TASK FORCE SERIES

Engaging Religious Communities Abroad:
A New Imperative for U.S. Foreign Policy

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON RELIGION AND THE MAKING OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

R. Scott Appleby and Richard Cizik, *Cochairs*
Thomas Wright, *Project Director*

SPONSORED BY

THE CHICAGO COUNCIL
ON GLOBAL AFFAIRS

TASK FORCE SERIES

Engaging Religious Communities Abroad:

A New Imperative for U.S. Foreign Policy

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON RELIGION AND THE MAKING OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

R. Scott Appleby and Richard Cizik, *Cochairs*

Thomas Wright, *Project Director*

SPONSORED BY

THE CHICAGO COUNCIL
ON GLOBAL AFFAIRS

The Chicago Council on Global Affairs is a leading independent, nonpartisan organization committed to influencing the discourse on global issues through contributions to opinion and policy formation, leadership dialogue, and public learning.

The Chicago Council provides members, specialized groups, and the general public with a forum for the consideration of significant international issues and their bearing on American foreign policy. In addition to remaining the premier platform in the Midwest for international leaders in foreign policy, The Chicago Council strives to take the lead in gaining recognition for Chicago as an international business center for the corporate community and to broaden and deepen The Chicago Council's role in the community.

THE CHICAGO COUNCIL TAKES NO INSTITUTIONAL POSITION ON POLICY ISSUES AND HAS NO AFFILIATION WITH THE U.S. GOVERNMENT. ALL STATEMENTS OF FACT AND EXPRESSIONS OF OPINION CONTAINED IN THIS REPORT ARE THE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE TASK FORCE AND ITS MEMBERS AND MAY NOT REFLECT THE VIEWS OF THEIR RESPECTIVE ORGANIZATIONS OR THE PROJECT FUNDERS. WHILE THE TASK FORCE IS SOLELY RESPONSIBLE FOR ITS REPORT, INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS OF THE TASK FORCE MAY NOT AGREE WITH THE REPORT IN ITS ENTIRETY.

The Chicago Council will sponsor an independent task force when (1) an issue of current and critical importance to U.S. foreign policy arises and (2) it seems that a group diverse in backgrounds and perspectives may, nonetheless, be able to reach a meaningful consensus on a set of policy-based recommendations through private and nonpartisan deliberations. This Task Force met five times to ensure the relevance of its work.

Upon reaching a conclusion, a report is issued, and The Chicago Council publishes its text and posts it on The Chicago Council Web site.

All task force reports "benchmark" their findings against current administration policy in order to make explicit areas of agreement and disagreement. The task force is solely responsible for its report. The Chicago Council takes no institutional position.

For further information about The Chicago Council or this Task Force, please write to The Chicago Council on Global Affairs, 332 South Michigan Avenue, Suite 1100, Chicago, IL, 60604. Visit the Chicago Council's Web site at www.thechicagocouncil.org.

© 2010 by The Chicago Council on Global Affairs

All rights reserved.

Printed in the United States of America

This report may not be reproduced in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that copying permitted by sections 107 and 108 of the U.S. Copyright Law and excerpts by reviewers for the public press), without written permission from the publisher. For information, write to The Chicago Council on Global Affairs, 332 South Michigan Avenue, Suite 1100, Chicago, IL, 60604.

Task Force Cochairs

R. Scott Appleby
Director, Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies
University of Notre Dame

Richard Cizik
President
New Evangelical Partnership for the Common Good

Task Force Members

Michael Barnett
Harold Stassen Chair of International Relations, Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs
University of Minnesota

Henry Bienen
President Emeritus
Northwestern University

José Casanova
Professor of Sociology and Senior Fellow, Berkley Center for Religion, Peace, & World Affairs
Georgetown University

Bob Edgar
President and Chief Executive Officer
Common Cause

Virgil Elizondo
Professor of Pastoral and Hispanic Theology and Fellow, Institute for Latino Studies and Kellogg Institute
University of Notre Dame

Jean Bethke Elshtain
Laura Spelman Rockefeller Professor of Social and Political Ethics
The University of Chicago Divinity School

Thomas F. Farr
Visiting Associate Professor and Senior Fellow, Berkley Center for Religion, Peace, & World Affairs
Georgetown University

Frederick Mark Gedicks
Guy Anderson Chair and Professor of Law
Brigham Young University

Kent Greenawalt
University Professor
Columbia Law School

Ken Hackett
President
Catholic Relief Services

William Inboden
Senior Vice President
Legatum Institute

Martin Indyk
Vice President and Director of Foreign Policy
The Brookings Institution

Douglas Johnston
President
International Center for Religion and Diplomacy

Katherine Marshall
Senior Fellow and Visiting Professor, Berkley Center for Religion, Peace, & World Affairs
Georgetown University

Radwan A. Masmoudi
President
Center for the Study of Islam and Democracy

Ruth Messinger
Executive Director
American Jewish World Service

Abner J. Mikva
Schwartz Lecturer Emeritus and Former Senior Director, Mandel Legal Aid Clinic
The University of Chicago Law School

Dalia Mogahed
Senior Analyst and Executive Director
Gallup Center for Muslim Studies

Emile Nakhleh
Independent Consultant

David Neff
Editor-in-Chief and Editorial Vice President
Christianity Today International

Eboo Patel
Founder and Executive Director
Interfaith Youth Core

Edward Perkins
William J. Crowe Chair in Geopolitics, Emeritus
University of Oklahoma

Gerard Powers
Director of Catholic Peacebuilding Studies, Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies
University of Notre Dame

Asifa Quraishi
Assistant Professor of Law
University of Wisconsin Law School

George Rupp
President and Chief Executive Officer
International Rescue Committee

Rabbi David Saperstein
Director
Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism

Father Donald Senior
President
Catholic Theological Union

Timothy Samuel Shah
Senior Research Scholar, Institute on Culture, Religion, and World Affairs, Boston University
Joseph R. Crapa Fellow, U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom

Peter Steinfels
Codirector
Center on Religion and Culture, Fordham University

Karin von Hippel
Codirector, Post-Conflict Reconstruction Project and Senior Fellow, International Security Program
Center for Strategic and International Studies

Table of Contents

Foreword

There are times in foreign policy when the gap between what the United States can do and what it needs to do suddenly comes into focus. The advent of the nuclear age ushered in expertise on deterrence. The attacks of September 11 led to a more rigorous and systematic understanding of terrorist networks and how they operate. But there are also occasions where the capabilities gap is real, but lingers for some time, often at a great cost. The role of nationalism and decolonization was not widely understood in the United States until after the Vietnam War, despite considerable supporting evidence in the 1950s. Such is the case with religion today.

Religion has been rapidly increasing as a factor in world affairs, for good and for ill, for the past two decades. Yet the U.S. government still tends to view it primarily through the lens of counterterrorism policy. The success of American diplomacy in the next decade will not simply be measured by government-to-government contacts, but also by its ability to connect with the hundreds of millions of people throughout the world whose identity is defined by religion. Religious communities are central players in the counterinsurgency war in Afghanistan, development assistance, the promotion of human rights, stewardship of the environment, and the pursuit of peace in troubled parts of the world, but the United States lacks the capacity and framework to engage them.

President Obama's historic speech in Cairo on June 4, 2009, with its promise to engage with Muslim communities, was an important step in the right direction. Now, we must develop a strategy to engage religious communities of all faiths when relevant to pressing foreign policy challenges and build the institutional capacity to support it.

The Task Force

The Chicago Council on Global Affairs convened the Task Force on Religion and the Making of U.S. Foreign Policy to advance understanding of the role of religion in world affairs and to develop a framework to appropriately integrate religion into U.S. foreign policy. The Task Force began its work in September 2008 and held five meetings in Chicago and Washington, D.C.

During the Task Force meetings, outside experts and participating Task Force members engaged in conversations about how to best use all the tools available to more successfully engage religion inter-

nationally. Topics covered included the American religious landscape; secularist assumptions in U.S. foreign policy; cases in which a lack of religious appreciation caused the United States to stumble; the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan; religious literacy; and legal constraints (perceived and actual) that may inhibit developing the best responses.

The Task Force has been led by two cochairs: R. Scott Appleby, John M. Regan Jr. Director of the Kroc Institute and professor of history at the University of Notre Dame, and Richard Cizik, president of the New Evangelical Partnership for the Common Good, Open Society Fellow, and senior fellow at the United Nations Foundation. The Task Force cochairs provided leadership and direction throughout the year-long process of meetings, conference calls, working groups, and report preparation and played critical roles in shaping the overall Task Force findings and recommendations. The Task Force comprised thirty-two high-level and influential policymakers, academics, constitutional lawyers, religious leaders, and members of the media. Abner J. Mikva, Schwartz Lecturer emeritus at the University of Chicago Law School, former White House counsel, former chief judge on the United States Court of Appeals, and former member of the U.S. Congress, served as the Task Force's third cochair throughout the first year of the project. Judge Mikva had to step down from his leadership role in the Task Force due to health reasons, but continued to follow the progress of the development of the final report and has endorsed the report as a signing member.

Acknowledgments

The Chicago Council would first like to thank the Task Force cochairs, Scott Appleby and Richard Cizik, for their leadership and dedication throughout the project. The issues surrounding religion and policymaking are complex and require a thoughtful and nuanced approach that takes into account the views of diverse stakeholders who are invested in the outcome of these issues. It speaks to their standing and dedication that the project was able to assemble a diverse Task Force with wide-ranging backgrounds and to incorporate these perspectives into a thorough, well-founded report. The Council would also like to thank Abner Mikva for his contributions to and leadership of the project during its early stages.

The Council would also like to extend its deepest appreciation to the members of the Task Force, each of whom brought distinct experiences and expertise to the table, yet worked together effectively to

achieve consensus on the report's recommendations. I would like to especially thank them for their time and willingness to exchange views candidly during and following the Task Force deliberations.

The Council acknowledges and thanks the Berkley Center for Religion, Peace, & World Affairs at Georgetown University and the center's director, Tom Banchoff, for their support of this project. The Council also extends its gratitude to Eric Patterson, who served as the primary consultant to the Task Force. Eric played an integral role in the development and management of the meetings, the early briefings of the Task Force members and Council staff, and the planning for the launch and dissemination of the report.

Several members of The Chicago Council staff played key parts in planning and implementing the project and creating the final report. Vice president Rachel Bronson developed the original concept for the Task Force and oversaw the project at an executive level, working closely with the cochairs to steer the many actors involved throughout the process. Executive director for studies Thomas Wright served as project director and principal author of the final report, undertaking extensive consultations with Task Force members to ensure that consensus was reached. Senior program officer Alya Adamany managed key details of the project from its inception and provided important input on the project's members, materials, final report, and launch.

Chicago Council staff member Elisa Miller and interns Ehrin Hopkins and Jamal Afridi also worked hard throughout the process to ensure each of the many moving parts ran smoothly. Editor Catherine Hug expertly oversaw the publication process and managed the editing and design for the final report.

Finally, The Chicago Council would like to express its deep appreciation and thanks to the Henry R. Luce Foundation and Carnegie Corporation of New York for the generous support that made this project and report possible.

Marshall M. Bouton
President
The Chicago Council on Global Affairs

Executive Summary

Religion has been a major force in the daily lives of individuals and communities for millennia. Yet recent data show that the salience of religion is on the rise the world over. Once considered a "private" matter by Western policymakers, religion is now playing an increasingly influential role—both positive and negative—in the public sphere on many different levels. Religious actors are central players in local, national, and international life, from providing basic services in impoverished areas of the world to influencing larger social, economic, and political developments; shaping important international debates; and advancing the goals of peace, justice, and freedom.

Well-organized and well-funded extremist groups also use religion to deepen existing cultural and political fault lines and justify militancy and terrorism. Just as globalization and communication technologies have supported positive religious developments, they have also facilitated the growth of extremist religious views and the development of dangerous terrorist networks.

As America looks ahead, it is clear that religious actors will not only continue to present major challenges to our security, but provide enormous opportunities to create new alliances and forge new paths to peace and prosperity in many troubled areas of the world. This means that the United States government will not only need to develop a far greater understanding of religion's role in politics and society around the globe—including a detailed knowledge of religious communities, leaders, and trends—but it must move beyond traditional state-to-state relations to develop effective policies for engaging religious communities within and across nations.

After decades of assuming that religion had only a waning influence, policymakers in the United States have gradually become more aware of religion's role in many dilemmas and developments around the world—often through painful experience dating back to the Iranian Revolution of 1979. Events such as the September 11 attacks and the struggle with intrareligious conflict in Iraq have more recently concentrated the attention of many policymakers on religion as a "problem" or threat. However, a focus on religion through the lens of terrorism and counterterrorism strategy is too narrow—and even then still poorly understood. This limited focus has caused many U.S. decision makers to overlook and undervalue the influential role of religious leaders and communities in helping address vexing global problems and promoting peace.

In his speech in Cairo on June 4, 2009, President Obama recognized the importance of engaging economically and politically influential sectors of societies, including religious communities. This follows efforts by the Clinton and Bush administrations to begin raising the profile of religious engagement. Yet while a vision has been articulated, the way to move forward has not. The U.S. government lacks the framework, strategy, and capacity to fully understand and effectively engage religious communities. While there have been advances across the U.S. foreign policy bureaucracy over the last several years in recognizing that religion is an important driver in global affairs, there is still much to be done.

First and foremost, this report argues for greater acknowledgement of the full range of opportunities and challenges religious leaders and communities provide. This includes a focus beyond the Muslim world to encompass religious communities more broadly.[1] What is needed is an informed and coherent framework that allows actors within and outside government to better understand and respond to religiously inspired actors and events in a way that supports those doing good, while isolating those that invoke the sacred to sow violence and confusion.

This report aims to provide this needed framework. It reflects the consensus of leaders drawn from academia, religious institutions, the foreign policy community, development agencies, and nongovernmental organizations. It is structured around three key objectives that the Task Force set itself: (1) offering an understanding of the role that religion plays in world affairs, (2) explaining why this matters for the United States, and (3) charting a strategy for moving forward.

Religious Patterns in a Volatile World

The Task Force has identified six principal patterns that together reflect religion's increasing importance in international affairs.

1. The influence of religious groups—some with long-established and others with newly won voices—is growing in many areas of the world and affects virtually all sectors of society, from politics and culture to business and science.

1. Due to the political context and current foreign policy discourse, many of the examples in this report have to do with Muslim communities. However, the strategic framework provided by the Task Force is applicable to the engagement of all major religious communities abroad.

2. Changing patterns of religious identification in the world are having significant political implications.

3. Religion has benefited and been transformed by globalization, but it also has become a primary means of organizing opposition to it.

4. Religion is playing an important public role where governments lack capacity and legitimacy in periods of economic and political stress.

5. Religion is often used by extremists as a catalyst for conflict and a means of escalating tensions with other religious communities.

6. The growing salience of religion today is deepening the political significance of religious freedom as a universal human right and a source of social and political stability.

Strategic Challenges for the United States

Each of these trends is interesting but not necessarily consequential when taken alone. Yet they combine to become a powerful force on the local, national, and international stage, making them impossible to ignore in the conduct of foreign policy if the United States is to achieve its strategic aims. It will be much harder, if not impossible, to accomplish important goals—including development objectives, conflict resolution, and the promotion of social and human rights—without understanding the religious context. Yet moving forward with religious engagement also presents some important strategic challenges that must also be clearly understood.

First, while the United States has an interest in religious communities realizing their legitimate aspirations, including the right to live in a democratic society, it must also seek to maintain its strategically important bilateral alliances and partnerships throughout the world. These two interests—democratization and alliances—are, at times, in conflict. In particular, there is a concern that the introduction of elections in certain countries could result in the empowerment of parties and movements, often defined in religious terms, with an expressed anti-American agenda. The United States needs a way to reconcile these two objectives.

Second, the United States has an interest in promoting human rights, including religious freedom, as core values of U.S. policy, but

must do so in a way that is not perceived as a Western assault on local faith and custom. U.S. policymakers must also acknowledge the challenges of doing this effectively.

Third, while debates inside religious communities have a bearing on the wider world, including the United States, outsiders currently lack the standing to influence them. The United States should be actively engaged in dialogue with the leaders of these communities, while not manipulating religion for its own ends or treating religion exclusively as a "problem."

A New U.S. Strategy

This report proposes a new strategy for effective religious engagement that is indirect rather than direct. The Task Force believes the United States should avoid trying to change religious societies through direct action or to promote an uncompromising secular alternative. Both of these approaches would likely backfire with dangerous consequences. Instead, the Task Force advocates an indirect approach that builds, cultivates, and relies upon large networks and partnerships—which will vary by degree—with religious communities. This requires building the capacity at home to listen to and interpret the advice provided by these networks and institutionalize the expertise needed to determine how best to engage these communities.

This approach rests on the following assumptions:

1. Religion should not be viewed only as a problem, but also as a source of creativity, inspiration, and commitment to human flourishing that can and often does provide enormous opportunities.

2. The United States should avoid actions that use or appear to use religion instrumentally, i.e., the United States should not try or be widely perceived as trying to manipulate religion in pursuit of narrowly drawn interests.

Recommendations

The recommendations in this report fall into two main areas: (1) how to build the internal capacity to engage religion and religious communities and (2) how to engage religion and religious communities

more effectively by better identifying whom to engage, what issues to engage, and the goals of that engagement.

