

RELEASE IN PART
B6

From: Anne-Marie Slaughter [redacted]
Sent: Friday, December 2, 2011 2:07 PM
To: H
Cc: Abedin, Huma; Cheryl Mills; Jacob J Sullivan (SullivanJJ@state.gov)
Subject: plane reading
Attachments: CSIS_Seizing the Opportunity_Executive Summary.pdf

B6

What an incredible trip. I'm sure you now have nothing to do but read :-), so here are two of my most recent columns, both of which have gotten a lot of play. The first is on the concept of collaborative power and the second is on public private partnerships. I'm also attaching the executive summary of the CSIS study on PPPs, which cites you and the Global Clean Cookstove Alliance as a model of how it should be done and notes your personal leadership.

All best,
 AM

A New Theory for the Foreign Policy Frontier: Collaborative Power

By Anne-Marie Slaughter
 Nov 30 2011, 9:42 AM ET 8

The power of many can accomplish more than any one can do alone -- and that distinction is different than the traditional classification of hard and soft power



Protesters wave Egyptian flags in Tahrir Square / AP



Shortly after Egyptian security forces detained well-known Egyptian-American blogger and columnist Mona Eltahawy last Wednesday night in the Egyptian Interior Ministry in Cairo, she managed to tweet five chilling words to her more than 60,000 followers: "beaten arrested in Interior Ministry." Her tweet went out at 8:44 pm Eastern Standard Time (3:44 am in Cairo). At 9:05 pm, I got a direct message on Twitter from the NPR strategist Andy Carvin, who covers English-language social media from Arab protests, telling me of Mona's tweet. After responding to him, I immediately sent an email to my former colleagues at the State Department. Within another hour, I'd heard back and was able to tweet that the U.S. Embassy in Cairo was on the case. Nick Kristof, citing his own contacts at the State Department,, sent out a similar message to his million-plus followers. By then, #FreeMona, a hashtag Carvin had started to help track the disparate efforts to help Mona, was already trending worldwide on Twitter. A few hours later, Mona was free, although with two broken bones and a traumatic story of sexual assault. Maged Butter, an Egyptian blogger who had been arrested with Eltahawy, was also released.

A debate about the role of Twitter and whether or not it helped win Mona's release has already been joined by Andrew Rasiej and Evgeny Morozov. The ever-perceptive and thoughtful Zeynep Tufekci wrote a long post reflecting on the nature of this intervention. Adrija Bose also wrote on the episode at FirstPost, as did Alix Dunn at the Engine Room. I will not join that debate directly here, but the incident provides the perfect hook for a piece that I have been wanting to write for a while about the nature of power on the foreign policy frontier.

This past fall, I gave the inaugural Joseph S. Nye lecture at Princeton. Nye is perhaps the world's pre-eminent theorist of power; he coined the term "soft power" for the power of attraction versus "hard power," the power of coercion. (Full disclosure: he's also a mentor and an old friend.) I used the lecture to contrast what I then called bottom-up power to what I argued was Nye's concept of top-down power. But, on reflection, I think "collaborative power" is a better and more accurate term for the phenomenon I am trying to capture.

Nye distinguishes between "resource power" -- resources that can produce outcomes, such as money, territory, etc -- and "relational power," which he defines as "the capacity to do things and in social situations to affect others to get the outcomes we want." Borrowing from various different power theorists and adapting their concepts of power to international relations, Nye then identifies three distinct "faces" of relational power. First is "commanding change": getting people or groups to do things they don't want to do. Second is "controlling agendas": the bureaucrat's favorite ploy of framing "agendas for action that make others' preferences seem irrelevant or out of bounds." And third is "shaping preferences": using "ideas, beliefs, and culture to shape basic beliefs, perceptions and preferences." This is hardly the place to engage Gramsci, Foucault, Giddens, and the many others who have examined the deep social and political structures of power. So, for present purposes, think of how soft power -- the attractive draw of Hollywood movies, American rock music, and the Declaration of Independence -- have shaped preferences around the world.

As with all of Nye's work, this analytical framework is elegant, compelling, and seemingly comprehensive. But where does the power that toppled Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak fit in? The power, evident in ongoing protests despite months of bloodshed, that will not be silenced or stopped in Syria? The power that brought NATO to use force to protect Libyan civilians? Or the power that freed Mona Eltahawy?

One familiar distinction is "power with" versus "power over." The power that interests Nye is the power that a person, group, or institution exercises over other people, groups, or institutions, getting them to do something they would not have done on their own. "Power with," on the other hand, is the power of multiple actors to get something done collaboratively. (I first heard this distinction from Harvard Law Professor Lani Guinier, but have since seen it in many places.) That certainly seems to capture the phenomenon we are witnessing in so many different places -- the networked, horizontal surge and sustained application of collective will and resources.

I will call it collaborative power and define it as the power of many to do together what no one can do alone. Consider the power of water. Each drop is harmless; enough drops together create a tsunami that can level a landscape.

Collaborative power can take many forms. The first is mobilization; to exercise collaborative power through not a command but a call to action. The second form is connection. In contrast to the relational power method of narrowing and controlling a specific set of choices, collaborative power is exercised by broadening access to the circle of power and connecting as many people to one another and to a common purpose as possible. A third form (many more dimensions of collaborative power will likely emerge) is adaptation. Instead of seeking to structure the preferences of others, those who would exercise collaborative power must be demonstrably willing to shift their own views enough to enter into meaningful dialogue with others. The first step toward persuading others is often an evident and sincere willingness to be persuaded yourself.

