so I think there is actually this really important interplay between the two. It's not that the traditional media isn't important. It's rather the agenda is no longer driven by either those entities or elites who otherwise would actually just be submitting press releases and getting covered.

I think there is actually a powerful interplay. And my hope is people recognize that despite the reduction of traffic to some extent and challenges of business models, it does not at all mean that traditional media isn't powerful and important. It is. It just needs to be in a different light with a recognition that the generation of stories is now coming oftentimes from the voices of everyday people, not from the traditional leads that they used to receive information from.

UZODINMA IWEALA

So, Abdalaziz, I think Ben just stopped off on voices of everyday people, and I think that's something that you really try to do — everyday people's voices in a very extraordinary situation. How do you think about the work that you do in that context?

ABDALAZIZ ALHAMZA

Yes. First, forgive my English. You need to know that I learned it from YouTube.

I didn't study any media, or I had nothing to do with media before the Syrian revolution. I graduated in chemistry, and then suddenly the Syrian revolution started. When we ended up with the local media talking about animal documentaries when there were many demonstrations in the streets, we decided to be like the voice of the people, trying to be the media because the government prevented most media organizations from entering the country. So we started to organize ourselves, to do a Facebook page and Twitter, and we started to put out the videos and the photos of what's going on. And suddenly I saw my videos on Al Jazeera, CNN and BBC, and then we discovered that we can be reporters. We organized ourselves in groups, and we started to report the news.

We started to be a source for the information. And since we were working in ISIS territories — and it's impossible for any traditional media to go to Syria and to ISIS territories and report the news — we found ourselves the only source for information. Before we started our organization to report the news, all the media were taking the news from ISIS propaganda, ISIS sources. So later on we figured out that it's so important to do that thing — and not to be the people who were reporting about the news, to talk up on behalf of those people who are being besieged in ISIS territories because most of the people are thinking that the people who are living there are pro-ISIS and are terrorists. We try to show the truth about that — that there are 1 million civilians besieged there, and they are not ISIS. They were forced to be in this space besieged by ISIS, and they can't leave it.

Later on we started to be the main source of information or news for CNN, BBC and the international media. Then we developed ourselves to have a website, to have a newspaper, to have Facebook, Twitter and to do many reports.

UZODINMA IWEALA

Right. So essentially a ton of exploration and an unveiling as you stepped into this space. I think it's interesting that each of you has talked about this idea of unveiling, of uncovering, of broadening the space, this idea of transparency and truth and the change in perspectives.

Malika, I think you had started talking about Black Lives Matter as essentially that — as a democratic movement, as a social movement that has now essentially transformed into a media movement. I wanted to know if you could expand on that.

MALIKA SAADA SAAR

Let me pull the thread out in terms of Black Lives Matter against the backdrop of not just this new emergence that we see of digital movements but also the way

that technology has changed our contemplation of human rights abuses. I'm a human rights lawyer, and what you get trained to do as a human rights lawyer is to document. You document so that the world bears witness to the abuse done. We have these smartphones that now act as an opportunity to bear witness to human rights abuses. In this country our conversation around police misconduct five years ago was really a conversation that played out only in black and brown communities; but because of how the smartphone captures video of police brutality, that is then shared on global platforms like YouTube, and it changed our American conversation, our mainstream discourse, around police brutality.

I am fascinated how we can continue to advance human rights through the use of these technologies that force us to bear witness as a global community to violence — to be able to recognize that the more digitally connected we are, the less opportunity there is for massive human rights violations, for large-scale genocide. I think about what's happening in Syria versus the Sudan, right? Our knowledge of the horror that's happening in Syria is more present because there is the digital connection — more than what is available to us to see the human rights abuses that are happening in Sudan. I look at these ways in which the conversation of new media and the conversation of these new technologies are fundamentally also opportunities for us to think through How do we bear witness? How do we, in fact, demand that we be proximate to human rights abuses and be able to rage against them as a global community?