Building internal capacity to engage religion overseas

The report's recommendations include the following:

Establish religious engagement within the government bureaucracy.

The U.S. effort to engage religious communities must be broad and deep. The United States must broaden its definition of engagement and empower a larger number of government departments—including those outside the national security and foreign policy realm—to engage with religious leaders and organizations on issues defining their societies. The Task Force recommends that the effort to address the role of religion in world affairs be directed by the National Security Council (NSC), which will serve as the guardian and the definer of the strategic parameters of engagement. Presidential leadership and commitment is an indispensable element of any foreign policy, particularly one that is frequently neglected. The NSC reflects the views of the president more than any other agency in the U.S. government. It is also the only agency that has the authority and influence to ensure the strategy is coordinated across all government departments so presidential goals do not fall victim to parochial interests and concerns.

The Task Force recommends appointing a distinguished American Muslim as ambassador or special envoy to the Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC).[2] A robust vetting process will be necessary to ensure that this individual is qualified to both understand religious debates and to advance American interests.

The United States should also ensure that ambassadors to countries where religion plays a significant role (for example, Afghanistan, Brazil, China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Kenya, Malaysia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, and the Vatican, among others) have the standing and expertise (either themselves or in-house) necessary to effectively engage religious communities.

2. On February 13, 2010, after the Task Force had finished its deliberations, President Obama announced the appointment of a special envoy, Rashad Hussain, to the OIC. This is an important next step in the engagement of Muslim communities and Muslim majority states.

Provide mandatory training for government officials on the role of religion in world affairs.

The United States will be able to effectively engage religious communities only if it puts the structures and requirements in place that enable officers in the Foreign Service, military, and development sectors to be trained and educated about the role of religion in world affairs. This should include language training, cultural exchange programs, and courses on the varied ways religion informs political life and affects U.S. interests.

Take steps to integrate and nurture the skills and expertise of military veterans and civilians returning from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Over the next few years, veterans and those with field experience from nongovernmental organizations should be encouraged to develop their expertise in higher education or enter government and other forms of service to develop and make use of their practical knowledge. Although this expertise has come at a high cost, it is a welcome development and a significant opportunity to build capacity inside and outside the government on religious and cultural matters.

Clarify the Applicability of the Establishment Clause.[3]

The Task Force calls upon the president of the United States, advised by executive offices and agencies who have studied the problem, to clarify that the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment does not bar the United States from engaging religious communities abroad in the conduct of foreign policy, though it does impose constraints on the means that the United States may choose to pursue this engagement. Such clarification would serve as a major "next step" in the president's post-Cairo follow-up.

Engaging religion and religious communities effectively

The report's recommendations include the following:

3. A dissent to this recommendation and a response to that dissent can be found on pages 83-34 at the end of this report.

Engage on the societal level, not just the governmental or diplomatic level.

To connect with billions of people of faith, the United States must engage with them on the issues that touch their daily lives. In much of the world, particularly in Latin America, Africa, and Southeast Asia, many schools, hospitals, social services, relief and development, and human rights programs are sponsored by religious institutions. While these activities may appear to be nonpolitical, in the aggregate they have a powerful influence over peoples' lives and loyalties. By engaging with institutions providing these services and assisting them in their endeavors, the United States can help build good will in religious communities and connect directly with ordinary citizens rather than just engaging with regimes.

To do so the United States must engage with credible and legitimate indigenous groups in religious communities, including women's organizations, civil society associations, professional organizations, religious political parties, clerical centers, environmental groups, educational institutions, grade school and high school teacher groups, and particularly young people, who are often at the forefront of conflict. This report proposes several specific initiatives in pursuit of this goal, including the areas of education, health, energy, climate change, democracy, religious freedom, interfaith exchanges, and the rule of law. For example, American educators should establish programs with elementary and secondary educators in selected countries to enhance the teaching of computer technology, math, and the sciences, while American energy experts—from the private sector, the U.S. Department of Energy, and the national laboratories—should work with civil society groups in selected countries to increase the availability of clean drinking water and combat diseases that are associated with polluted water.

Engage religious political parties even if they may oppose U.S. foreign policy.

While we should not paper over the differences with such parties, evidence from the past decade indicates that religious political parties often place pragmatism and problem solving over ideology. Indeed, no Islamist party elected to national parliament has sought to put greater emphasis on Sharia laws as the source of legislation, despite preelection rhetoric to the contrary. Instead, they often become mired in the day-to-day necessities of ruling, which include making good on commitments to tackle corruption and provide much-needed public services in order to build a record of practical

accomplishment. The Task Force endorses six criteria for how and when to engage with these parties.

Reaffirm the U.S. commitment to religious freedom, while clarifying the meaning of the term.

As the International Religious Freedom Act (IRFA) and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights recognize, religious freedom is a human right and an integral part of a vibrant democracy. The ambassador-at-large for international religious freedom's first priority should be to clarify that religious freedom not only includes the right of individuals and groups to be free of persecution, but also includes both minority and majority rights as well as the right of religious individuals and groups to advance their values publicly in civil society and political life. The ambassador should communicate to majority as well as minority religious communities why religious liberty is in their interests. The administration should elevate the position of ambassador-at-large for religious freedom, as intended by the IRFA, to a status commensurate with other ambassadors-at-large based at the State Department. The administration should also ensure that the ambassador has adequate resources to perform his or her tasks.

The new ambassador should develop U.S. international religious freedom strategies within the context of the religious engagement policy recommended in this report. This includes articulating religious freedom in a way that is not viewed as imperialism, but as a means to support religious agency to undermine religion-based terrorism and promote stable democracy.

Embrace a comprehensive approach to democracy promotion and human rights in order to accommodate the legitimate aspirations of religious communities.

The United States faces a gathering crisis where its alliances with certain nations are dependent upon autocratic regimes, while the opposition, usually represented by religious parties, often (though not always) espouses anti-American positions. The challenge is to promote democracy without strengthening anti-Americanism. However, a comprehensive approach to democracy promotion is actually the critical element in maintaining U.S. alliances and partnerships. Democracies require active and organized civil societies; elections are often the last, not the first, step. The United States needs

to engage, both bilaterally and through multilateral organizations, with authoritarian regimes on specific aspects of governance such as law enforcement, freedom of the press, health and educational issues, religious freedom, and women's contributions to the country's economic life. Engagement must include exchange programs across the range of issues, bringing foreign officials and leaders to the United States and U.S. officials and leaders to the Middle East, Latin America, Africa, and Asia.

Work with multilateral organizations—for example, the United Nations, UN agencies, the World Bank, the G-20, and the G-8—to expand and deepen their engagement with religious actors.

International organizations such as the United Nations, its major specialized agencies like UNICEF and UNESCO, the World Bank, and others would benefit from a better understanding of religious dynamics in the contemporary world as they carry out their respective missions. The United States plays significant leadership roles in these organizations, which, for the most part, suffer from similar blinders where religion is concerned. The United States should urge global institutions to take religious institutions and actors more explicitly into account. The United States also stands to learn from the experience of international organizations and their interactions with faith-based institutions in numerous fields.

Conclusion

President Obama's speech in Cairo in June 2009 set the stage for a new departure in U.S. foreign policy toward Muslim communities. This is a vital task and a laudable beginning. However, the scope must be much broader. Engaging Islam is only one very crucial component of a larger challenge—engaging the multitude of religious communities across the world as an integral part of our foreign policy.

Without a more serious and thoughtful engagement with religion across a host of issues and actors, U.S. foreign policy will miss important opportunities. America's long history of influencing the international understanding of democracy and human rights will be compromised. The United States will be absent from crucial global conversations about matters such as managing climate change and ensuring that the United Nations Millennium Development Goals are advanced. Opportunities for resolving conflict and building peace may be lost. We will be less capable of waging successful counterin-

surgency campaigns in Iraq and Afghanistan and of understanding Pakistan. And, we will undermine our ability to protect citizens from violence perpetrated by religious extremists. Indeed, pushing an uncompromising secular alternative can have the unintended effect of feeding extremism by further threatening traditional sources of personal, cultural, and religious identity. The challenge before us is to marginalize religious extremists, not religion.

The time has come to build on Cairo—to expand its scope and add substantive initiatives to the concept. It is the hope of this Task Force that the analysis and recommendations in this report will provide a path forward in this important endeavor.

Prologue

"It is my deeply held belief that in the year 2009—more than at any point in human history—the interests of nations and peoples are shared. The religious convictions that we hold in our hearts can forge new bonds among people, or they can tear us apart."

—President Barack Obama, Address to the United Nations, September 23, 2009

In February 2006 al Qaeda in Iraq (AQI) bombed and almost completely destroyed the Golden Mosque in Samarra, Iraq. The mosque is one of the two holiest sites in Shia Islam. It contains the burial sites of two of the twelve imams of Shiism and the entrance to the cave where the twelfth, the Hidden Imam, Muhammad al-Mahdi, is said to have disappeared as a boy. The attack was designed by Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, the leader of AQI, to provoke Shiites into attacking Sunni holy sites, which would in turn cause Sunnis to rally around their extremist elements. The destruction of the Golden Mosque was AQI's ticket to civil war. The gamble paid off, at least initially. In the five weeks that followed, Shia retaliation meant that 600 Sunni men, women, and children, many of whom were tortured and mutilated, turned up dead on the streets of Baghdad. The violence in Iraq proceeded to new depths of horror. By September, the monthly civilian death toll reached between 2,700 and 3,800, with half of all casualties in Baghdad.[4]

At the Iraqi national security advisor's daily brief less than a week after the Samarra attack, American officials almost entirely ignored the incident and failed to grasp its significance. According to notes taken by David Kilcullen, then a senior U.S. State Department official, the session was "a dialogue of the deaf … a detailed, very jargon-filled and intricate PowerPoint brief on the latest trends, followed by a strictly quantitative assessment of progress … The Americans were mainly interested in active kinetic operations against insurgents and terrorists … [They] all looked satisfied."[5] Kilcullen recalls that an analysis of the U.S. daily briefs to the commanding general of mul-

4. Colin Kahl, Michele Flournoy, and Shawn Brimley, *Shaping the Iraqi Inheritance,* (Washington DC: Center for a New American Security, 2008), 14.

5. Field notes quoted in David Kilcullen, *The Accidental Guerrilla: Fighting Small Wars in the Midst of a Big One* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 120-121. In this context, the word kinetic refers to the use of military force against enemy combatants. It does not include other operations such as the protection of civilian population centers and the provision of basic services like sanitation and electricity.

tinational forces in Iraq [then General George Casey] "indicates that it took approximately four-and-a-half months, from the Samarra bombing until mid-July 2006, for these slides to begin reflecting what the Iraqi political staff [who worked less than fifty yards from the briefing room but were not allowed into it] had told me the very week of the bombing: that the Samarra bombing was a disaster that had fundamentally and irrevocably altered the nature of the war."[6]

AQI had spectacularly thrust a religiously laced dagger into the heart of Iraq, but the U.S. government completely missed its significance. America's implacable enemy had deliberately targeted a holy site to provoke religious conflict. As Iraqi society came apart along already strained religious seams, American eyes glazed over for four-and-a-half long months until the obvious became unavoidable. The United States had a blind spot and would pay a heavy price.

It would not be the first time that ignorance about the role of religion in world affairs has inhibited smart strategic thinking, whether in the deployment of foreign aid, relationship building with other nations, or the tackling of transnational challenges such as climate change, fighting disease, and promoting human rights. It was, however, one of the most obvious and most deadly.

6. Ibid.

Chapter I
Introduction

With the advent of the second decade of the twenty-first century, we find ourselves in an increasingly dynamic and volatile world. Where the international political system was once dominated almost exclusively by state-to-state interactions in a bipolar world, today the rapid spread of democratic forms of governance, widespread economic development, technological innovations, and globalization have given rise to new actors and new challenges in foreign policy. Nonstate actors, transnational movements, and cross-border conflicts have emerged as powerful forces in world affairs. Religion is one of the most powerful among them.[7]

Religion has been a major force in the daily lives of individuals and communities for millennia. Yet recent data show that the salience of religion is on the rise the world over. Once considered a "private" matter by Western policymakers, religion is now playing an increasingly influential role—both positive and negative—in the public sphere on many different levels. Religious actors are central players in local, national, and international life, from providing basic services in impoverished areas of the world to influencing larger social, economic, and political developments; shaping important international debates; and advancing the goals of peace, justice, and freedom.

Well-organized and well-funded extremist groups also use religion to deepen existing cultural and political fault lines and justify militancy and terrorism. Just as globalization and communication technologies have supported positive religious developments, they

7. For the purposes of the report, we define religion as an established system of belief, practice, and ritual based in a collective affirmation of a transcendent or otherworldly reality that encompasses and gives ultimate meaning to earthly existence. While indigenous faiths and new religions or sects are very much part of the global reality, we are particularly focused on multigenerational, transnational religions organized around institutions, leaders, and disciples or followers—adherents who normally number in the millions worldwide, but who are supremely local in their influence and impact. Here, of course, we would include, inter alia, Buddhism, Christianity, and Islam, which are all self-consciously missionary religions, and other religious traditions that have become global through their diasporas, including Judaism, Hinduism, and Sikhism. Given the internal pluralism and divisions that mark all major religions (e.g., the various branches of Christianity, Sunni and Shia Islam, schools of Buddhism, and Judaism, etc.), it is more accurate to speak of the Judaism*s*, Christianitie*s*, Islam*s*, Buddhism*s*, etc. of the world.

have also facilitated the growth of extremist religious views and the development of vast terror networks.

As America looks ahead, it is clear that religious actors will not only continue to present major challenges to our security, but also provide enormous opportunities to create new alliances and forge new paths to peace and prosperity in many troubled areas of the world. This means that the United States government, which represents both a deeply religious and a secular society, will not only need to develop a far greater understanding of religion's role in politics and society around the globe—including a detailed knowledge of religious communities, leaders, and trends—but must move beyond traditional state-to-state relations to develop effective policies for engaging religious communities within and across nations.

President Barack Obama's speech in Cairo on June 4, 2009, recognized the importance of engaging religious communities. Specifically, the president proposed to open a new era of engagement with "Muslim communities," signaling that engagement will encompass not only formal U.S. government relations with foreign states and regimes, but also—and perhaps more significantly in the long term—partnerships with other economically and politically influential sectors of societies, including religious groups, educational institutions, and youth. He also spoke about the importance of religious freedom as central to the abilities of peoples to live together and of the special need to engage on women's rights, development, and innovation.

This follows efforts by the Bush and Clinton administrations to begin raising the profile of religious engagement. President Bush's faith-based initiative recognized the important role of religion in promoting constructive social and political behavior and sought to unleash "armies of compassion" to combat social ills in ways that government programs could not. President Clinton signed the International Religious Freedom Act and organized groups of religious leaders to travel to China and engage local leaders.

Yet while a vision has been articulated, the way forward has not. The U.S. government lacks the framework, strategy, and capacity to fully understand and effectively engage religious communities. There are many U.S. policy responses that might have been different—and more successful in protecting and advancing U.S. interests—had American officials better understood religious forces. These include American underestimation of the capacity of Iranian religious leaders to conduct a "successful" revolution in 1979; underestimation of the role of the Catholic Church in democracy movements in Poland

and Latin America; a misreading of the motivations, timing, and patterns of suicide bombings conducted in Iraq to polarize society around religious lines; and a debilitating lack of knowledge about key religious power brokers in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan who could peacefully negotiate local political rivalries.

As America continues to develop its capacity to deal with new challenges, it must better understand the conditions under which religion influences public behavior, whether individual or collective, constructive or destructive. The challenge is how best to understand and work with religious actors to promote American interests around the world, while opposing religious actors that promote violence and repression.

This report highlights the concrete ways in which a new and comprehensive approach toward religion—its institutions, movements, beliefs, leaders, and followers—can contribute to a more informed and constructive foreign policy agenda for America. It helps answer a host of thorny questions, including whom to engage, how to help them succeed, what vocabulary to use, and what the limits of such engagement are. Far from diluting our strategic interests, comprehensive engagement on religion offers solutions to some of America's most intractable strategic challenges, including supporting the emergence of democratic practices and institutions and the marginalization and defeat of violent extremists.

The Context

If the United States is to move forward with comprehensive engagement of religious communities, it must grasp the import of religion's changing role. To appreciate religion's full potential force, it is helpful to consider the following two phenomena: the power of religious faith and the impact of globalization.

The power of religious faith

The influence of religion on individual and collective action in the public sphere should not be underestimated. Religion is not epiphenomenal—a secondary human experience that has no bearing on political developments and that we can therefore ignore. Treating it as such leads to a fundamental misunderstanding of the dynamics and trends in world affairs. Religion—through its motivating ideas and the mobilizing power of its institutions—is a driver of politics in its own right.

To comprehend religion's power as an agent of social and political change, one need consider only the peaceful revolutions in Eastern Europe; the human rights movement in Latin America; the antiapartheid struggle in South Africa; the downfall of Marcos in the Philippines; the peace processes in Colombia, Mozambique, and Uganda; the struggle for freedom in Tibet; the efforts of the two largest Muslim nongovernmental organizations in Indonesia on behalf of human rights and justice; and the campaign for democracy in Myanmar. These events were all bolstered and in some cases led by religious leaders and their followers.