RELATIONAL POWER	COLLABORATIVE POWER
Command	Mobilize
Control Agendas	Connect
Shape Preferences of Others	Adapt One's Own Preferences

But here's the most important difference between these two kinds of power. Relational power is held by an individual, group, or institution in relation to, as the name suggests, another individual, group, or institution. Collaborative power,

on the other hand, is not held by any one person or in any one place. It is an emergent phenomenon -- the property of a complex set of interconnections. Leaders can learn to unlock it and guide it, but they do not possess it.

Many terrific thinkers in fields from computer science to business management and entrepreneurship to neurobiology and complexity theory are working on similar ideas. Through my Twitter feed, I have gotten many great links to thoughtful posts and articles making similar points to those above. It's time we apply these concepts and insights to foreign policy, both analyzing what we see and prescribing policy options -- much as the informal #FreeMona team did during Mona Eltahawy's detention in Cairo. Nothing about collaborative power suggests that relational power -- both hard and soft -- doesn't exist or isn't important. But it's only part of the story. Remember, drop by drop, water will wear away or wash away stone, sometimes far more quickly than we can imagine.

Slaughter: The future of foreign policy is public-private partnerships

Editor's Note: Anne-Marie Slaughter is the Bert G. Kerstetter '66 University Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University. From 2009 to 2011, she was the Director of Policy Planning at the U.S. State Department. Follow her on Twitter at [slaughteram](#).

By Anne-Marie Slaughter – Special to CNN

On Black Friday, the apotheosis of consumerism and the celebration of private enterprise (entrepreneurial on-line marketers are targeting in-line consumers with ads sent to their cell phones while they wait to purchase goods in physical stores), it's a good time to consider the power of harnessing private incentives to public goals.



Newt Gingrich made this point in the CNN national security debate for Republican presidential candidates on Tuesday night, arguing about how he would shave \$500 billion out of the federal budget. "There are lots of things you can do," he said, including giving foreign aid "in a way that we actually help people even more effectively and at a much lower cost by having public/private partnerships."

Gingrich was unwittingly signing on to the Obama mantra. The Obama National Security Strategy mentions public-private partnerships over 30 times. Over the past 3 years both the White House and the State Department have set up offices to reach out to the private sector.

Notable successes include the [Global Clean Cookstove Alliance](#), which brings together over 175 government agencies, corporations, NGOs and foundations around the world to secure the adoption of 100 million clean cookstoves by 2020, thereby reducing carbon emission, improving the health of tens of millions of families and increasing the security of millions of women.

Another notable initiative has been the [Partnership for a New Beginning \(PNB\)](#), a partnership created after President Obama's speech in Cairo between the State Department, the Aspen Institute, and scores of corporations, foundations, and universities in the U.S., Algeria, Egypt, Indonesia, Morocco, Pakistan, the Palestinian Territories, Tunisia and Turkey. In barely over a year, PNB has supported over 70 projects connected with science and technology, economic opportunity, and education. Its 2011 status report [can be found here](#).

The political argument for PPPs is that they stretch scarce government resources and ensure that they leverage other contributions of money, expertise and other in-kind resources. The initial emphasis on PPPs came from the Reinventing Government initiative under the Clinton administration, but the George W. Bush administration was also enthusiastic.

Equally important is the effectiveness argument: These alliances are better at taking advantage of local knowledge in developing countries and at pooling and learning from the experience of many diverse actors. And the energy, innovation and capacity in the private sector, both corporate and civic, are a vital foreign policy resource.

Finally, the kinds of global problems we face – proliferation of nuclear weapons, global terrorist and criminal networks, climate change, global pandemics, fragile states, resource scarcity (water, oil, minerals), civil conflict – cannot be solved by governments alone, much less governments increasingly strapped for funds.

Governments will be in the business of negotiating agreements, resolving crises and solving problems with one another for a long time to come, but top-down efforts cannot stimulate the widespread behavioral change that is required to address social and economic challenges. Those changes are most effectively motivated from the bottom up, through many different initiatives that come from individuals determined to improve their health, water and energy usage, education, security, etc. Former Army Colonel Richard Holshek has written persuasively on this score.

For the moment, government rhetoric on PPPs still exceeds the reality. A particular problem is that the federal government is still badly set up to engage corporations. A recent Center for Strategic and International Studies report on PPPs points out a number of operational problems due to government rules and multiple instances when the right government hand did not know what the left was doing. One consumer products company reports being approached by six different parts of the government, including parts of the same agency, to join in the same partnership.

Still, PPPs are going to be a very useful tool in the foreign policy toolbox. Better still, they are an area in which the U.S. is very well placed to lead. As John Donahue and Richard Zeckhauser argue in a recent National Journal article, "From de Tocqueville's day to the present, Americans' knack for cobbling together pragmatic alliances has often served to offset our weak suit of formal government."

At a time when China is preaching the virtues and reaping many of the benefits of statism in its investment and assistance programs around the world, the U.S. can model a far more pluralist approach that involves parts of the state working together with a wide range of social actors. It is a model that simultaneously promotes collective effort and self-reliance.

Focusing on PPPs puts the entire Republican national security debate in a different light. The tools that most of the candidates focused on were both governmental and coercive: Sanctions or bombs for Iran; drones for terrorists; troops in or out of Iraq and Afghanistan; withholding aid for feckless allies like Pakistan. Once again, national security is simply a toughness test. Odd that a party so fixated on cutting back government and building up private enterprise and social capital would leave their principles at the water's edge.

The views expressed in this article are solely those of Anne-Marie Slaughter.