UZODINMA IWEALA

Abdalaziz, I wonder what you think of that in terms of the idea of bearing witness so that people rage? I mean, I guess the more direct question is then, *Why?* Right? What is your end goal in reporting what you report?

ABDALAZIZ ALHAMZA

Yes. As someone who came from the Middle East, we have these dictators, so we grew up in a community where you can't say whatever you want. We couldn't have freedom of speech. To say anything against government means that you will be sent to death. And later on the Arab Spring was meant to educate the people, so revolutions started in many countries, and it ended up in Syria. Then we started to discover many things. We had not had enough education, and we were lucky that we were not like North Korea or Cuba, where they don't have access to the internet, where they have only local TV. We were able to use Facebook, but it was controlled by the government. We were able to use Twitter, but everything was controlled, and you couldn't write or do anything against the government.

Then we started to think about other ways to use the internet. We were lucky to smuggle satellite internet and some encrypted internet tools. Then we started to report about what's going on with the revolutions, while local TV or local media are talking all the time about how everything is fine and there is no revolution in the country, and the sky is blue and birds are flying. But people are getting killed daily in the streets. So it was kind of a reaction. I didn't think that one day I will be a media man. I hate journalism or media, but I was forced to do it. I had no choice. Either watch people getting killed and watch the local TV, or do something. So our choice was to do something.

We started to report, and we didn't notice that it's a risky thing to do, especially to do it in the war zone. When we started our organization, RBSS [Raqqa Is Being Slaughtered Silently], we lost 10 members between colleagues and family members. And they were not only in Syria. It was also outside. We got three assassinations in Turkey. We discovered it's not an easy thing to do, but if we stopped doing it, the people will be taking the dictator's regime media or the extremist's media, and we didn't want that. We knew that if we do not do something for our city, for what we believe in, for the human rights, no one will come and do it for our country, and that was the main reason.

UZODINMA IWEALA

Ben, I saw you nodding your head to a bunch of things that Abdalaziz was saying. What are you in accordance with?

BEN RATTRAY

Well actually, playing upon the point that Malika mentioned, which is the discrepancy, look: As awful as things are in Syria, we know about them in a way that we don't so much in the Sudan. People who want to know can find out, but it's not nearly as transparent, not nearly as exposed. I think we talk so much and think so much right now about the concern about misinformation, about propaganda, about fake news and whatnot — which is something I think is important to discuss — but it's also important to reveal, to recognize, that these problems are not new. I mean, Black Lives Matter — one of the best; you hear a lot of talk in communities that are not communities of color: "Wow, this is new. Why is this happening now? This is so new." This isn't new. This is just pulling the veil away from what always existed before, and in many ways in much worse circumstances, and we're just now realizing it.

That's such a powerful thing that I think goes underappreciated in the otherwise chaotic nature of our news. If we look at today what people are able voice around the world versus 30, 40 years ago, the potential is so immense. And I think the project we should all be involved in is recognizing, one, that this is not changing and, two, given that, there's immense potential for good, which we need to amplify, and the bad that we see as well. The things that many of us are concerned about are things that are fundamentally addressable. I think we need to be specific and proactive about amplifying the good and addressing the bad.

UZODINMA IWEALA

Yes. I want to press you on this idea of *fake* news. I mean, I think it's a term that we've heard being tossed around almost ad nauseam at this point in time, but we're talking about trust. We're talking about institutions that are in flux, and we're talking about how you essentially preserve this trust or help rebuild or build a social fabric. I would like you to just expand on the idea of fake news — all of you, actually, up here — without getting into the trite characterizations that we've had or heard bandied all about by a few people, some who live blocks away from here.

BEN RATTRAY

I think that when people think about fake news, the problem is not the production of fake news, right? In a world in which anyone can publish, you're going to have massive production of information. There's two ways of looking at this information. One is, 99 percent of this is rubbish. The other is, 1 percent of this is incredible. And if you can ensure that distribution is disproportionate to the 1 percent of content that is trustworthy and valuable, that's all that matters. I think the biggest failure of the platforms we have — the technology platforms that spread, that propagate, that distribute this information — is actually the way in which they have been wittingly or unwittingly amplifying this content, so the production I'm not worried about. It really is that distribution.