The impact of globalization

In addition, religion's role can only be properly understood as part of an international system that is increasingly dynamic and volatile. A new era of global trade, international travel and migration, and the widespread access to modes of personal communication across vast distances have increased connections across economies and cultures. Peoples who were once definitively separated by time, space, knowledge, and culture now interact and intermingle on an unprecedented scale. This has not only strengthened established religious communities, networks, and movements—for good and for ill—but also fostered an unprecedented plurality of forms and expressions of religious behavior and belonging. This new context for religion is having a far-ranging impact on matters ranging from youth culture to the construction of "ethnic" identity to social values informing decisions about military policy, urban planning, and genetic engineering.

Religion's new salience in international affairs also derives in part from the way it intersects with other global developments. For instance, the Sunni-Shia divide is not new, but it became politically relevant on a global level amid the volatility and instability produced by the rise of al Qaeda, the terrorist attacks on the United States, and the U.S. invasion of Iraq, which created the first-ever Arab, Shia-governed state.

This complex mix of promising and perilous developments is the prism through which one must view religion in world affairs. Policymakers who do not reflect upon the implications of these global cultural and religious trends will miss not only the big picture, but also the telling details that inform sound decision making.

The Policy Background

Despite a world abuzz with religious fervor, not least in many congressional districts in this country, the U.S. government has been slow to respond effectively to situations where religion plays a global role. These shortcomings are a result of many forces, including a past political context that did not require as great an appreciation for the religious fabric of societies, a fear of treading too far over a set of unclear domestic legal lines separating church and state, and what some observers view as a secular bias in U.S. foreign policy, among other issues.

The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, led to a surge in interest in religion, but subsequent U.S. government responses were uncoordinated, underresourced, haphazard, and often counterproductive. Senior officials in the CIA suggest that the improvements in analysis that came after September 11 did not lead to a sensible strategy of engaging religious communities.[8] Some commentators and politicians tended to seek refuge in simplistic religious labels that obscured rather than clarified events. In addition, because of the focus on religion's role in the "war on terror," religion's increasing visibility in political life became cast too often as a "problem" or threat, something to be seen only through the lens of terrorism and counterterrorism strategy. Predictably, both conflict along religious fault lines and religiously based arguments about the common good continued to gain considerable political salience, yet the United States remained unprepared to adequately respond.

Gradually the episodic and uncoordinated nature of U.S. engagement of religion in world affairs has begun to be addressed. The CIA's Office of Political Islam increased in size and influence. The United States Military Academy at West Point established the Harmony Project to understand al Qaeda and religious extremism. President Bush appointed a special envoy to the Organization of Islamic Conference in an effort to engage Muslims. USAID ran a number of programs designed to engage local religious leaders across a spectrum of sectarian groups as part of U.S. foreign assistance. Even before September 11, the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 established a U.S. ambassador-at-large for international religious freedom.[9] Meanwhile, nongovernmental international forums,

8. Emile Nakhleh, *A Necessary Engagement: Reinventing America's Relations with the Muslim World* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009).

9. Religious freedom is not only the "first freedom" of the American constitution. It is also rooted in Article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. But reli-

including the UN Alliance of Civilizations, the Parliament of World Religions, and Religions for Peace, are providing a venue for multilateral and interreligious progress on a variety of issues.

Sometimes lessons were learned the hard way, after much blood was spilt and treasure spent. It was only when faced with a difficult and protracted war in Iraq that the U.S. military elevated and revised counterinsurgency doctrine to take special account of local religious and cultural dynamics.[10] Meanwhile, several nongovernmental organizations and universities embarked on ambitious projects to better understand the role of religion in world affairs. These included the Carnegie Corporation of New York's Islam Initiative, the Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life of the Pew Research Center, the Center for Strategic and International Studies, the Henry R. Luce Foundation's Initiative on Religion and International Affairs, the U.S.-Muslim Engagement Project, Notre Dame's Kroc Institute for Peace Studies, and Georgetown University's Berkley Center for Religion, Peace, and World Affairs.[11]

In addition to his Cairo speech and his earlier speech in Ankara reflecting similar themes, President Obama reestablished the White House Office of Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships and further extended its mandate.[12] Specifically, the president has asked for recommendations on how to promote interfaith dialogue and collaboration that would enhance the capacity of states and communities to address poverty, underdevelopment, delivery of health

---

gious freedom had previously been neglected in U.S. foreign policy. The International Religions Freedom Act recognizes it in U.S. law as a core value critical to healthy democratic societies.

10. See *The U.S. Army and Marine Corps Counterinsurgency Manual* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2007); "U.S. Counterinsurgency Guide," Department of State, January 2009, http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/119629.pdf.

11. See the Carnegie Corporation of New York's Islam Initiative, http://carnegie.org/programs/islam-initiative/; Center for Strategic and International Studies, *Mixed Blessings: U.S. Government Engagement with Religion in Conflict-Prone Settings* (Washington DC: CSIS, 2007); U.S.–Muslim Engagement Project, *Changing Course: A New Direction for U.S. Relations with the Muslim World* (Washington DC: Search for Common Ground and Consensus Building Institute, 2009), www.usmuslimengagement.org; and http://berkleycenter.georgetown.edu. Also see the Berkley Center's Program on Religion and U.S. Foreign Policy, http://berkleycenter.georgetown.edu/programs/155.

12. During the Bush administration this was called the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives.

care, and other social arenas where religion and religious groups have demonstrated their effectiveness.[13]

Despite these advancements, much remains to be done. President Obama's bold Cairo declaration is a critically important and significant step in a journey already under way. However, the question now is whether the United States can build on the lessons of the past eight years to craft a sustainable and effective strategy to address the role of religion in world affairs.

The Task Ahead

If the United States does not develop effective policies for engaging religious communities, it will struggle to build the necessary bridges on the road to economic development and political stability in many troubled regions. Moreover, in the absence of a successful policy of religious engagement, the United States can expect to be confounded for many years by one form or another of religious extremism. Indeed, it is vitally important to understand the negative consequences that will ensue if we respond to the increasingly prominent and policy-relevant role of religion in world affairs by pushing an uncompromising secular political alternative in foreign policy. Ignoring or trying to isolate religious actors in world affairs would have the unintended effect of feeding extremism by further threatening traditional sources of personal, cultural, and religious identity.

The Task Force believes that the best way to counter religious extremism is through more authentic engagement with religion and religious communities. Authentic engagement is the most effective way to support and further empower the progressive and benevolent elements within societies and cultures shaped by religion. It entails engaging religious communities on their own terms, listening carefully to their concerns and fears, and entering into substantive dialogue about how to realize their legitimate aspirations. A robust policy of authentic engagement must be carefully tailored so as not to overstep the bounds by intervening unwisely in theological disputes or, worse still, seeking to manipulate religion. Nonetheless, the goal must be to empower constructive ideas and leaders within the religious community. Neither disengagement nor exclusive reli-

13. President Obama laid out four priorities for the office. The first three were domestic in orientation. The fourth, however, was quite new. The office was to focus "beyond American shores, work with the National Security Council, [and] "foster interfaith dialogue with leaders and scholars around the world."

ance on U.S. religious institutions overseas is a viable alternative to a comprehensive policy of authentic religious engagement. To achieve this, any new strategy must be developed around the following principles.

The approach must be global

While the American public is frequently confronted with news of religious strife in the Middle East, problems fester throughout the world and in every religious tradition. A December 2009 study published by the Pew Research Center's Forum on Religion & Public Life found that public tensions between religious groups were reported in the vast majority (87 percent) of countries.[14] Despite official state atheism, China is home to numerous indigenous (or "new religious") movements such as Falun Gong as well as a burgeoning group of legal and underground Christian churches and Muslim communities. Buddhist monks have justified—and incited—deadly conflict against Tamils in Sri Lanka and bravely marched against repressive regime policies in Burma. Christian-Muslim tensions animate ethnic violence in Thailand, Nigeria, and Indonesia as well as European cities like London, Amsterdam, and Paris.[15] Political debates in India often turn on different visions of Hinduism and the proper relationship of Hindus to other ethnic and religious communities. Extremists spouting slogans of *Hindutva* ("Hindu-ness") promote a chauvinistic and religiously exclusivist form of national identity; activists of the Hindu Nationalist RSS have been implicated in murderous campaigns against Indian Muslims.

To be viable, a new strategy of engagement must be truly global. Accordingly, U.S. efforts to engage religious communities should not be focused solely along the Christian-Muslim fault line. Nor should the focus be solely on the negative dimensions of religious presence in the public sphere. The rise of Pentecostalism in Latin America and of Christian churches and preachers in Africa and Asia, for exam-

14. See "Global Restrictions on Religion," The Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, December 2009, http://pewforum.org/newassets/images/reports/restrictions/restrictionsfullreport.pdf.

15. Taken from Robert Ruby and Timothy Samuel Shah, "Nigeria's Presidential Election: The Christian-Muslim Divide," The Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, March 21, 2007, http://pewforum.org/docs/?DocID=182; Peter Chalk, "The Malay-Muslim Insurgency in Southern Thailand: Understanding the Conflict's Evolving Dynamic," Occasional Paper 5, RAND Counterinsurgency Study (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2008); Philip Jenkins, "Religion and Pacific Rim" (working paper, 2009), 8-9.

ple, are important religious developments that warrant attention. Religious activism was behind the September 11 attacks, but also the fall of the Berlin Wall. It fuels bloody communal conflict in Bosnia and Sudan, but also peace and forgiveness in South Africa and Northern Ireland. It has motivated the politics of Osama bin Laden and violent Hindu nationalists, but also of Pope John Paul II and the Dalai Lama. It is pivotal to the fate of Afghanistan, India, Iraq, Iran, Nigeria, Pakistan, Yemen, and many other locales where the United States has vital foreign policy interests. The many examples of religious contributions to democratization and of religious leaders who help provide foreign assistance, implement development programs, and build peace are emblematic of how religion can play a positive role everywhere in the world.

Knowledge must be local

While engagement must be pursued broadly, our expertise must dig deep. Knowledge as well as politics will continue to be stubbornly local—even as the local is shaped by larger patterns and priorities. In most cases, religiously motivated political actions—whether in the Ferghana Valley in Central Asia, a village in Sumatra, the Guangdong Province of China, or a tribal stronghold in southern Yemen—will remain local in character. In such a world, acknowledging religion means engaging with religious communities across a range of issues—from education and poverty reduction to conflict resolution and democracy—as they apply to their locales. It simply will not serve American interests to allow the experience that those communities have of the United States to be defined primarily through the global lens of counterterrorism policy or by overriding strategic or economic concerns deemed important to us, but not perceived as equally relevant by others.

U.S. terms of engagement must be clear

Uncertainty surrounding the limits of the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment, which prohibits the U.S. government from establishing religion in the United States, appears to be impeding foreign policy in some significant ways.[16] The separation of church

16. This is not just theoretical. In July 2009 the USAID inspector general raised concerns that USAID may have breached the Establishment Clause by using public funds to rebuild four mosques and adjoining community centers in Fallujah. Such uncertainty acts as a brake on policy innovation and risk taking. A new strategy must pro-

and state affects the way we approach the issue of religion in political affairs and has contributed to its marginalization. The barrier is partly psychological—some find it hard to accept that religion belongs in policy discussions in a secular and democratic state. It is also partly legal, but the impact of this legal barrier must be carefully calibrated so that it does not preempt defensible action.

The effort must be coordinated

A related problem is organizational in nature. Previous U.S. government efforts to address the role of religion in world affairs have been plagued by a dearth of resources and lack of interagency coordination. Most importantly, a strategy of engaging religious communities must include departments that we do not normally think of as involved in national security and foreign policy, including the Department of Education and the Department of Health. But there must be a lead agency such as the National Security Council capable of ensuring that engagement is perceived as a priority throughout the bureaucracy. Otherwise, any effort is doomed to be ad hoc and suboptimal in its impact.

The legitimate rights of religious groups must be supported

In keeping with the deepest American values, our engagement with religious communities should not be just a matter of sharing information and technical expertise, but also a matter of promoting justice. Solutions must be formulated with a clear awareness of their impact on human lives and their relationship to human values of fairness, equality, and freedom. Religions and religious leaders "specialize" in these fundamental priorities, which form the lens through which the United States is perceived and judged. Accordingly, we cannot overlook the exacting challenge of integrating means of promoting human and civil rights, including religious freedom, into our policy recommendations.

Unless religious majorities as well as minorities are sure that they have U.S. support in taking their rightful place in civil society and their national political debates, it will not be possible to successfully engage religious communities around the world. Religious communities, both majority and minority communities, should understand

---

vide clarity about what is and is not permissible. Constitutional constraints on U.S. engagement of religious actors abroad, if any, must be clear, reasonable, and appropriate to the task of defending American interests.

that the United States has an interest in their playing an active part in their own societies.

Some members of the Task Force believe that a potentially powerful and effective means of fostering constructive religious agency is through the advancement of international religious freedom. They are convinced that only a regime of religious liberty can provide both the latitude and the limits necessary to ensure stable political reform and to undermine religion-based terrorism in highly religious societies. However, because of the sensitivities that a policy of religious freedom—often seen as a means of imposing American values—entails, other Task Force members believe such a policy would not address and may even undermine the real issue of finding new means of empowering religious individuals and communities, whether minority or majorities, in matters ranging from judicial reform to delivery of health care to strengthening the rule of law. This report attempts to acknowledge both views and chart a path forward.

Chapter II
Understanding Religious Patterns in a Volatile World

The pursuit of a policy of engagement with religious communities around the world begins with a full recognition of religion's influence and changing role in public life. The Task Force has identified six principal religious patterns that have emerged in our era and merit special attention from U.S. policymakers.

1. The influence of religious groups—some with long-established and others with newly won voices—is growing in many areas of the world and affects virtually all sectors of society, from politics and culture to business and science.

Religion did not suddenly burst onto the scene with the end of the Cold War; it has been a powerful force in society for millennia. Today, however, religion is playing an increasingly influential role, for good and sometimes for ill, in the public sphere.[17]

Much is heard about the radical and dangerous, destructive face of religion. Less well known, but no less important for the future, is the recent emergence of local as well as transnational religious actors and faith-based organizations that are embracing the role of peacebuilder and of advocate for democracy and human rights. For decades religious leaders have played a recognized role in brokering the peace in conflict zones such as Mozambique and Mindanao, Guatemala and Algeria. They built and helped sustain processes to advance reconciliation in divided societies such as South Africa and Northern Ireland. Religious leaders such as Pope John Paul II have played critical roles in collapsing authoritarian regimes and facilitating peaceful political change toward democracy.

Now efforts at peacebuilding are becoming more systematic, structured, and integrated into the life of religious communities and faith-based organizations. The Society of Engaged Buddhists

17. After the 1979 Iranian Revolution, some academics and policymakers began to take the role of religion more seriously. Douglas Johnston and Cynthia Sampson's pathbreaking book *Religion: The Missing Dimension of Statecraft* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994) is one example of the think tank community grappling with the issue. Key academic works were also published. Still, these works were largely critiques about the then-current direction of foreign policy analysis and were far ahead of mainstream political decisions.

draws on traditional Buddhist precepts and practices in its efforts to oppose unjust government policies in the majority Buddhist nations of Southeast Asia. Scholar-activists such as Mohammed Abu-Nimer and Marc Gopin draw upon rich Islamic and Jewish scriptural resources to promote the peacebuilding vocation within their respective religious communities. The Catholic Peacebuilding Network, a global alliance headquartered at the University of Notre Dame, brings together diocesan peace and justice workers from Mindanao, Colombia, and Great Lakes Africa to share resources and best practices that define the field of conflict transformation and peacebuilding as it is evolving in conflict settings. As part of its worldwide mission of relief and development, Catholic Relief Services trains its (multireligious) staff in the skills of religiously and culturally nuanced peacebuilding. The Society of Friends (Quakers), the Mennonite Central Committee, and the lay Catholic Community of Sant'Egidio are among the prominent and effective exponents and practitioners of culturally sensitive conflict mediation and resolution.

Apart from the activism of these religiously inspired peacebuilders on the one hand and religiously inspired terrorists on the other—each operating at opposite ends of the spectrum of religious violence—there is a vast and complicated "middle" of religious presences in global affairs. For instance, religious voices shape many international development debates, especially on gender issues and increasingly on the environment, in ways that can be seen as both positive and negative. To take one positive example, the New Evangelical Partnership for the Common Good has engaged in a sustained dialogue with Moroccan Muslim leaders on religiously inspired care for the environment that offers ways to engage religious communities in addressing climate change and other environmental challenges. On the negative side, statements on Middle East politics and Islam by some American evangelical leaders, including a "60 Minutes" interview in 2002 by the Rev. Jerry Falwell, may have been a precipitating factor for violent protests abroad.

Religious figures and communities also play a highly constructive role in social, economic, and political developments. Often the most legitimate and effective care providers in impoverished and underdeveloped areas are grassroots charitable groups and religious orders that run hospitals, food programs, and orphanages. Some of these largely unsung contributions have their historic roots in the activities of American missionaries overseas. Many U.S. nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) that receive financial support from the

U.S. government are faith based. According to a study conducted by *The Boston Globe,* 159 faith-based organizations received more than $1.7 billion in USAID contracts and grants from 2001 to 2005.[18] Moreover, private aid donated by religious institutions is of increasing importance.