The biggest lie in Silicon Valley is that technology is neutral. This is why we have designers, right? Designers construct technology and design things in such a way that the default is what most users use. I call out Facebook specifically here. It's actually fundamentally different from Google, in part because Google relies on a business model of relevance and verified, trusted information, whereas Facebook is focused on engagement. And really the distribution mechanics of Facebook are at large the root cause of this propagation of misinformation, so I think it's fundamentally addressable in its distribution, which is why it matters.

UZODINMA IWEALA

Abdalaziz, I want you to pick up on that because I think obviously with the recent events in Syria — with the chemical attacks, or some other people would say the faked chemical attacks — the idea of casting doubt on everything in terms of whether it's true or not and really using obfuscation to muddle the messages or the severity of conflict, as you talked about. I mean, how have you dealt with that? I think you guys have also come under attack from people who would accuse you of spreading fake news.

ABDALAZIZ ALHAMZA

Yes. You will not find fake news more than the real news about Syria because right now most of the media are focusing on Syria and what's going on there. There are many media outlets that are supporting some governments. So if I would talk about the Russian media, they were saying that there was no chemical attacks at all. And then they said there were chemicals weapons in that area, and the Russian warplanes bombed them. And when you watch the other media channels, they were saying, "They were like a chemical attack." So many people got lost on whom to believe. And the problem is that most of the people are following the international media, not the local. There were many local people, local media agencies there, who reported, who filmed everything there. The picture — the video — is proof about everything. I see many media or many newspapers talking about the news without anything to believe, but there are other media who are putting out photos, videos, many things to prove their information. As a people working, we have many enemies, so I can say that Russia, US, ISIS, the Syria regime, YPJ [Women's Protection Unit] — there are seven or eight. Everyone doesn't want us to talk about the other.

UZODINMA IWEALA

And these are everyone arrayed against you essentially, people who find you to be problematic.

ABDALAZIZ ALHAMZA

The people want us not to talk about some side, so we're talking about all the groups or all the sides that are committing human rights violations. The American warplanes are killing civilians, the Russians the same as well and the Syrian regime, ISIS. So when we talk about one of them, some people are saying, "Ah, you are spies for US," when we were talking about Russia. When we were talking about Russia, they are saying, "You are pro-regime." And when we talk about Assad, "Ah, you are pro-ISIS." So we were getting all this stuff. And sometimes it started to be threats. Many of my colleagues and I were getting threats from all these sides all the time. And it was really threats. We had many assassinations. So sometimes talking about one side, it even affects the funds if you're getting funds. And that was one reason why we stopped getting funds because we were talking about all the sides. So fake news affected everyone. And the fund had a main rule to direct people to talk about that side. So many funders are saying, "OK, we are going to fund you, but don't talk about US" or "Don't talk about Russia." So it's also a way to create more fake news.

UZODINMA IWEALA

Right. I think that brings us to an interesting point, which is the role essentially of capital in this space, in the media space. We were chatting about this earlier, that capital — essentially money — is an amoral thing, whereas what you guys are trying to do is connected very closely to morality. And we have folks onstage to pick on you a little bit, Malika; you are here representing Google, which is a \$570 billion company. You work on advocacy for them on social issues, but Google makes money off of media. Ben, you've raised considerable amounts of money for your platform. I think the last I saw was about \$25 million. So it's like money is really important, but money doesn't necessarily care about truth. Money cares about money. So how do you deal with that in this space?

MALIKA SAADA SAAR

You know, I'm not sure I would have taken this position at Google — because I did not become a human rights lawyer to work for Google — but I heard this very powerful speech that Paul Polman, the CEO of Unilever, gave around human rights and corporations. He talked about how we can push and force and demand that corporations promote, adhere and advance human rights in ways that we don't see our governments doing. I think that's an especially interesting conversation right now as we see so many of our governments turning toward these nationalistic tendencies. So what is the role of a Google in that context?

I'm very proud of the decision that Google made to go up against the executive order on refugees and immigrants. I'm proud of the fact that we have been very active in legally opposing the bathroom bills in North Carolina. And I'm very proud of the work that we've done in terms of not just funding but having a presence around racial justice. I see my role at Google as a human rights lawyer to really push for and think

through these different platforms that we have at our disposal, to be able to reveal, to be able to connect each other around human rights abuses.

At Google every day we're talking about the issue of mass incarceration. One of our vice presidents has said, "Google's all about disruption and disruption for good. And if anything needs to be disrupted, it's mass incarceration." I've had the honor and privilege of thinking through *How do we use these different platforms at our disposal to tell the stories of the human costs of mass incarceration?* and *How do those stories connect us, scale the prison walls, scale the divides between us, to be able to give empathy and urgency to addressing and disrupting mass incarceration?* I don't think that any of the spaces — whether it's funding or government or the private sector — are pure, but I have a moral obligation as a human rights lawyer to think through *How do we use these resources and these new technologies to ensure that people are not left behind and that, in the presence of so much wealth and access and opportunity, we are ensuring that that is extended to those who are in the presence of human rights abuses every day?*

BEN RATTRAY

Yes. So just as a quick context, because oftentimes people don't know, Change.org has a B Corporation, a technology platform enabling people to start movements around the world. And the Change.org Foundation allows people basically to amplify those movements. We have activists around the world to support everyday citizens who are running those campaigns. We made this big decision a number of years ago not to take traditional Silicon Valley money from venture capital firms. The investors are Bill Gates, Pierre Omidyar from eBay and Reid Hoffman from LinkedIn; the Gates Foundation is also a funder of our foundation. And the reason that was important is that capital is a sort of incentive. I mean, we were worried about giving ourselves a perverse incentive for the kind of profit maximization that we think would undermine our ability to truly serve the public in the best way possible.

And it's not just capital; it's also a business model. When we started we had a relatively ad-based business model that gave us, just like any other media, what I think to be perverse incentives to maximize traffic and clicks. And that was actually a problem, so we recently shifted over to a membership-based model. It's a subscription-based model where people can pay to be members of Change.org, and they get exclusive access to content around different campaigns that they care about. And this is, I think, one of the most important shifts we need to see in media in general. Insofar as media is driven almost entirely by page views, its business model is predicated upon that. Facebook in particular is focused on the most provocative, sensationalized, most commented-upon content, which is surfaced in Facebook's algorithm based on engagement. I mean, that is just going to result in the kind of things we see. It's all about incentives. I think this is something we need to really, really think about when we create an ecosystem. Instead of pointing it out to any individual media organization and critiquing it for its actions, we need to look systemically at the incentives that they face, as well as what these large platforms face.

UZODINMA IWEALA

Right. Right.

Abdalaziz, you talked about how you position on some of these platforms, right? How are you doing that in terms of getting attention for the headlines that you put out? How are you getting attention? How are you fighting within this space for more attention in terms of what you're broadcasting, the stories that you're putting out in a space where often sensationalism wins, where bending the truth or shifting it just a little bit can help you get multiple page views or more accessibility or more likes?

ABDALAZIZ ALHAMZA

Yes. For us the main tools to do our work are Facebook, Twitter — the social networks; they were a main tool to do revolutions in the Middle East and North Africa. So without Facebook or Twitter, I can say that we would not be able to have revolutions because all of that started with a Facebook page — uploading videos, photos, about what's going on since we had no independent media in the country. So we do our work through Facebook and Twitter.

We faced many problems to use these platforms or to engage people through these platforms. First, Facebook closed our page three times because they thought that we are extremists. Twitter also did it once. My personal account got closed three, four times, and I was, "I swear I'm not ISIS." And it was so hard to get it back. But convincing YouTube, Facebook, Twitter and the social networks that we are not ISIS took some time, but then it was the easiest way.