Natural disasters can demonstrate the best and worst of faith-based efforts. A classic example of the wonders and ills was the catastrophic earthquake in Haiti in January 2010. Eighty-one U.S. charities, including faith-based organizations, raised or pledged $611 million for relief efforts within three weeks of the devastating quake, while legions of development personnel worked in the midst of great suffering to provide food, medicine, and shelter. Meanwhile, a Baptist group was implicated in the kidnapping of children, which raised local suspicions and tainted the immense, positive contribution of the faith-based development effort.

Religious groups also play an important role in international politics. In the twenty-first century, the success and failure of states is a key national security concern. Lack of access to clean drinking water today, for example, may create the conditions for greater political instability tomorrow, with all of the risks that ensue for global health, refugee flows, state failure, and violence. Conversely, success in health, education, and the provision of basic services holds the promise of creating a more benign and prosperous world. Our understanding of national security and the national interest now incorporates these issues. But we are only beginning to document and evaluate the role of religious groups—both constructive and potentially destructive—as they become important players in development.

2. Changing patterns of religious identification in the world are having significant political implications.

Patterns of mobility and migration within the context of globalization as well as the "de-privatization" of religion in Western "enlightened" societies call into question the conventional wisdom regarding the inevitable secularization of developed nations such as the United States, England, France, and Japan. Indeed, recent scholarship has redefined secularization to take account of the coexistence and compatibility of scientific reason and religious faith in modern

18. Farah Stockman et al., "Bush Brings Faith to Foreign Aid," *The Boston Globe,* October 8, 2006.

individuals and societies.[19] In addition, reliable data indicates that developing and underdeveloped societies have become increasingly religious, even as they have become wealthier.[20] Contrary to what modernization theory earlier suggested, "it is exactly the sort of upwardly mobile, educated middle classes that Marx and Weber presumed would shed such superstitions who are driving the explosion of faith."[21] In India, Turkey, Israel, and even China, "modernization has helped to create the up-and-coming bourgeoisie that [secular leaders] prayed for; but these people are the most fervent supporters of the religious parties."[22] Moreover, in many places throughout the world, younger generations of believers tend to be more religiously committed and observant than the generation of their parents.[23]

A majority of respondents in Africa, much of Asia, and Latin America now report that religion is "very important to their life."[24] The numbers of Christians in Africa has risen from ten million in 1900 to over 400 million today, accounting for approximately half of the continent's population, with Evangelicals accounting for much of the growth. [25] Religion is even on the rise in China, which is estimated to have at least sixty-five million Protestants, twelve million Catholics, and about twenty million Muslims. This means that China has more Christians than members of the Chinese Communist Party.[26] In a Pew Global Attitudes Poll in 2005, 56 percent of Chinese said they felt religion was important in their lives. By 2050 China

19. Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007); Talal Asad, *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003).

20. Modernization theory, which predicts that states will become less religious as they become wealthier, has proven to be incorrect. Even though there is a rich-poor gap, levels of religiosity are not correlated with economic development.

21. John Micklethwait and Adrian Wooldridge, *God is Back: How the Global Revival of Faith is Changing the World* (New York: The Penguin Press, 2009), 18. For evidence of the gap between advanced industrialized societies and the rest of the world, see Pippa Norris and Ronald Inglehardt, *Sacred and Secular: Religion and Politics Worldwide* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

22. Ibid.

23. Anton A. Bucher, "Religiosity and Spirituality among Young Adults," Bertelsmann Stiftung Religion Monitor, http://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/cps/rde/xbcr/SID-CACAA633-B386387B/bst_engl/xcms_bst_dms_24989_24990_2.pdf.

24. See Pew Research Center for the People & the Press, "What the World Thinks in 2002," December 2002, http://people-press.org/report/165/what-the-world-thinks-in-2002.

25. Micklethwait and Wooldridge, *God Is Back*, 16.

26. Ibid., 4.

could be both the world's most populous Muslim country and the world's most populous Christian country.[27]

Demographic trends, which favor non-Western countries, mean that the world overall is becoming more religious. The four largest world religions—Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, and Hinduism—continue to grow. Their collective share of the world's believers rose from 67 percent in 1900 to 73 percent in 2005 and may reach 80 percent by 2050.[28] By 2025 over 70 percent of Catholics will live in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It is reasonable to expect that the Catholic Church will be increasingly attentive to the concerns and interests of the Global South.

3. Religion has benefited and been transformed by globalization, but it also has become a primary means of organizing opposition to it.

The world's religions are now transnational and global in nature. As discussed in the previous chapter, globalization and international communications have brought people together who were once completely disconnected, creating vast networks, movements, and plurality of expression on an unprecedented level. The impact on everything from personal and political identity to social, economic and political developments is enormous. Indeed, in combination with other transformational circumstances, including war and democratization, globalization has contributed to a shake-up of the status quo in many parts of the world. This upheaval has reopened the basic political questions of who governs and how. With the stakes raised, the political salience of identity, which religion helps to shape in so many cultural settings, increases dramatically. In many cases globalization, along with economic modernization, education, urbanization, and political democratization, has served not to marginalize but to empower religious actors. These forces have provided both the need and the opportunity for religious actors to enter public life and seek to shape it in accordance with their distinctive religious visions.

While globalization has provided a positive opportunity for religious revival, it has also fueled fears, resentment, and opposition. For many, globalization is seen as "Americanization," an unacceptable interference with and corrosion of religious, social, cultural,

27. Ibid., 5.

28. World Christian Database, cited in "In God's Name," *The Economist,* November 1, 2007.

and national identities. This is particularly true in the Muslim world, but also in India, South America, and other societies with powerful religious communities. Free trade may hurt local industry; urbanization breaks up communities and brings divergent groups together for the first time; the rapid pace of change threatens to sweep away cherished, age-old traditions.[29] Worried about the erosion of moral values, economic injustices, and growing inequities, religious leaders have often played an important part in shaping opposition to aspects of globalization.

A lack of local or national economic opportunity, despite rising global prosperity, can be especially damaging. Several of the world's poorer societies produce large numbers of educated young people who lack opportunities once they enter the workforce. Religious movements often offer a compelling narrative to explain their misfortune by critiquing aspects of globalization and holding out hope of a better future in opposition to it.

It is important to distinguish between mainstream and radical responses to globalization. Many people have no larger political agenda than to serve a higher purpose, to advance the common good, and to enjoy a degree of stability in a world that appears unrooted, volatile, mercantilist, and materialist. Efforts to tackle global poverty and debt reduction through religious groups like Jubilee 2000, for example, were largely driven by a humanitarian concern on the part of churchgoers who sought to ensure that the fruits of global economic growth did not exclude the world's poorest.[30]

At times, however, the response can be more reactionary. Such responses have been fueled by the fall of anti-Western secular ideologies such as communism, which used to provide ideological competition for democratic capitalism. In their place we see new religious narratives about alternative ways of organizing society to pursue social justice.

In addition, some argue that the "deterritorialization" of religion has promoted more radical responses to the post–Cold War global realities. The French scholar Olivier Roy has shown how this plays

29. As one Task Force member put it, people of different faiths now live "cheek by jowl" in increasingly urbanized settings to a greater extent than in the past. In other words, millions of citizens are having to reflect on relating to their new neighbor-down-the-street of a "foreign" religious faith, the interreligious dating of their teenager, the country that their soldier-son was just sent to, changes in the curriculum of their local school, and the like.

30. Joshua Busby, *States of Grace* (New York: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming).

out in Islam.[31] He argues that while Muslims have traditionally practiced their faith in Islamic societies, many of them now find themselves in the minority because of economically motivated migration.

According to Roy, this has strengthened fundamentalism and extremism in two ways. First, for second- and third-generation Muslim immigrants, the practice of Islam is no longer conditioned and moderated by local custom. It is possible to seek a global and more radical form of the creed. Second, radical religious narratives can offer alienated and uprooted youth an ideological purpose that may be otherwise lacking in their lives. For Roy, the rise of fundamentalism and extremism in secular societies such as France and Great Britain is inextricably linked to this deterritorialization of Islam. Others disagree, however, arguing that the deterritorialization of Islam may mean that the experience of Islam as a minority can lead to peaceful religious competition that may deepen and strengthen democracy, similar to the historical experience of other religious communities (especially Catholic and Protestant communities).[32]

One way or the other, the experience of Muslims in Europe raises important questions, including how to effectively integrate Muslims into European society so they do not become radicalized, and how Europe may be able to use its experience to assist in engaging Muslim communities and Muslim majority states. It also raises questions for U.S.–Europe relations. How closely should the U.S. government cooperate with European nations in engaging religious communities internationally? Given that the United States and European nations have different strengths and weaknesses on this issue, how can these be managed in the context of the transatlantic alliance?[33]

4. Religion is playing an important public role where governments lack capacity and legitimacy in periods of economic and political stress.

The contemporary age is defined in part by weak, failing, and failed states. Such states can threaten the West—as well as their own citi-

31. Olivier Roy, *Globalized Islam: The Search for a New Ummah* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004).

32. See Thomas F. Farr, "Diplomacy in an Age of Faith," *Foreign Affairs (*March–April 2008): 110-124; and "Islam's Way to Freedom," *First Things (*November 2008), http://www.firstthings.com/article/2008/10/002-islams-way-to-freedom-22. Also, for contrasting views on this point, see chapters by Bassam Tibi, Karen Armstrong, and Maajid Nawaz in *Debating the War of Ideas,* ed. Eric D. Patterson and John P. Gallagher (New York: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2009).

33. The Chicago Council on Global Affairs will be publishing a paper on this topic in the summer of 2010.

zens and neighbors—not least by their inability to prevent terrorists from operating on their territory and by their failure to provide a political space for religious actors to counter extremist religious ideologies. Owing to their inability to provide adequate public health infrastructures and domestic stability, such states become havens for insurgents and extremists. Somalia is a clear instance of this pattern. Pakistan has also fallen into this category as the government struggles to exert its authority, as has Yemen.

Religious institutions, because of their structure and experience, can and often will fill the vacuum created by the absence, erosion, or collapse of state authority over some or all of its territory. As the state retreats or flounders, people often rely on alternative means of service delivery. Some of these means are traditional, tried, and tested, whereas others are new—whether it is law and order, education, sanitation, or health care. Sometimes, the advances made internationally in these areas can adversely affect the ability of local governments to keep up with prevailing international standards. To take one example, the high cost of medicine, which governments cannot afford, offers an opportunity for religious institutions to provide medical services and to also offer spiritual healing.[34] The provision of health care is a key strength of religious institutions in Africa and some parts of the Middle East.

Religious institutions also have an advantage in that they often work from the ground up, not from the top down. This has been particularly apparent in conflict zones, including those of strategic importance to the United States. Following America's initial defeat of the Taliban in Afghanistan in 2001-02, an international conference in Bonn created a "Judicial Commission," whose role was "to rebuild the domestic justice system in accordance with Islamic principles, international standards, the rule of law, and Afghan legal traditions." Responsibility was assigned to Italy, which set about creating a new legal system.

Unfortunately, locals saw few signs of progress on the ground. The planners had failed to engage the relevant range of Afghans, including Muslims and tribal leaders who represented the various elements of the complex array of courts and processes that constitute the local justice system in Afghanistan. All the more regrettable was the fact that some of the religious leaders were open to

34. Philip Jenkins, "Mapping the Global Future: Global Trends Through 2025" (working paper, 2009).

the adoption of democratic and liberal norms.[35] Meanwhile, nineteen Taliban-run Sharia courts sprang up in Southern Afghanistan to fill the gap. These courts impose the harsher elements of Sharia law with often horrific consequences, but they also deal in property disputes and the codes of conduct governing everyday normal life. The Taliban's local presence proved more adept and stable than the official state. In the absence of competitors to the Taliban's distorted and destructive expression of local Islam, their brand of so-called justice went unchallenged.[36]

Finally, religious institutions tend to be more durable competitors to the state than other nonstate actors are. In particular, religious institutions, as a result of their endurance and credibility with people they have served for generations, are often a tougher opponent of authoritarian regimes than secular dissidents. Killing or imprisoning Catholic priests and Buddhist monks can carry heavy consequences. Regimes that attack religious figures and institutions risk both overt and subtle forms of resistance and retaliation. In many societies the attempt to desecrate holy ground or humiliate religious leaders carries the onus of taboo—a form of shame for the perpetrators that also resonates internationally. Even dictators who scorn such tokens of legitimacy worry about radicalizing their enemies and provoking a counterrevolution inspired by the cult of the holy martyrs they have helped to create.

Driven by the force of such dynamics, religious institutions possess the internal resources, a capacity for popular mobilization, and the moral legitimacy to provide a viable alternative to a state that fails to live up to its obligations. As states come under increasing pressure, religious institutions will likely become even more pivotal.

5. Religion is often used by extremists as a catalyst for conflict and a means of escalating tensions.

Religious actors also inspire or legitimate violent conflict by framing it as an act of justice. Most infamous is the case of al Qaeda, whose appropriation of Islamic teachings for purposes of terrorism, while repudiated by the vast majority of Muslims, is nonetheless a source

35. J Alexander Their, "Reestablishing the Judicial System in Afghanistan," Working Paper 19, Center on Democracy, Development, and the Rule of Law, Stanford University (September 2004).

36. See Thomas F. Farr, *World of Faith and Freedom: Why International Religious Liberty is Vital to American National Security* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 3-7, 9.

of conflict that cannot be reduced merely to mundane political, economic, or territorial ambitions. Today's wars and conflicts tend not to arise directly from theological disputes within or across religious boundaries. Rather, religion lends a sacred aura and intensity to disputes and campaigns that also have significant secular dimensions. If religion is not everywhere the cause of conflict, it does often change and shape its meanings, patterns, and outcomes. Calls to defend that which is held sacred are increasingly employed as a conflict escalator. Aggressors target holy sites, use religious language to radicalize and mobilize believers, and provoke and seize upon real or perceived religious slights.

There are numerous examples. In 1992 the horrendous riots and communal violence that surrounded the destruction of the Babri Mosque by Hindu nationalist mobs caused 900 deaths in Mumbai alone. The way in which some U.S. evangelicals have introduced a religious framing to the Israeli–Palestinian dispute and used this to argue for a greater Israel has antagonized Muslim communities abroad. In 1994 Baruch Goldstein, an Israeli reserve officer, opened fire inside the Ibrahim Mosque at the Tomb of the Patriarchs in Hebron, killing scores of Muslims during Ramadan. The attack—conducted months after Israeli–Palestinian peace accords were signed on the White House lawn and after some in Israel had argued they would stop the delivery of land they consider their biblical birthright into the hands of the Palestinians—set off protests throughout the Palestinian territories and Arab world and led to some of the bloodiest fighting between Israelis and Palestinians since the 1967 war. Other examples include the murder of the Dutch filmmaker Theo Van Gogh by Mohammed Bouyeri in Amsterdam in 2004, the outrage following publication of cartoons of the Prophet Muhammad in the Danish journal *Jyllands-Posten* in 2005, the bombing of the Samarra Mosque by al Qaeda in Iraq in 2006, and the violent reaction to Pope Benedict XVI's comments about the Prophet Muhammad in a speech at the University of Regensburg in 2006 titled "Faith, Reason, and the University."

In a recent example, legislation was introduced in the fall of 2009 in Uganda—endorsed by senior Ugandan officials—that would impose (1) life in prison for people found to have engaged in homosexual acts, (2) the death penalty for people found to have engaged in homosexual acts who were also HIV positive, and (3) a three-year prison term for people who had knowledge of others engaged in homosexual acts but refused to turn them over to the authorities. Some religious actors have supported this legislation. Others have

severely criticized it as harsh and merciless and utterly contrary to the example of Christ and any notion of human dignity.[37]

All too often, Western powers fail to appreciate the consequences of such actions because the religious resonance is so poorly understood. This ignorance makes the tactic even more effective because it contains the element of surprise. However, Americans can also employ religion in a way that is irresponsible, wrong, and can escalate tensions. For instance, the widely reported remarks in 2004 of Lieutenant General William Boykin that framed the war on terror in sectarian terms served to deepen fault lines between the United States and Muslims. More recently, the Michigan defense contractor Trijicon was revealed to have stamped references to biblical verses on rifles sold to the U.S. government and subsequently used in Iraq, both by U.S. troops and by Iraqi forces trained by the United States. This incident ran a severe risk of escalating tensions between the United States and Muslim nations and placed U.S. troops in danger.[38]

Religion is sometimes employed as a catalyst for conflict escalation because it is a unique instrument of global appeal. Religious identity and affiliation is more transnational and therefore more mobile than identity based on nationality or language. As a result, the clash of religious identities, including conflicts within religions, can play out internationally. The multinational Sunni-Shia rivalry; Hindu-Muslim tensions in India and Pakistan; and disputes among Christians, Muslims, and Jews in the Holy Land are examples.

The transnational nature of religious movements and global, instantaneous, and cheap communications have also allowed extremists to more easily exploit incidents and remarks—once limited to small audiences or local interests—among a wide audience. Extremist leaders watch carefully not just what the United States government does in relation to their country, but what private American citizens say and do in relation to their religious "brethren." As recently as the 1980s, a remark by a U.S. politician to an audience in the American heartland would not spark outrage. But today comments critical of Islam or other religions may be and often are used as recruiting tool by extremists. Local controversies can quickly spiral into international outrage, wielded and exploited for political gain.

37. The Ugandan proposal has been widely and overwhelmingly condemned as hateful and wrong by evangelical, and other religious leaders in the United States.

38. Joseph Rhee, Tahman Bradley, and Brian Ross, "U.S. Military Weapons Inscribed with Secret 'Jesus' Code," *ABC News,* January 18, 2010, http://abcnews.go.com/print?id=9575794.

Since actions often speak louder than words, an outrage such as the prisoner abuse at Abu Ghraib, for example, is instantaneously known and similarly understood by all Muslims, not just Iraqis. An understanding of this appears to have persuaded President Obama not to release additional photos of prisoner abuse out of fear that they would inflame Muslims, empower extremists, and put U.S. forces at greater risk. Increasingly, whether Americans like it or not, the United States is talking, through words and deeds, with global religious communities, not just the states that house them. Consistent messaging becomes more difficult, and hypocrisy carries a higher price.[39]

6. The growing salience of religion today is deepening the political significance of religious freedom as a universal human right and a source of social and political stability.

In Cairo, President Obama proclaimed, "People should be free to choose and live their faith based upon the persuasion of the mind and the heart and the soul." "Freedom of religion" the president added, "is central to the ability of peoples to live together."[40] He noted that intrareligious aggression (e.g., Sunni versus Shia Muslims in Iraq, Catholic versus Protestant Christians in Northern Ireland) as well as interreligious conflict (e.g., Hindus versus Christians in India, Jews versus Muslims in Israel/Palestine) threatens both the autonomy of religious communities and the rights of individuals and communities to worship and practice their religious beliefs as they choose.

The degree and kind of religious freedom practiced in a society—especially the right of religious groups and individuals to advance their values publicly in civil society and political life—is of great importance to fundamental U.S. interests around the world and in the homeland.[41] The 2009 Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life

39. For a detailed treatment of how transnational movements affect the message unity of great powers, see Daniel Nexon and Thomas Wright, "What's at Stake in the Empire Debate," *The American Political Science Review* 101, no. 2 (2007): 253-271.

40. President Barack Obama, "On a New Beginning" (speech, Cairo University, Cairo, Egypt, June 4, 2009).

41. The political scientist Alfred Stepan defines religious freedom as "the minimal boundaries of freedom of action that must somehow be crafted for political institutions vis-a-vis religious authorities and for religious individuals and groups vis-a-vis political institutions." This definition implies both rights and limits: "Religious institutions should not have constitutionally privileged prerogatives that allow them to mandate public policy to democratically elected governments. At the same time, individuals and religious communities … must have complete freedom to worship

report found that the greatest restrictions on religion were in place in the Middle East/North Africa and in South Asia. These restrictions contribute to tensions between religious groups, encompassing countries of considerable strategic importance to the United States such as Afghanistan, Egypt, India, Iran, Iraq, Pakistan, and Yemen.[42]

The status of both majority and minority religious groups is critical, including especially their ability to operate independently of the state; to have access to the public square on the basis of equality with each other and with nonreligious groups; and to be protected from coercion by the state or by other ethnic, nationalist, or religious groups. We know that government regulation of religion can lead to increased persecution and religious violence, forces that increasingly escape confinement within national borders.

In other words, in addition to the moral imperative to advance a universal regime of human rights that includes religious freedom, the United States also faces a political and security imperative.

Because of globalization and heightened religious pluralism and competition, people in more and more parts of the world are enjoying greater opportunity to reflect on their religious beliefs and to shape their own religious identities. At the same time, this has fostered a fear in some quarters that one's own people can be converted by the "other"—a particular fear of religious leaders and communities at a time of such religious upheaval around the world.[43] Such fear has generated support in some countries for laws and regulations restricting religion and religious freedom. According to the aforementioned report by the Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, more than 70 percent of the world's people live in societies in which there are severe government restrictions on religious practice.

A challenge facing our Task Force has been to resolve the tension between (1) our conviction that the United States must foster the legitimate agency and autonomy of every religious community,

---

privately. In addition, as individuals and groups, they must be able to advance their values publicly in civil society and to sponsor organizations and movements in political society as long as their actions do not impinge negatively on the liberties of other citizens or violate democracy and the law." See Alfred Stepan, "Religion, Democracy, and the 'Twin Tolerations,'" in *World Religions and Democracy,* ed. Larry Diamond and others (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005), 3, 11.

42. See Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, "Global Restrictions on Religion," December 2009, http://pewforum.org/newassets/images/reports/restrictions/restrictionsfullreport.pdf.

43. For an account of Sunni fear that Iran is sponsoring a campaign to convert Sunnis to Shiism see Jeffrey Goldberg, "How Iran Could Save the Middle East," *The Atlantic Monthly* (July–August 2009).

whether a national minority or majority, that rejects terrorism and religious intolerance and (2) the concern about undermining our objectives because of the negative connotations the term "religious freedom" inspires among some religious communities, who see it as a code word for American intervention. To resolve this conflict, we must be sure that in the strategy of engagement recommended in the following chapters, we promote genuine religious freedom and its companion religious pluralism in ways that are viewed as promoting the common good and not as a form of imperialism or threat.[44]

This is a crucial task because government violations of religious freedom restrict much more than the freedom to speak about one's own religion, including efforts at conversion, which can be particularly controversial. Governments also restrict the ability of majority as well as minority religious groups to organize publicly, to petition the state with religiously informed moral arguments for laws and policies that reflect religious values and are designed to advance the common good, and to strengthen civil society with faith-based educational institutions, communication networks, political parties, and charitable organizations. Government violations also constrict the ability of religious communities to have free and open debates between different theologies and hence to evolve towards theologies that are more accepting of pluralism, freedom, and democracy. The stifling of such opportunities prepares the ground for religious extremism.[45] The emergence and maturation of democratic Islamic politics, for example, has been retarded in some nations—such as Afghanistan, Algeria, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Pakistan—by the exclusion of some religiously informed arguments, religious actors, and viable parties from the public sphere.

We must understand that in some cases, violence by religious actors is born of frustration with systemic discrimination against and repression of religious organizations and movements that are the people's most trustworthy and responsible advocates for genuine social and economic progress and justice. In combating religious extremism, then, the United States must act with insight and discretion when advancing religious freedom, lest the responsible prosecution of terrorists dissolve into wholesale repression of religious actors, leading to the ironic and unintended consequence of

44. Religious pluralism is characterized by respect for distinct religious communities, active and positive relationships among them and nonreligious communities, and a commitment among all groups to build a healthy, diverse, and shared society.

45. See Daniel Philpott, "Explaining the Political Ambivalence of Religion," *American Political Science Review* 101, no. 3 (2007): 505-525.

deepening the problem of religiously inspired violence. If the United States acts with wisdom and prudence, however, it can advance religious freedom in ways that undermine religious extremism, violence, and terrorism.

Chapter III
Acknowledging Strategic Challenges and Developing a New Path Forward

The greater visibility of religion and religious actors in international politics has greatly complicated America's approach to world affairs. A narrow view of religion in the context of terrorism and counterterrorism strategy will no longer suffice. Instead, religion must be seen as a more profound and encompassing social reality—one that shapes and is shaped by other major transnational phenomena, including violent conflict and war, globalization, and democratization.

Crafting sound policies for understanding and engaging religious communities in this context is a critical task. This chapter focuses on the challenges and dilemmas that this task presents for U.S. policymakers and lays out the beginnings of a comprehensive new approach to religion that emphasizes the building of partnerships with religious communities. This approach has the virtue of acknowledging and taking into account current realities, while building on long-established U.S. doctrine.

Part I: U.S. Strategic Challenges

Strategic Challenge #1: The United States has an interest in religious communities realizing their legitimate aspirations, but must also seek to maintain its strategically important system of bilateral alliances and partnerships.

The foundations of U.S. security policy in the Middle East and Asia include a number of bilateral alliances and relationships, both formal and informal, with key autocratic states, including Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and China as well as struggling democracies like Afghanistan, Iraq, and Pakistan. At the same time, the United States has long supported democratization as a principle of its foreign policy. These two elements—alliances and democratization—are, at times, in conflict. In particular, there is a concern that the introduction of elections in certain countries could result in the empowerment of parties and movements, often defined in religious terms, with an expressed anti-American agenda.

This fear dates back to the 1979 Iranian Revolution, when a popular uprising rejected an autocratic ruler and ushered in an anti-

American religious regime. In part because of this history, when the Islamic Salvation Front (FIS) won a popular election in Algeria in December of 1991, the United States responded sympathetically to the Algerian military's decision to quash the elections. Then assistant secretary of state Edward P. Djerejian made a public speech in which he worried that FIS would cancel future elections if it came to power.[46]

More recently, successive administrations have not stood up for the rights of Islamic parties to stand in elections, arguing that the United States should not interfere in what it deems an "internal matter." The U.S. government broke off contact with Egypt's Muslim Brotherhood in the late 1990s following objections from President Hosni Mubarak's regime. Conversely, the United States has not followed up on its rhetoric to press that regime to move toward democracy. Similarly, some analysts worry that individuals sympathetic to al Qaeda could take advantage of municipal elections in Saudi Arabia and the opening up of the political process elsewhere. In 2003 deputy secretary of defense Paul Wolfowitz suggested that the Turkish military play a more assertive role in reversing the Turkish parliament's decision to withhold support for the impending U.S. invasion of Iraq. Perhaps illustrating this concern most vividly, in January of 2006 Hamas, a terrorist organization under U.S. law, won a majority of seats in the Palestinian parliamentary election. More recently, the Obama administration put off a meeting with the Dalai Lama in a move that was widely perceived as part of an attempt not to annoy the Chinese government.[47]

Previously, the emergence of Islamic political movements encouraged the United States to rely more heavily on its autocratic allies, which in turn can inadvertently strengthen the opposition's base of support and weaken America's legitimacy with Muslim communities. While the United States might be tempted to side with authoritarian regimes against parties with an expressed anti-U.S. agenda, even if that means opposing the introduction of democratic practices, this poses a severe risk to U.S. goals and objectives in the long run by making the United States a partner in the suppression of political and human rights. As the opposition to authoritarianism grows, so too will the suppression. And if such a regime falls, it is likely to be replaced by a government more hostile to the United

46. Nakhleh, *A Necessary Engagement,* 42.

47. John Pomfret, "Obama's Meeting with the Dalai Lama is Delayed: Move Appears to be a Nod Toward the Chinese," *The Washington Post,* October 5, 2009.

States than may otherwise be the case. As former British Prime Minister Tony Blair said, "It is the most dangerous thing imaginable to force people to choose between an undemocratic elite with the right idea and a popular movement with the wrong one."[48]

Strategic Challenge #2: The United States has an interest in promoting human rights, but must do it in a way that is not perceived as a Western assault on local faith and custom.

The United States has historically supported human rights around the world. In some strategically important countries, however, U.S. emphasis on human rights and the advocacy of religious freedom are perceived as part of an "antireligious" (or pro-Christian) and imperialist strategy by Western powers. The official shift in rationale for the invasion of Iraq from preventing Iraqi acquisition of weapons of mass destruction to the promotion of democracy and human rights in the Arab world exacerbated this perception. This was also reinforced by the subsequent retrenchment in the U.S. push for democracy and human rights elsewhere in the Middle East. Occasional ill-considered, inappropriate, and unrepresentative behaviors by overzealous missionaries—a fact that some American Christian leaders have acknowledged with regret—have further contributed to the problem.[49]

Of course, opposition to U.S. human rights policy overseas existed prior to the invasion of Iraq or the misbehavior of a minority of missionaries—and continues to exist independently of these events. Autocratic regimes draw on religion and anti-Western feeling to discredit those who receive active support of the United States. For example, President Bashir of Sudan has been able to use anti-Western sentiment to portray his indictment by the International Criminal Court as a colonial and specifically anti-Muslim act rather than an effort on the part of the international community to punish massive human rights abuses. His efforts largely succeeded—the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), the African Union, and key states subsequently opposed the indictment.

Left unchecked, the inaccurate perception that U.S. promotion of human rights is an imposition of Western imperialism or a

48. Tony Blair, "Faith and Globalization," (speech, The Chicago Council on Global Affairs, Chicago, IL, April 22, 2009).

49. Robert Seiple, "Bible Bombardmen to Incarnational Evangelism: A Reflection on Christian Witness and Persecution," *The Review of Faith and International Affairs* 7, no. 1 (2009).

Christian crusade may prevent the United States from realizing one of the core values of its foreign policy—namely, the promotion of human rights. Even the positive gains already achieved in rights promotion are in jeopardy. Continuing distortion and misunderstanding abroad, fueled in part by a lack of attention or resolve on the part of some policymakers to "get rights right" is likely to heighten tensions between the United States and religious communities. Even more damaging is the opportunity such tensions provide to nefarious actors who seek to manipulate and exploit old fears and memories.

Meanwhile, numerous religious organizations and leaders, including many missionaries, have been strong and effective advocates and champions of human rights, including women's rights, freedom of speech, democracy, and the right of religious freedom, quite independently of the U.S. government.[50] For instance, the American Jewish World Service (AJWS) has a panoply of programs working with women on women's empowerment in settings where this is not a position immediately embraced by other local groups.[51]

The role of women in society is a particularly challenging area. Advancing the equality of women is an important U.S. policy objective. Women remain severely disadvantaged in large parts of the world, suffering under dramatic gender gaps in access to the basic needs of food, water, health care, education, and jobs. These disadvantages are acute in some strongly religious societies. As with its impact on social conditions, religion can be both a means of improving the lives of women and a barrier to that improvement.[52] Faith-based organizations such as AJWS, Catholic Relief Services, World Vision, and Islamic Relief, along with local religious communities, actively promote the advancement of women's rights by educating girls, reducing domestic violence, and other means. But the advancement of rights can also challenge existing social structures, local traditions, and religious traditions.

---

50. Robert D. Woodberry and Timothy S. Shah, "The Pioneering Protestants," in *World Religions and Democracy,* ed. Larry Diamond, Marc A. Plattner, and Philip J. Costopoulosl (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005), 117-131.

51. The American Jewish World Service (AJWS) currently supports over one hundred women's empowerment initiatives in twenty-seven countries. Through grants and capacity-building support, AJWS enables project partners to train marginalized women and girls to advocate for their rights; provide women with skills and means to become financially independent; combat discrimination and gender-based violence; and establish a voice in their homes, communities, and societies so they too can be decision makers and policymakers.

52. Katherine Marshall, "Faith, Gender, and International Affairs" (working paper, August 2009).

While issues surrounding women's rights spark controversy within many religious traditions, the internationalization of the drive for the equality of women has helped to build a constructive, inclusive dialogue about how to reconcile social change with religious sensibilities. Religious communities play an increasingly important role in this dialogue, and most contain the theological resources to defend and advance the equality of women. But tensions and barriers remain. Again, the United States must take great care in how it goes about promoting women's rights in order to facilitate rather than undermine this effort.

The challenge for the United States is to understand and present human rights as a global rather than a solely Western value. Communities and cultures around the world, each in their own ways, have the potential to affirm the canon of human rights and recognize it as their own. Accordingly, the United States must recognize that human rights can be implemented effectively and robustly only in a manner consistent with different traditions and beliefs. As with other challenging issues addressed in this report, constructive engagement and dialogue with local religious leaders is a promising way forward. These religious leaders can credibly and convincingly promote human rights, equality, justice, and democracy in their homelands. In order to do so, however, they must have religious freedom.

Strategic Challenge #3: While debates inside religious communities have a bearing on the wider world, including the United States, outsiders often lack the standing to influence them.

Religions are not monolithic, nor are the political movements they inspire. Frequently, the fissures within these religions are more important than the relationship between the religion's formal leadership and the United States. For example, it is now commonplace to argue that the rise of al Qaeda is a consequence of an ideological civil war within Islam or that the Shia revival in the Middle East is an historic phenomenon with causes and momentum internal to the Muslim world.[53] Similarly, one can point to competition among Protestant churches, between Protestant churches and the Catholic Church in Latin America and Africa, or between Haredi Jews and mainstream religious political parties in Israel. Some scholars have

53. See Eric D. Patterson and John P. Gallagher, eds. *Debating the War of Ideas* (New York: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2009).

noticed subtle or dramatic shifts toward orthodoxy within all of the world's major religions.[54]

The United States has a profound interest in the outcome of some of these debates. Internal divisions within Hinduism in India and within Islam in Pakistan, for example, have enormous implications for relations between those two nuclear powers. Americans suffered when al Qaeda's violent extremism spilled over into the continental United States on September 11, 2001, in globally televised terrorist acts designed to "awaken" politically somnolent fellow Muslims in support of a murderous terrorist campaign expressed as a "defensive jihad."[55] Religious Zionist Jews are at odds with the rapidly growing population of Haredi Jews regarding the religious meaning and destiny of the state of Israel—an internal struggle not without consequences for U.S.–Israel relations. The peculiar strain of religious extremism and anti-Semitism represented by Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad has profoundly shaped America and the world's perception of the threat posed by Iran's pursuit of nuclear weapons technologies.