Right now the people don't go to the website to read a long article. They want to break fast the news. And there is this new technology — the short videos, like one-minute videos — talking about an issue or letting you understand something in one minute because the people right now are busy most of the time, and they are not interested in watching 10- or 20-minute videos. So we used all of this as a way to engage or to have more. And when we made a comparison between posted videos, the short videos get more viewers; many people interact with it. Make one short video, and it gets sometimes half a million views, which is so good for us as a small organization. We are not as big as Google or Change.org, for sure, but we were able, through those platforms, to make a change.

Later on through these things, the media started to contact us and to do interviews. They were picking up the news from Facebook and Twitter, and they put us as a source and it started to be easier for the professional journalists. They can't go there. They don't have the sources there, so they are using the local organizations like us to get the news. Daily when I Googled our name, I found that more than 100 pages, websites, newspapers and other media are mentioning or talking about the news they were getting from us. So it was the easy way. Instead of contacting all these media platforms or organizations, we just threw it on Facebook and Twitter and let them do it.

UZODINMA IWEALA

Just to put it out there. Go ahead, Malika.

MALIKA SAADA SAAR

Can I go back to the fake news issue?

UZODINMA IWEALA

Yes, you can.

MALIKA SAADA SAAR

Is that OK?

UZODINMA IWEALA

Yes, please.

MALIKA SAADA SAAR

I think it's an issue that we have to struggle with. I think it's challenging. I think it reveals values and policy and algorithms in a very fundamental way, a very critical way that we have to take on every day.

I also want to talk about it in the context of human rights violations though. Part of this happened in the beginning of the uprising in Syria, where there were questions of when supposed human rights abuses happened and whether those abuses could be verified. And that becomes so critical when we talk about war crimes, but just in general, in the general conversation around whether human rights abuse played out. We have now been able to address that from the place of technology. There's this amazing app called eWitness, where the human rights violation that can be captured on a smartphone is also connected to a GPS [global positioning system] locator, right? So where it happens is concretized, is captured, and the time that it happened is captured. So now we have an opportunity to be able to surmount claims of whether or not that really was a human rights abuse that happened in Syria in 2012. And then we can use that video when hopefully there's an opportunity to bring war crimes charges against Assad. Can you imagine if we had that app, that technology, in Bosnia or Rwanda?

I know that we're having this very difficult question around fake news — that we have to take it on and be very adherent in how we engage it and very open and transparent. And I think it's also important to pull out the contours of the conversation around fakeness in terms of human rights and what we have been able to accomplish in the tech community to be able to verify, and then the power of using that verified video to hopefully bring war crimes against certain perpetrators.

UZODINMA IWEALA

I want to pick up on what you said about this idea of both reporting but also creating the news, which is to a certain extent what I think you were talking about, right? New media organizations are not just assemblers of information. They are creators of stories that then drive stories in other forms of media. And I think what you're saying about that app sort of points to that, right? Assembling and then also putting out and verification on the spot.

I think, Ben, you guys have this same impact as well, where I guess we're talking about the petition sort of model that you have where anyone can get on and start a petition. And you see that some of these petitions can be about anything, right? They both

are reactions to what you see in the news — for example, if you're talking about the immigration bans that were recently announced — but they also then drive the news.

BEN RATTRAY

Yes. We see both. I think right now it's about 25,000 campaigns get launched every month. So basically for every major news story there are multiple campaigns that get launched in immediate reaction to it to mobilize people to take constructive action in response. I think the less appreciated component is the one you just mentioned on construction, which is, as we talked before, about surfacing issues that otherwise aren't in the public discourse.