However, the United States often lacks the capacity to understand even the broad contours of such debates, much less the subtleties and nuances of religious history, theological argument, and cultural context. Furthermore, when the United States unwisely involves itself in these debates by naively weighing in on theological arguments when it lacks the expertise and the means to do so or by publicly supporting sympathetic clerics, the results can be counterproductive. Individuals and groups identified as "moderates" are

54. See Dean Kelley, *Why Conservative Churches are Growing: A Study in Sociology of Religion* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1996); Lynn Davidman, *Tradition in a Rootless World: Women Turn to Orthodox Judaism* (Berkley: University of California Press, 1993); Gilles Kepel, *The Revenge of God: The Resurgence of Islam, Christianity, and Judaism in the Modern World* (University Park, PA: Penn State Press, 1994). In addition, the five-volume *Fundamentalism Project* (The University of Chicago Press: 1991-1995), edited by Martin E. Marty and R. Scott Appleby, charted the growth of "neoorthodox"movements whose claims to be orthodox or conservative are sharply contested by fellow believers and by many scholars.

55. Al Qaeda's war against the United States is not a defensive jihad despite its effort to frame it as such. Classical Islam allows for "defensive jihad" if Islam as a religion and territory is under attack. However, such a jihad must be declared by qualified political and theological authorities. According to classical Islamic jurisprudence, neither Osama bin Laden nor Ayman al-Zawahiri are qualified to declare jihad and therefore such declarations are considered by contemporary Muslim scholars and theologians null and void. See M. Cherif Bassiouni's "Evolving Approaches to Jihad: From Self-Defense to Revolutionary and Regime Change Political Violence," *Chicago Journal of International Law* 8, no. 1 (2007).

then vulnerable to being regarded by their communities as lackeys of the United States.

The key challenge for the United States is to act in a way that is both decisive and prudent, developing the means to assist those whose ideas it supports without tainting them by association with actions perceived as hostile or offensive to a given religious tradition. The idea of the Hippocratic Oath applies: "First, do no harm." In other words, the United States must find indirect ways of supporting a constructive debate within strategically important, religiously influenced societies.[56]

Part II: A New U.S. Strategy

How can the United States develop a new strategy to help navigate these complex, value-based dilemmas successfully? Historically, the objective of U.S. policy has been the pursuit of a world environment that is open, prosperous, and free, where the American system can survive and flourish.[57] The promotion of an open global economy, democracy, and human rights are policy pillars in this pursuit. While American policy has enjoyed many successes—the world's great powers are at peace, tens of millions of people have been lifted out of poverty the world over, communications are now accessible to billions of people—it has not eliminated conflict or devastating regional and intrastate wars. New dangers have emerged as others have faded away; ancient pathologies have reappeared. We now worry about ethnic conflict, failed states, catastrophic terrorism, massive abuses of human rights, and a breakdown of the global economic system. Religion is an important part of this world—it has contributed to the threats and challenges, but it also offers new resources and partners to tackle them.

The broad strategic imperative now is for the U.S. government to understand the first-order importance of religion and craft policies that promote religion's positive dimensions and resist its negative manifestations. In particular, the United States must reach out to religious actors, organizations, and communities that can be partners in promoting stability and reconciliation in societies divided by ethnic or political conflict, in fostering enterprise and economic

56. See David Saperstein, "The Children of Abraham at a Time of Crisis: Challenges and Opportunities" (keynote address, Children of Abraham: A Trialogue of Civilizations, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, October 23, 2007).

57. Ernest May, ed., *American Cold War Strategy: Interpreting NSC 68* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1993), 40.

growth, and in diffusing and marginalizing those who seek to use religion to justify armed conflict, terrorism, and other forms of violence. Religious contributions to conflict mediation, open political debate, intercultural dialogue, and the search for common ground in a religiously plural setting will help enormously to build the social and cultural infrastructure necessary to give life to universal principles of justice, fairness, human and civil rights, gender equality, economic opportunity, and the rule of law.

Pursuing an indirect approach

How should the United States go about achieving these strategic objectives? Over the past decade, Americans have learned the hard way the limitations of imposing change on foreign societies from the outside. Using diplomatic and military pressure to compel governments to change their ways has some utility, but it also has its drawbacks. External pressure can have unintended consequences. In authoritarian regimes, the United States will face active, thinking, and resourceful opponents that will do everything they can to blunt the effectiveness of U.S. initiatives. If a regime is deposed, other problems may ensue. Moreover, many religious communities do not trust the U.S. government, and overcoming such distrust will require a wisely crafted strategy. In addition, the United States will continue to do and say things that alienate key religious communities, and on many occasions will do so knowingly (e.g., with rergard to women's rights issues).

There will always be a place for direct pressure—for example, in the form of foreign assistance, a response to human rights abuses, or economic incentives. However, prioritizing a strategy of engaging religious communities from below, accentuated but not driven by government-to-government diplomacy, offers better prospects of success. By working with religious communities on issues such as defining justice and the common good or on quality-of-life issues such as health care, education, and environmental stewardship—and by supporting their freedom to address such issues precisely in their capacity as religious actors—the United States would enhance their active participation as constructive change agents in their own societies. Over time, as religious communities play even greater roles in the positive transformation of their societies, the importance of vital and autonomous religious agency will become more visible, pronounced, and politically consequential.

By being on the right side of the historic struggle for freedom and justice, the United States would only improve the quality of its relationships with these religiously vibrant societies. As we describe in the next chapter, in order to pursue this indirect strategy the United States should build, cultivate, and rely upon networks and partnerships with religious communities. The degree and kind of such engagement, of course, will vary according to the circumstances. In each case, however, government officials should listen carefully to these networks, even when their views appear to be contrary to our own, and develop the capacity to engage them with respect and effectiveness.

A key characteristic of an indirect strategy is avoidance, where possible, of direct application of military, diplomatic, and political power to compel change. Instead, the U.S. government—and its partners operating from nongovernmental sectors such as higher education and business—should concentrate on creating a structural environment that will ultimately bring about the desired ends.[58]

A strategy of engagement would require the United States to identify, consolidate, and expand the common ground it shares with religious communities. Over time, this strategy should greatly reduce the probability that the growth in influence of religious communities will collide with America's interests and values. Indeed, opportunities should emerge for mutually beneficial cooperation.

Building partnerships and networks

The core objective of religious engagement is to build partnerships and networks with religious communities that will increase in value over the long run. We define a partnership as a relationship that the U.S. government has with actors in foreign religious communities, while a network can consist of links between nongovernmental or subgovernmental actors and their counterparts in foreign religious communities. Partnerships and networks are quite different from an alliance, which is an arrangement between two or more states to cooperate on an area of mutual interest. America tends to have long-standing alliances that are carefully nurtured and deepened over time. Partnerships and networks deepen understanding between actors that may otherwise be wary of each other. They may result

58. In certain circumstances the United States will need to use military power against extremists who use violence to promote their objectives. However, this should be used sparingly as a last resort and should be part of and consistent with a broader political strategy of engaging religious communities to isolate extremism.

in cooperation, but that is not the only metric by which to judge them.[59] Promoting mutual understanding and respect will, over the long term, lead to greater success in protecting American interests.

In addition, well-developed partnerships and networks based on hard-earned trust and confidence will enable the advancement of shared interests and objectives, which may include the effective deployment of foreign assistance, the development of stable democracies that resist extremism, the building of healthy and mutually beneficial relationships with other countries, and the promotion of human rights. Partnerships and networks can also help act as "shock absorbers," whereby local groups work with the United States to prevent the manipulation or abuse of religion to escalate conflict or tensions. For example, engaging local partners may have helped U.S. forces limit the political damage caused by the 2006 bombing of the Samarra Mosque in Iraq. Moreover, working with and listening to local religious communities can help the United States avoid actions that would cause offense to reasonable people or give legitimacy to extremists.

Developing partnerships and networks also means reaching out to leaders and stakeholders in foreign religious communities, whether they share interests and values with the United States, remain neutral, or even are hostile. It also means that the United States must have the courage to risk alienating governments that attempt to control every aspect of their citizens' relationships with outsiders, often under the broad cloak of "national security and sovereignty."

At the same time, the U.S. government must also have the prudence to know when *not* to take this risk. Despite the fact that territorial borders are not the obstacle to innovative people-to-people collaboration that they once were, no nation-state has abandoned the principle of state sovereignty. Careful thought must therefore be given to the principles guiding such sensitive engagement with nongovernmental actors in foreign nations. In many cases such engagement has been and will continue to be the responsibility of nonstate, nongovernmental actors from the United States—universities, private foundations, businesses, and the like. If a policy of constructive engagement must necessarily be multisectoral, it must also be coordinated and coherent across sectors. Only the government can set the tone and take the lead in this coordinating enterprise.

59. Andrew Shearer and Thomas Wright, "The Obama Administration's Approach to Alliances and Partnerships" (working paper).

For instance, how might the United States open a channel with representatives from the Muslim Brotherhood who already have an electoral mandate? The purpose would be to reach out broadly so that some of these relationships bear fruit over time and to discern which elements of the Muslim Brotherhood are interested in moving away from extremism. In each case close attention must be given to identifying (when appropriate), training, and tasking the appropriate American interlocutors/sectors for such an assignment. In certain cases it will not matter whether the American partners are direct or indirect representatives of the United States—the governments will object, perhaps strenuously, to any such "intervention." Nonetheless the United States should seek to increase its engagement with these groups when and where possible.[60] In addition, while relationships may start out focused on a specific issue such as environmental protection, they may also mature into something broader at a later stage. Capacity in one area can be fungible enough to provide capacity in another.

The United States should not seek to control these networks and partnerships. Indeed, their inherent value is that they are unequivocally indigenous and autonomous. The purpose is greater understanding and the identification of shared interests, values, and perspectives. Networks and partnerships can provide the United States with local knowledge and expertise of foreign societies that it sorely lacks and would be hard to develop independently in the short to medium term.

Communicating effectively

One of the most important things the United States must do is learn how to communicate effectively. This includes listening to what its religious counterparts say about how to promote understanding, rights, and matters of common interest. On occasion it may be appropriate to follow up with direct action such as an official statement or diplomatic representation, but on other occasions it may be best to stay out of the way.

In developing its own communications, the United States must not deliver a Madison Avenue–style advertising campaign in foreign countries extolling the virtues of the American way of life. It must instead develop a comprehensive communications strategy built

60. One approach, which would work in Egypt although not with the Falun Gong in China, is to meet with all parliamentarians, including those in parties like the Muslim Brotherhood, as long as they meet the criteria outlined in Chapter IV.

around actions that support "the message" and facilitated by the sophisticated use of so-called new media.

Since actions speak louder than words, the success of any communications will be measured by the behavior that backs them up. For example, when he assumed command of the U.S. war effort in Afghanistan, General Stanley McChrystal stated at the U.S. Senate confirmation hearings that "one of the most dangerous enemies we face" is adverse perceptions of the United States caused by civilian casualties. He subsequently designed a change in strategy to make the reduction of civilian casualties the U.S. military's top priority in the war.[61] General McChrystal understood that Afghans pay more attention to U.S. actions than to statements or television advertisements that have little connection to the situation on the ground.

To take another example, U.S. statements in support of engaging with political Islamic groups and leaders are taken more seriously when backed by credible action. President Bush's decision to appoint an envoy to the OIC, for example, was a very important first step and conveys seriousness in engaging the Muslim world. The next challenge will be for the United States to appoint a person who can intimately understand the debates he or she will be responsible for following. In addition, the United States can demonstrate a commitment to addressing others' concerns about globalization and help to alleviate those concerns by expanding consultations with NGOs—including religious organizations—at meetings of multilateral organizations. Ensuring actions are as consistent with rhetoric as reasonably as possible is a crucial element of a successful strategy.

61. General Stanley McChrystal, testimony before the U.S. Senate, June 2, 2009.

Chapter IV
Religious Engagement—Recommendations

President Obama's speech in Cairo and his earlier address in Ankara presage what the members of this Task Force hope will be a dramatic shift in U.S. foreign policy. For too long religion, religious groups, and religious ideas have been viewed as inconveniences or as epiphenomenal to other more important political phenomena. This has unnecessarily hamstrung the United States, blinded it to opportunities, and prevented it from anticipating future challenges. This chapter offers principles and guidelines for moving forward.

Religious engagement rests on two basic assumptions. First, religion should not be approached as only a "problem" that needs to be fixed, but also as a set of beliefs and values that offers opportunities for enhanced dialogue and peaceful coexistence. Just as an unwavering, absolute commitment to one's faith can lead to extremism and be a source of division, so can it also be a powerful force for freedom, justice, and liberation.[62] President Obama acknowledged this potential during his speeches in Ankara and Cairo. Focusing specifically on Muslim communities, he stated clearly that "our partnership with the Muslim world is critical not just in rolling back the violent ideologies that people of all faiths reject, but also to strengthen opportunity for all its people."

Second, religion should not be treated or appear to be treated instrumentally. In other words, we should not try or be widely perceived as trying to manipulate religion in pursuit of a narrowly drawn set of interests. There is, in short, an important difference between engaging religion and manipulating it. Constructive change occurs through the former, not the latter. An exclusive focus on religious extremism is precisely the wrong approach because it leads to an anxious, crisis-driven attempt to change religious culture "from outside." Religion's presence in people's lives is more pervasive and complicated than such an approach allows. As we have emphasized, religion informs the norms and values around which societies are constructed. It is a force that motivates and mobilizes people. It cannot be coerced, but it can be engaged.

The Task Force recommendations for engaging religion fall into two main categories: (1) steps that can be taken inside the United

62. R. Scott Appleby, *The Ambivalence of the Sacred: Religion, Violence, and Reconciliation* (Lanham, MD: Rowan & Littlefield, 2000), 5-7.

States to build the capacity to engage with religious communities and (2) guidelines for using this capacity effectively.

Part I: Building Internal Capacity to Engage Religion Overseas

Over the past decade, the United States has learned some hard lessons. A series of terrorist acts beginning in the 1980s and culminating in the catastrophic attacks of September 11 taught the intelligence community the importance of understanding extreme religious ideologies. The U.S. Army and Marine Corps came to understand the importance of religious actors in Iraq and Afghanistan as they sought to stop the bleeding and reverse a failing strategy that ignored the unique political and cultural characteristics of those societies. The State Department began to focus on engaging Muslim communities to address increasing anti-Americanism in the Muslim world. And, USAID found that it was important to engage faith-based organizations at home and overseas to more effectively deploy aid.

How can the United States, itself a deeply religious country, build the internal capacity to acquire practical knowledge about the role of religion in international affairs, thus avoiding the painful process of trial and error that has cost so much in recent years? What are the steps that can be taken now to institutionalize the hard lessons already learned? What part of the U.S. government should take the lead role in this effort? The following recommendations address these questions.

Establish religious engagement within the government bureaucracy.

The U.S. effort to engage religious communities must be broad and deep. The United States must expand its definition of engagement and empower a larger number of government departments—including those outside of what is normally thought of as the national security and foreign policy realm—to engage with religious leaders and organizations on issues defining their societies. The Task Force recommends that the effort to address the role of religion in world affairs be directed by the National Security Council (NSC), which will serve as the guardian of this issue and the definer of the strategic parameters of engagement. Engaging religious communities requires the active involvement and commitment of the president, and the NSC is the only agency in the U.S. government that has the

authority and influence to ensure that the strategy is coordinated across all government departments and that presidential goals do not fall victim to parochial interests and concerns.

The State Department and USAID have critical roles to play, but so too do the intelligence community, the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Energy, the Department of Education, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Justice, among others. Likewise, integrating religious factors into U.S. foreign policy will require active involvement from Congress. Specific initiatives are described in the next section. Such efforts need to be coordinated and strategic, utilizing all aspects of U.S. capabilities and influence to redefine the nature of America's engagement with religious communities.

In addition to broad governmental engagement, the effort must also include nongovernmental actors—including development agencies, foundations, think tanks, and educational institutions—which are better placed to carry out certain tasks. These tasks include establishing relationships with controversial religious parties and facilitating fruitful intrareligious debates. An approach of this kind would ensure widespread "ownership" of a national engagement effort throughout the nongovernmental sector as well as the U.S. government, coordinated by the NSC.

The Task Force also recommends that the United States mandate that its ambassadors engage religious communities. This aligns with a major recommendation made by former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright in her book *The Mighty and the Almighty:*

> "In the future, no American ambassador should be assigned to a country where religious feelings are strong unless he or she has a deep understanding of the faiths commonly practiced there. Ambassadors and their representatives, wherever they are assigned, should establish relationships with local religious leaders. The State Department should hire or train a core of specialists in religion to be deployed both in Washington and in key embassies overseas."[63]

As a first step, the United States could appoint a distinguished American Muslim as ambassador or special envoy to the Organization

63. Madeleine Albright, *The Mighty and the Almighty* (New York: Harper Collins, 2006), 75-76.

of Islamic Conference (OIC).[64] President Bush was the first to appoint a U.S. envoy to the OIC, but that appointment lapsed with the end of his administration. Replacing the envoy with a well-respected and learned ambassador, preferably a Muslim American with direct access to the president and secretary of state, among others, would signal America's seriousness in engaging Islam and give some permanence to the position. This post would be in addition to the existing position of special representative to Muslim Communities at the State Department.

In addition to serving as the U.S. representative to the OIC, the ambassador would attend religious dialogue conferences (such as those held in recent years in Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Spain, and Turkey as well as holy sites like Mecca that are closed to non-Muslims), serve as the official U.S. spokesperson on Islamic issues and U.S.-Muslim relations, and work with U.S. ambassadors to individual Muslim countries. A respected ambassador could contribute to the broad religious discussions occurring across the globe and engage in serious dialogue with credible religious leaders in the Muslim world. Such a representative would also provide the secretary of state, along with others in the administration such as the ambassador for international religious freedom, with the capacity to better understand how ideas being debated abroad might impact American interests both positively and negatively. A robust vetting process is required to ensure that this individual is qualified to both understand religious debates and to advance American interests.

The United States should also ensure that ambassadors to countries where religion plays a significant role—for example in Afghanistan, Brazil, China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Kenya, Malaysia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and the Vatican—have the standing and expertise (either themselves or in-house) necessary to effectively engage religious communities. Senior and respected presidential envoys could be appointed to engage with religious leaders that are not covered by existing ambassadorial appointments.

64. On February 13, 2010, after the Task Force had finished its deliberations, President Obama announced the appointment of a special envoy, Rashad Hussain, to the OIC. This is an important next step in the engagement of Muslim communities and Muslim majority states.

Provide mandatory training for government officials on the role of religion in world affairs.

The United States will be able to effectively engage religious communities only if it puts in place the structures and requirements that will enable officers in the Foreign Service, military, and development sectors to be trained and educated about the role of religion in world affairs. Courses and seminars should include a comprehensive introduction to the varied ways that religion shapes political culture and informs political life; case studies illustrating patterns by which religious symbols, doctrines, rituals, and ethics together constitute a distinctive "logic" according to which religious actors perceive and approach issues ranging from women's rights and health care to security and the meanings of justice; and how this kind of knowledge serves the goal of effective U.S. engagement. Language instruction and cultural immersion is a critical element of any such training program, particularly for officials who may serve in the field and are engaged in analysis of religious and cultural trends.[65]

As a parallel track toward pursuing practical religious literacy, both U.S. governmental offices and nongovernmental institutions should create or reform existing international exchange programs. The new or newly expanded programs of interaction—at home and abroad—between U.S. and foreign political, civic, and business leaders should prominently include meetings and dialogue between religious leaders and other representatives of religious communities from the United States, the Middle East, Latin America, Africa, and Asia. Such programs play a crucial role in improving mutual understanding and awareness.

Unfortunately, the United States thus far has been reluctant to adopt a proactive approach to becoming religiously aware. Former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright has made this point numerous times in interviews, stating, "Diplomats trained in my era were taught not to invite trouble. And no subject seemed more inherently treacherous than religion."[66] As she noted, this had a real impact:

65. The shortcomings of the U.S. government's language training are described in a forthcoming General Accounting Office (GAO) report. For a description of the report's findings, see Josh Rogin, "GAO Report Finds State Department Language Skills Dangerously Lacking," *The Cable,* September 22 2009, http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2009/09/22/exclusive_gao_report_finds_state_department_language_skills_dangerously_lacking.

66. Madeline Albright, interview by Bob Abernethy, "Madeline Albright: The Intersection of Religion and Foreign Policy," *PBS,* May 19, 2006. See also Peter Steinfels, "Madeline Albright, the Cardinal?" *The New York Times,* May 6, 2006.

> "When I was secretary of state, I had an entire bureau of economic experts I could turn to and a cadre of experts on nonproliferation and arms control … With the notable exception of Ambassador [for international religious freedom] Robert Seiple, I did not have similar expertise available for integrating religious principles into our efforts at diplomacy. Given the nature of today's world, knowledge of this type is essential."[67]

Secretary Albright's insight is also shared by Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, who cautioned: "Never neglect the psychological, cultural, political, and human dimensions of warfare, which is inevitably tragic, inefficient, and uncertain."[68]

The successes of religious engagement to date have been largely the result of individual insight and initiative rather than institutional guidance. In other words, it has been entirely ad hoc. Owing to his own faith, former U.S. ambassador to Qatar Joseph Ghougassian was religiously sensitive, but unaware of religious trends in Qatar until he arrived there. He recalls:

> "I believed it was my duty as the American ambassador … to promote the values of religious tolerance and freedom even though the Department of State had not directed me to do so … I had spent two months in consultations in the Department of State prior to arriving in Qatar, and the lack of religious freedom had never been hinted at."

At the time, Qatar allowed no religious practice within its borders other than Islam—not even for foreign nationals and diplomats. "The crux of the matter," Ambassador Ghougassian continues, "was how to change the minds and hearts of the Qatari officials without offending their sensitivities and sensibilities … I would not act as a colonial agent, but rather … with humility, astuteness, and in total friendship with my interlocutors." The ambassador promoted many of America's ideals and interests in Qatar, developing personal relationships with key figures in the government. Ultimately, the government allowed Christian worship services, and today, two decades later, religious toleration is enshrined in Qatar's constitution.[69]

---

67. Albright, *The Mighty and the Almighty,* 75.

68. Robert Gates, quoted in Thom Shanker, "Defense Chief Criticizes Bureaucracy at the Pentagon," *The New York Times,* September, 29 2008.

69. Joseph Ghougassian, *The Knight and the Falcon: The Coming of Christianity in Qatar, A Muslim Nation* (Escondido, CA: Lukas and Son, 2008).

Ambassador Ghougassian's experience should be the norm, not the exception. Institutionalizing religious literacy in State Department, military, and USAID training programs would go some way in ensuring that the United States is properly equipped to understand the factors that shape and drive behavior in foreign societies in the coming decades.

Take steps to integrate and nurture the skills and expertise of military veterans and civilians returning from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

As Thomas Friedman observed, the past eight years "have left us with a deep cadre of officers with experience in Iraq and Afghanistan, now running both wars—from generals to captains. They know every mistake that has been made; been told every lie; saw their own soldiers killed by stupidity; figured out solutions; and built relationships with insurgents, sheikhs, and imams on the ground that have given the best of them a granular understanding of the real Middle East that would rival any Middle East studies professor."[70]

Over the next few years, war veterans—both military and civilian—and civilians with field experience from nongovernmental organizations should be encouraged to develop their expertise through higher education or enter government and other forms of service to develop and make use of their practical knowledge. Although this expertise has come at a tremendous cost, it is a welcome development and a tremendous opportunity to build capacity inside and outside the government on religious and cultural matters. The follow-up education of military and civilian veterans of recent wars and their integration into positions of influence could transform both the government and the academy in profound and constructive ways.

As Marc Lynch, head of the Middle East Program at George Washington University, put it:

> "Many will [and do] enter their programs with far more advanced language skills than did earlier generations of students, although perhaps with more familiarity with colloquial spoken dialects than with Modern Standard Arabic [reversing a common traditional pattern]. Their point of reference will be [and is] Iraq and the Gulf, not Israeli-

70. Thomas Friedman, "The Class Too Dumb to Quit," *The New York Times,* July 21, 2009.

> Palestinian affairs, Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, or other areas where a great number of current faculty began their encounters with the region. And they will have much greater familiarity and comfort with military and security issues than do many currently in the field."[71]

It is absolutely vital that the lived experiences and practical knowledge of these veterans be drawn out, conceptualized, and shared with other students of the cultural and religious dimensions of contemporary foreign engagement. The U.S. government and institutions of higher education should partner in this effort through the provision of federal grants, scholarships, financial aid, and curriculum development.

Clarify the Applicability of the Establishment Clause.[72]

The conduct of U.S. foreign policy is complicated by questions surrounding the relevance and applicability of the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. These questions must be resolved if the crucial task of developing strategies to engage religion is to move forward.

Within the United States, the Establishment Clause prohibits a range of interactions between government and religion, including

- the fusion of religious and government authority;
- the disbursement of government aid on the basis of religious criteria;
- government approval of or preference for particular religions;
- government adjudication of theological controversies.

It is unclear, however, whether and how these domestic nonestablishment constraints apply to U.S. foreign policy. There are reasonable arguments that the clause imposes significant limits on the conduct of foreign policy, and there are equally reasonable argu-

71. Marc Lynch, "Will the Iraq war change how scholars study the Middle East?" *Foreign Policy Blog,* July 29, 2009, http://lynch.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2009/07/29/the_future_of_middle_east_studies.

72. A dissent to this recommendation and a response to that dissent can be found on pages 83-34 at the end of this report.

ments that it imposes only relatively narrow limits that have little or no practical effect on the policies recommended in this report.

There is a general assumption that the Constitution and Bill of Rights (including, presumably, the Establishment Clause) apply to most U.S. government action abroad. Moreover, the Supreme Court treats the Establishment Clause, unlike other provisions of the Bill of Rights, as a structural limitation on government that is not subject to a balancing of interests. This conception of the clause, in turn, suggests that it should apply regardless of whether the government acts domestically or overseas. Yet, the conduct of foreign policy is informed by important and often vital U.S. interests such as national security, which further suggests that normal assumptions about nonestablishment constraints may not apply and that apparently absolute structural constraints must be balanced by the weighty interests at stake in the conduct of foreign policy.

Similarly, there is little doubt that those who drafted and ratified the clause were principally concerned with government support or favoritism of particular religions within the United States, which suggests that it was not meant to apply to relations with foreign countries. On the other hand, the founders were unquestionably concerned about preventing all federal religious establishments, even if they may not have thought about such establishments in the context of foreign policy. Globalization, moreover, means that many interactions of government with religion overseas may well strengthen the power or influence of particular religions within the United States in violation of domestic Establishment Clause norms.[73]

The legal uncertainty created by these conflicting arguments is exacerbated by a dearth of judicial authority, together with factors that are likely to prevent the courts from resolving or addressing them. The Supreme Court has never ruled on whether or how the clause applies to foreign policy, and the very few relevant lower court opinions are narrow or inconclusive.[74] Additionally, political practices and procedural limitations such as congressional deference to the executive branch's conduct of foreign policy,[75] justiciability-

73. For example, foreign aid disbursed outside the United States through or to religions that have a presence within the United States may well strengthen the social and political standing of those religions within the United States.

74. See, for example, *Lamont v. Woods,* 948 F.2d 825, 832 (2nd Cir. 1991); *Dickson v. Ford,* 521 F.2d 234, 236 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied,* 424 U.S. 954 (1975).

75. See *United States v. Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.,* 299 U.S. 304, 319 (1936). This suggests that federal power to conduct foreign affairs is vested in the executive branch, largely beyond the supervisory control of Congress.

doctrines that preclude judicial review of "political questions,"[76] and standing doctrines that restrict who may bring legal challenges to executive branch actions under the Establishment Clause[77] combine to make authoritative judicial pronouncements about the applicability of the clause overseas unlikely.

Legal uncertainty about the extent to which the Establishment Clause applies to government action overseas has seriously undermined the effectiveness of U.S. foreign policy. It is undoubtedly one reason U.S. foreign policy actors have avoided religion, as discussed elsewhere in this report. This avoidance, in turn, prevents diplomats, aid workers, and others working in the field from effectively interacting with local actors to advance common interests and fulfill the mandates and goals of aid programs and other foreign policy initiatives.

This uncertainty has also led to ill-founded and ill-advised restrictions on interaction with and assistance to religious groups overseas at precisely the time when the worldwide resurgence of religion has made such interaction and assistance crucial to the protection of national security and other vital U.S. interests. So long as the government has failed to develop a well-considered position on the applicability of the clause, those within government departments, agencies, and offices may act to avoid the risks and complexities of controversy and of potential litigation by avoiding all interactions with religion, even when these interactions do not raise Establishment Clause concerns.

Perhaps most unfortunate have been thoroughly mistaken (though apparently widespread) perceptions about Establishment Clause limitations on foreign policy, perceptions that would be incorrect regardless of how legal uncertainty about the reach of the clause overseas is resolved. For example, at one end of the spectrum is the erroneous view that the Establishment Clause precludes foreign policy initiatives that advance the freedom of religious practice and belief in other countries. To the contrary, the Establishment Clause reinforces religious freedom by ensuring that religion does not control government and that government does not distort religious preferences by subsidizing, preferring, endorsing, or favoring particular religions or religion in general. The clause is thus no obstacle to even-handed government support of the free exercise

76. See, for example, *Nixon v. United States,* 506 U.S. 224 (1993); *Baker v. Carr,* 369 U.S. 186 (1962).

77. See, for example, *Hein v. Freedom From Religion Found.,* 551 U.S. 587 (2007).

of all religion or of all participants in aid programs and other foreign policy initiatives without regard to their religious affiliation or lack thereof.

At the other end of the spectrum is the view that the Establishment Clause is an American idiosyncrasy that has no place outside our borders. Although it is unrealistic and insensitive to insist that our Establishment Clause should be adopted by other countries without regard to their differing political and cultural circumstances, nonestablishment norms facilitate a country's development of religious tolerance, political stability, and other characteristics essential to a well-functioning liberal democracy.[78]

The lack of clear judicial authority and the consequent uncertainty over the boundaries and contours of Establishment Clause constraints on U.S. foreign policy highlight the critical need for a comprehensive and definitive consideration of this question. Accordingly, the Task Force calls upon the president of the United States, advised by executive branch offices and agencies who have studied the problem, to clarify that the Establishment Clause does not bar the United States from engaging religious communities abroad in the conduct of foreign policy, though it does impose constraints on the means that the United States may choose to pursue this engagement.[79]

Part II: Engaging Religion and Religious Communities Effectively

Building capacity is a critical first step in effectively engaging religious communities. The key to success, however, lies in *how* this

78. See, for example, David Gray, "Constitutional Faith and Dynamic Stability: Thoughts on Religion, Constitutions, and Transitions to Democracy," *Maryland Law Review* 69, no. 26 (2009).

79. The Task Force views the question of which executive branch office or agency should issue this opinion as beyond the scope of this report. Possibilities include the Office of the Legal Advisor in the Department of State, the Office of Legal Counsel in the Department of Justice, or an ad hoc group composed of representatives from these and other relevant executive branch offices or agencies. USAID's Office of General Counsel has already requested guidance about the constitutionality of certain of its programs from the Office of Legal Counsel in the Department of Justice and has recommended presidential clarification of this question. See Office of the Inspector General, "Audit of USAID's Faith-Based and Community Initiatives" (Audit Rep. No. 9-000-09-009-P, July 17, 2009), 7-8, http://www.usaid.gov/oig/public/fy09rpts/9-000-09-009-p.pdf.

capacity is applied. The following recommendations address this issue.

Engage on the societal level, not just the governmental or diplomatic level.

For billions of people around the world, their relationship with the United States is defined not by official diplomatic relationships, but by their experiences with the organizations and services that touch their daily lives. In much of the world, particularly in Latin American and Africa, a large number of schools, hospitals, social services, relief and development, and human rights programs are sponsored by religious institutions. While these activities may appear to be non-political, in the aggregate they can have a powerful influence over peoples' lives and political persuasions. By making positive contributions through engagement with the institutions providing these services, the United States can help build good will as it fosters the habits and virtues of liberal democracy.

Fortunately, the United States is in a position to engage credible and legitimate indigenous groups that are doing good work based on their religious beliefs. These include women's organizations, civil society associations, professional organizations, religious political parties, clerical centers, environmental groups, educational institutions, and grade school and high school teacher groups. The United States must continue to find ways to engage these groups constructively. For instance, many American Muslim leaders and organizations have strong connections with their countries of origin, are a credible voice for American values, and can act as a bridge between the United States and the Muslim world. American Muslim leaders, activists, organizations, and scholars are the key for improving dialogue, cooperation, and understanding with their counterparts in the Muslim world.

The effectiveness of engaging religious communities at a societal level can be seen in the following examples. First is the case of HIV/AIDS education. In Ethiopia USAID worked with both the Ethiopian Orthodox Church and the Council of Imams to help distribute HIV/AIDS literature into the villages. By contrast, in two provinces of Nigeria USAID made the mistake of not engaging with the dominant Islamic network when it was trying to inoculate the local population against polio. The situation was complicated when local imams issued religious rulings against polio inoculation, substantiating a false rumor that any child that was given the polio vac-

cination would be sterilized.[80] Having learned from this mistake, USAID engaged the support of the Islamic Council of Doctors in India in order to successfully combat polio there. In contrast to what occurred in Nigeria, the council issued a fatwa declaring that anyone who did not get their child vaccinated against polio would be acting in violation of Islam.

Pursuing religious engagement can be delicate. As discussed in Chapter III, issues that confront women and girls throw this into sharp relief. There are positive examples of programs run by religiously inspired organizations that are dedicated to improving the lives of women and girls throughout the world. These programs help increase access to education and health-care services; reduce child, infant, and maternal mortality; tackle spousal abuse, and reduce material deprivation in basic necessities like water and food. Nonetheless, as argued by Task Force member Katherine Marshall of the Berkley Center for Religion, Peace, and World Affairs at Georgetown University, "The changes that modernization promises in women's traditional roles are so tightly linked to religion that engagement with religion, about rights and realities, is more needed on women's issues than on any others."[81] This engagement will not be without tensions and problems. Issues like responsibility for ensuring maternal health remain divisive and often heavily influence the debate on international women's rights efforts more generally. Nevertheless, this difficulty does not excuse inaction. The U.S. government and religious organizations should work closely together to find common ground, while respectfully disagreeing on some matters.