One of my favorite examples — I mean, it's sort of a challenging topic — is of this young woman, Amanda Nguyen, who is actually living in DC now, when she was at Harvard she had been assaulted. And in the process of the prosecution, her rape kit had been thrown away. She finds out that this happens quite often across America. And there's no federal regulation around this at all. And it's, again, not talked about by anybody in the national conversation. So she starts a campaign on the site. It goes viral. More than 100,000 people join. She then uses that campaign to raise \$20,000 through Change.org to fly a bunch of young women to meet with their members of Congress. She gets 11 US senators to support the campaign, endorse it formally, and ends up doing a press conference with Chuck Grassley. It ends up getting unanimously passed in the House and the Senate — a sexual assault bill of rights — in August; it was signed by President Obama on the same day the Access Hollywood tapes were revealed, during October, I believe. Now she's doing this incredible thing, where she's literally launching campaigns in 50 states with other young women to do state-based laws in a distributed, sort of movement-like fashion.

Now, again, that wasn't on anyone's agenda. That wouldn't have been otherwise covered by the media. It wasn't in response to anything but a personal injustice that was actually revealed to be systemic and undercovered that she was able to surface. And we see this all the time. The Dakota Access Pipeline: That wasn't something that lots of people were talking about. I mean, a bunch of young 13-year-old kids from the Sioux tribe literally started a campaign on Change.org more than a year ago, mobilized 500,000 people to join and used that as effectively a messaging list to mobilize people to go do protests in DC to raise money for protests back at home, and these are amplified by the media. The media plays a crucial secondary role, but the primary actors increasingly are, as we talked earlier on, the everyday citizens who are raising voices on issues otherwise unaddressed.

UZODINMA IWEALA

With that in mind, I wanted to go back to something, Malika, that you had said earlier about who gets attention and why they get attention. You mentioned that Syria is getting a lot of attention but South Sudan isn't, right? For example, Northern Nigeria at a certain point in time was getting some attention, but it isn't anymore. And where you see yourself, I mean, where you sit at this really large organization, how do you then think about deploying resources in the support? I guess the human rights, civil rights, are specifically where you work, but in terms of moving those stories, moving that discussion and ultimately moving our understanding of what the truth is in these situations out farther into the public space?

MALIKA SAADA SAAR

When I think about South Sudan, I think about this issue of how critical it is to be digitally connected because that is a human rights issue, right? In conversations around digital access or emerging markets, for me, those conversations are human rights conversations. Because we are in a space now where, as we have always been, almost every act of abuse, of violence, of rape happens in isolation and silence. And what we have now is an opportunity through new technologies to surmount the silence, to disrupt the isolation. If the 20th century has been a story of walls and borders and divides, I think so much of the 21st century will be a new narrative of how we are surmounting and disrupting walls and barriers and divides, which also explains some of the nationalistic backlash that we see. And so in recognition of that, of how technologies surmount these walls that allow abuses to be maintained and continued, I think it's absolutely critical that as Google, as Silicon Valley, we understand that these conversations we're having right now around digital access and who has digital access, and the emerging markets and where the emerging markets are and how we invest in those emerging markets, are not simply conversations around business but are fundamentally women's rights conversations and human rights conversations.

UZODINMA IWEALA

And you bring it back to something, Abdalaziz, that you touched on in terms of access, and access is directly related to funding. Funding can shift, can increase or dry up, depending to people's sentiments. We are in a room of people who either have to play that game in terms of getting funding or who are funders themselves. You mentioned a little bit about people saying, "You are pro-regime" or "You're pro-American" and therefore "You're telling a lie" or "You're not telling the truth about this; therefore we're going to pull funding" or "We like what you did, so we're going to give you more funding." How do you have those conversations with people in terms of educating people about the importance of letting you be as you report what you see?

ABDALAZIZ ALHAMZA

It's an important issue in Syria, especially with the Syrian media, the local media. Right now more than one side is fighting in Syria, and we started to have something called the citizen journalism, or citizen media, and we started from nothing to build this organization. We knew that we were going to have conversations with the funders; especially in the beginning, they were saying, "OK. We're going to fund you, but you need to do one, two, three." And that will affect the news. And that will lead to fake news. So if there was a crime committed by that side, many organizations are not talking about it because the funder doesn't want that. So it affected many groups. It affected the news.

Right now the Syrian situation is completely different from the others. What helped us was that we were able to have access to the internet, so we started to have more than one source of information. We were talking about Eritrea in Africa. When we were talking about Cuba and North Korea, the people there don't have access to the internet, so they were not able to do something and they are stuck in fake news all the time. In Syria we were able to have this access, but it was not that easy. It's not that cheap. To have satellite internet costs thousands of dollars monthly. And

no one can have this thing, so you need to be funded to get it; you have to have conversations with some people, saying, "You are pro-this side" because of some kind of information.

We have a problem in Syria and outside. It's called education. Many people don't have education about many issues, and they're trying to create their own perspective about all the issues. So if they are Russian, they will watch the Russian TV and they will have perspective from Russian TV or reports.

I met many Russian people here in the US. In February I was at Sundance [Film Festival] to screen our documentary. I met a Russian movie director, and he was saying, "You are a liar. Russia is fighting extremism."

I told him, "They are bombing my city. They killed two of my relatives. That happened. I don't want to lie." And I said, "I can give you their names, their photos and all those things."

And he said, "No. They are only bombing ISIS."

I told him, "The first Russian airstrike was in an area where ISIS, Al Qaeda and all the extremist group were far away, a hundred kilometers, and it killed only civilians. So there are the videos — everything."

He's saying, "No. No. No. The extremists bombed them."

I told him, "ISIS doesn't have warplanes yet."

So he said, "Ah, really?"

So I was talking with someone who was thinking that ISIS has warplanes. So to have those people, they have or they create their information from some specific sources. And later on to jump, "Ah, you're pro-American because you're fighting ISIS." Fighting ISIS doesn't mean that you're pro-America. All those conversations are coming in at the same time. And especially when you are reporting in an area where there are several different sides, you will find all those rumors or these people started saying bad things about you, and you need to convince every one of them. Later on I found it so hard to convince everyone. Everyone was saying, "Ah, you are pro-America." "Look, this was against America." "You're pro-Russia." "Oh, look, this was against Russia, pro that side." So some people are focusing on one post. When we were talking about ISIS, "Ah, you are heroes." When we were talking about the Americans, "Ah, you are liars."

UZODINMA IWEALA

Right.

Ben, sorry. You wanted to...

BEN RATTRAY

I wanted to talk a little bit about the funding side because I think that, in the current context, relatively small amounts of funding have incredible leverage given what we're talking about. One, in the work that you're doing — I mean, we talk a lot about the budgets of large media organizations. You have half a dozen people full-time in many of these contexts. It has incredible impact, not just in what they do but the amplification of their work in large part because of other media entities.

So just as a quick example, this woman, Amanda Nguyen, who is launching this national movement now, literally, and she's trying to raise like \$200,000. She really is the person who's driving in the forefront of the fight against sexual assault across America. Another young woman started a campaign on the site around female genital mutilation [FGM], named Jaha [Dukureh]. This incredible woman ended up actually leading a national movement in the US. And then in her home country, Gambia, she convinced the president of Gambia to announce a ban on FGM. She was named one of Time's 100 most influential people in the world. She started a Change.org petition two and a half years ago, had no experience. She's looking to raise a few hundred thousand dollars to accelerate that incredibly powerful movement. And then globally, we have a team in Turkey, for example — three people. But they have 5 million people taking action on a regular basis around issues in government: local, national and regional. So I think that with relatively small amounts of money with these distributed individuals or new emerging groups, there is incredible amplifying potential power with a really small amount of support.

UZODINMA IWEALA

With that I'm going to turn it to you out there in the audience.



Global Philanthropy Forum

The Global Philanthropy Forum is a project of World Affairs.

312 Sutter Street, Suite 200
San Francisco, CA 94108
415.293.4600

www.philanthropyforum.org