The United States should encourage and, where possible and appropriate, facilitate interfaith partnerships between religious communities to build mutual understanding and inspire constructive action toward shared goals. This can be done by training religious communities and actors, especially youth, in religious literacy, civic leadership, and civic participation across religious lines. Indeed, special attention should be paid to the role of youth in religious communities, as they are often at the forefront of violence when incidences of conflict occur between religious communities. Among other measures, the State Department should expand and deepen exchange programs between religiously diverse youth

80. See www.unicef.org/cbsc/index_49534.html for details.

81. Katherine Marshall, "Faith, Gender, and International Affairs" (working paper, August 2009), 1.

groups from the United States and countries in Asia, Africa, Europe, Latin America, and the Middle East. This would give nontraditional religious actors (like youth) the opportunity to build citizen-to-citizen partnerships across national lines.

Launch a range of special initiatives.

What does societal engagement look like at an operational level? The Task Force proposes a series of initiatives that would involve a wide range of U.S. governmental and nongovernmental entities, including academia, NGOs, and the private sector.

- American educators—through a joint effort of educational institutions and the U.S. Department of Education—should establish programs with elementary and secondary educators in selected countries to enhance the teaching of computer technology, math, and the sciences.[82] This effort could be pursued in public and private (religious) schools in such countries as Bangladesh, Egypt, Indonesia, Jordan, Malaysia, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Uzbekistan, and Yemen. U.S. private-sector technology and scientific experts could play a leading role in cooperation with their counterparts overseas. Most U.S. programs are aimed at universities, even though many of the people the United States should engage only have a high school education. Accordingly, this initiative would tailor engagement on education, which President Obama endorsed in his 2010 State of the Union address, to reach primary- and secondary-level education.

- American medical centers—through a joint effort of medical institutions, public health centers, and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services—should work jointly with religious civil society organizations in selected countries to advance public health, hygiene, and the reduction and elimination of diseases, especially those caused by the environment or a lack of proper nutrition.

82. We have deliberately excluded the humanities and social sciences because in Muslim majority states this is strongly linked to Islamic sciences and jurisprudence. These states would likely reject outside advice in these fields, viewing it as interference in their theological studies.

- American energy experts—from the private sector and the U.S. Department of Energy and the national laboratories (Sandia, Los Alamos, etc.)—should work with civil society groups in selected countries to increase the availability of clean drinking water and combat diseases that are associated with polluted water.

- American democracy experts—from academia, human rights groups, think tanks, foundations, and the U.S. Department of State—should work with both religious and secular civil society groups and opinion makers in selected countries to enhance the growth of a democratic culture. The effort would expand beyond the traditional focus on elections and address the wider range of possibilities envisioned in the 2007 Advance Democracy Act that buttress the societal requirements for democracy.

- American legal experts—from academia, foundations, legal organizations, retired judges and lawyers, and the U.S. Department of Justice—should work with legal practitioners, university law departments, judicial groups, judges, lawyers, local human rights organizations, and religious jurisprudence scholars in selected countries to advance the rule of law and strengthen an independent judiciary.

- American scholars of religion—from academia, religious foundations and organizations, think tanks, and the Department of State—should engage with religious centers, clerics, and leaders in selected countries in a serious dialogue about religious freedom, human rights, and pluralism and about the equal rights of religious majorities and minorities in those societies.

Tackle extremism by engaging religious political parties, under certain conditions, even if they may oppose U.S. foreign policy.

The challenge before us is to marginalize religious extremists, not religion. Especially where religious extremism is a central factor in a conflict or the political landscape, it is all the more important that there be more tolerant religious voices that can counter the extremists and provide alternative views from within their own tradition. Promoting an uncompromising Western secularism as a solution to religious extremism can have the unintended effect of feeding extremism by further threatening traditional sources of personal, cultural, and religious identity. *Contra* the secularists, the best way

to counter extremist religion is with religion that is civil and public, not weakened or privatized.[83]

Part of this effort should include engaging with religious political parties even though they may oppose some aspects of U.S. foreign policy. While we should not paper over the differences with such parties, evidence from the past decade indicates that elected, religiously affiliated parties tend to place pragmatism and problem solving over ideology. In a comparable case of "moderation via participation," no Islamist party popularly elected to national parliament has sought to put greater emphasis on Sharia laws as the source of legislation, despite preelection rhetoric to the contrary.[84] Instead, they often become focused on the day-to-day necessities of ruling, which include making good on commitments to tackle corruption and provide much-needed public services in order to build a record of practical accomplishment.[85]

Hamas and Hezbollah are particularly vexing challenges for the United States. Both provide essential services to their constituents. Both are actively involved in the political scene and rely on a particular religious narrative for domestic support. But both are also on the State Department list of Foreign Terrorist Organizations (FTOs). The U.S. government should not be seen as legitimizing groups that advocate violence, oppose peace, and are in contestation with those who seek nonviolent reconciliation. On the other hand, engagement in the right circumstances might help to moderate elements within these groups and bring them to support a process of reconciliation.

In this context, the guidelines proposed in *Changing Course: A New Direction for U.S. Relations with the Muslim World,* a recent report by the Leadership Group on U.S.–Muslim Engagement, provides a path forward.[86] The report lays out six criteria for determin-

83. Gerard F. Powers, "Religion and Peacebuilding," in *Strategies of Peace,* ed. Daniel Philpott and Gerard F. Powers (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 321.

84. Some regional leaders in countries like Nigeria have sought to strengthen Sharia law, but to date no national Islamist political party has done so.

85. This pragmatic streak covers governing parties like the AKP in Turkey as well as minority parties like the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt, Hezbollah in Lebanon, the Islamic Party of Malaysia, Prosperous Justice Party in Indonesia, Justice and Development in Morocco, the Islamic Constitutional Movement in Kuwait, and al-Wifaq in Bahrain.

86. The Leadership Group on U.S.–Muslim Engagement is part of the U.S.–Muslim Engagement Project, convened jointly by Search for Common Ground and the Consensus Building Institute. The project was launched in order to examine the challenges and opportunities in U.S. relations with the Muslim world. The Leadership Group produced *Changing Course: A New Direction for U.S. Relations with the Muslim*

ing if and when to engage movements that have come to power through elections but continue to use violence. Noting that "there is a range [of opinions] within the Leadership Group on the intentions, actions, and legitimacy of Hamas and Hezbollah," the six sets of questions they have developed include:

1. Does the group or movement have a substantial base of legitimate public support demonstrated by membership, electoral success, and/or mass mobilization? Is this base of support equal to or greater than the apparent support for the current government?

2. Does the group have some interests in political, economic, or social reform that are complementary to U.S. interests?

3. Have the leaders of the group rejected the use of violence or shown the willingness and ability to halt the use of violence and give up their arms when they have had the opportunities of nonviolent political competition?

4. Is the group a potential spoiler of reform or peace initiatives advocated by mainstream movements or leaders? If so, is the group willing to negotiate participation in a reform coalition or peace process?

5. Would U.S. engagement with the group strengthen the position of moderate leaders within the group relative to those who advocate extremist views and actions?

6. If the United States needs to explore the preceding questions before engaging publicly in dialogue with the group, does it have informal and/or indirect channels for communicating with the group's leadership and is there a high likelihood that those communications can remain confidential?

The Task Force considers these questions to be a sound basis for dealing with this complex dilemma.

World in September 2008. The report and further information can be found at the project Web site at http://www.usmuslimengagement.org.

Avoid using pejorative or abstract religious terms that reduce complex religious movements to facile political categories.

Jargon should be replaced with language that underscores the positive role that religious actors are playing. Words matter, and it is important to be as accurate and intellectually honest as possible when discussing religious issues. The use of religious terms in political debates has served the United States poorly. For instance, the term *fundamentalist* has often been misused to describe violent anti-Americanists of every stripe. Some fundamentalists are not necessarily opposed to the United States, and only a small number support terrorism. Therefore, in its common political usage, *fundamentalist* serves to alienate rather than explain. *Islamist* has also been widely used, especially in the media, as synonymous with violent extremists. However, most Islamist individuals and political parties are nonviolent political and religious actors. Similarly, the common usage of *jihad* ignores the complexity of this word in Islamic thought, which can be used to convey positive as well as negative objectives. If such terms are to be used, they should be used with forethought and precision.

The United States should also avoid use of the term *moderate* to describe regimes and actors such as Saudi Arabia that are not moderate by any fair metric but do support U.S. policy. Also, few engaged believers from any religion prefer to be called moderate, as in "I am (just) a moderate Christian." (The connotation here is "not particularly serious and ready to compromise at any moment.") Such usage only diminishes the credibility of both the person being "labeled" and the "labeler" (the United States). Avoiding the use of damaging language will not solve America's problems in and of itself, but it is an important step in helping to stop the "bleeding."

Reaffirm the U.S. commitment to religious freedom, while clarifying the meaning of the term.

The 1998 International Religious Freedom Act (IRFA) established at the Department of State an ambassador-at-large for international religious freedom to advance religious freedom using the tools of U.S. foreign policy. It also created a separate U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom to act as a watchdog agency and provide independent policy recommendations. As IRFA recognizes, religious freedom is a universal human right and an integral part of a vibrant democracy. Religious freedom includes not only the right

of religious individuals and groups to be free of persecution, but also the right of religious individuals and groups to advance their values publicly in civil society and political life and to form or support political parties and the like. Highly religious societies are more likely to flourish when a sustainable balance of freedoms between religion and the state induces otherwise illiberal religious actors, including majority religious communities, into the democratic public square to engage in the political life of the nation on the basis of their religious beliefs, albeit within limits and on the basis of equality with other groups.[87] Religious freedom protects not only religious minorities, but also majorities from the domination of the state or of one particular school of thought.

Imposed limitations on religious freedom weaken democracy and civil society, poison political discourse, and foment extremism. Privileging secular over religious actors or one religion over others creates classes and levels of citizenship; robs religious actors of the ability to play a vigorous role in social and political debate; and eliminates the social latitude, freedom, and pluralism that religious groups need to reform and adapt to modernity. By the same token, a policy of religious freedom that entices otherwise illiberal religious actors and communities into the democratic public square can help ensure the stability and longevity of democracy.

IRFA was called for by leading scholars and practitioners who saw that religious freedom was routinely overlooked in America's advancement of human rights and political stability. These thought leaders pushed for the ambassador-at-large position—a senior diplomatic official—to ensure that (1) religious freedom would be a component of foreign policy on equal footing with other human rights and (2) religious freedom would be integrated into broader U.S. foreign policy concerns such as counterterrorism, democracy promotion, and economic development. Indeed, religious freedom is rooted in Article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights to which most countries have committed. Religious freedom, religious autonomy from the state, and religious pluralism are intertwined and mutually reinforcing dimensions of constructive religious agency. Together they constitute the civil and social foundation essential to rooting democracy in highly religious societies and to marginalizing religious extremists and encouraging tolerance and nonviolent social change.

87. See footnote 39.

Few believe that IRFA has achieved all that its proponents hoped it would. Some members of the Task Force believe IRFA has achieved very little of its considerable potential. Inside the U.S. foreign policy bureaucracy the ambassador has often been sidelined by other actors within the administration, many of whom see IRFA as a policy orientation imposed from the outside. Abroad, IRFA has been interpreted as a means of assisting certain religions in proselytizing. In Russia, for example, Orthodox Christian leaders interpret American religious freedom policy as an assault on Russian Orthodoxy. In India, Hindu nationalists see a similar motive in U.S. policy. These concerns are particularly acute in the Middle East.[88]

Some U.S. diplomats are reluctant to promote religious freedom for a variety of reasons, including the belief that religion is "too complicated or sensitive" and that religious ideas and actors should not be involved in political life.[89] Some are concerned because of how religious freedom is perceived in foreign religious communities. At the time of writing, the Obama administration has yet to appoint an ambassador-at-large for religious freedom.

The Task Force recommends that the administration appoint an ambassador with deep experience in foreign policy as well as religion. The ambassador's first priority should be to redefine religious freedom as recommended in this report and to communicate to majority as well as minority religious communities why religious liberty is in their interests. The administration should elevate the position of the ambassador-at-large, as intended by the IRFA, to a status commensurate with other ambassadors-at-large and senior envoys based at the State Department such as those for global women's issues, anti-Semitism, outreach to Muslim communities, disabilities, counterterrorism, global AIDS, and international energy. The administration should also ensure that the ambassador has adequate resources to perform his or her tasks. The ambassador should complement the work of the ambassador to the OIC recommended

88. Some observers believe that the skepticism with which religious freedom is met abroad is a function of the failure of American foreign policy to properly define and advance religious freedom. In particular, American diplomacy has failed to make the case to majority religious communities that a political system of religious liberty can serve their interests, i.e., they need not see it as exclusively supportive of minorities. Others argue that an expanded notion of religious freedom may be perceived as threatening no matter how it is explained and is a distraction from the need to effectively engage religious communities. Both views are represented on our Task Force.

89. Liora Danan and Alice Hunt, *Mixed Blessings: U.S. Government Engagement with Religion in Conflict Prone Settings* (Washington: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 2007), 3.

earlier. This would go some way toward ensuring that he or she could make a broad and significant contribution to U.S. foreign policy and be better integrated into the foreign policy apparatus.

The Task Force recommends that the ambassador develop U.S. international religious freedom strategies within the context of the religious engagement policy recommended in this report. This includes defining religious freedom in a way that addresses the misperception that it represents a form of imperialism and supporting religious agency as a means of undermining religion-based terrorism and promoting stable democracy. The U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom should be asked by the administration to cooperate in the development of a more effective U.S. religious freedom strategy that assists both religious majorities and minorities.

Embrace a comprehensive approach to democracy promotion and human rights in order to accommodate the legitimate aspirations of religious communities.

The United States faces a gathering crisis when its alliances with Muslim nations are dependent upon autocratic regimes, while the opposition, usually represented by religious parties, often (though not always) espouses anti-American positions. The challenge is to promote democracy without strengthening anti-Americanism. However, a comprehensive and sophisticated commitment to genuine democracy is actually the critical element in defending American interests and maintaining U.S. alliances and partnerships.

While any genuine democracy must have free elections, free elections are just one part of the story. A democratic society must also institutionalize the rule of law, keep government accountable, have active and organized civil societies, provide equal access to the political process to both religious and secular groups, and ensure basic human rights for its citizens. Without these elements, elections may empower illiberal parties or belligerent nationalists, tyrannize minorities, protect vested interests, and offer officials a carte blanche to ride roughshod over businesses and individuals.

While the importance of free elections should not be diminished, these multiple metrics help us measure a state's progress toward democracy. In many parts of the world, democracy is associated solely with elections. As a result, many people are concerned with the perceived chaos that would follow without progress in other areas. This does not mean that they are opposed to democracy, but

that more needs to be done to create the conditions under which democracy may be more appealing to greater numbers of people.

Engaging religious communities from below on a wide range of issues, some of which are apolitical, will in the aggregate make members of those communities more active citizens in their own societies. Over the long run, this should create the conditions for progress on the multiple metrics listed above. In this respect, it is important to remember that independent religious leaders and scholars are often more credible than those who are officially appointed or anointed by the government.

Meanwhile, the United States should also press the regimes—both bilaterally and through multilateral organizations—on specific aspects of governance such as law enforcement, an independent judiciary, freedom of the press, health and educational issues, religious freedom, and women's contributions to the country's economic life. In addition, the U.S. government and religious organizations should work to ensure that no foreign government uses religion to justify denying fundamental human rights—such as the right to life and freedom from unjust imprisonment—to individuals on the basis of gender, sexual orientation, political views, or religious faith.

A viable democracy promotion strategy is not a Trojan horse for undermining U.S. allies. Rather, it is essential for promoting America's long-term strategic interests by removing the causes of discontent and creating the conditions under which existing regimes may feel comfortable and secure in expanding political freedoms such as the right to organize. It is important to reiterate that a genuine democracy must allow secular as well as religious leaders and groups the right to organize and participate in the political process. In the long run, this strategy could help deflate the bubble of discontent with the United States and demonstrate America's good faith with the peoples of the world.

Work with multilateral organizations—for example the United Nations, UN agencies, the World Bank, the G-20, and the G-8—to expand and deepen their engagement with religious actors.

The proposed policy framework is necessarily broad, given the remarkably wide range of issues and institutions where religion exerts influence. It encompasses, in the first instance, the State Department, the National Security Council, virtually all U.S. government departments, think tanks, universities, civil society organizations, and private companies. The policy framework also should

encompass international organizations. Thus, United Nations, its major specialized agencies like UNICEF and UNESCO, the World Bank, and others would benefit from a better understanding of religious dynamics in the contemporary world as they carry out their respective missions. The United States plays significant leadership roles in these organizations which, for the most part, suffer from similar blinders where religion is concerned. The United States should urge global institutions to take religious institutions and actors more explicitly into account. The United States also stands to learn from the experience of international organizations and their interactions with faith institutions in numerous fields.

Governmental and international organizations like the United Nations and the World Bank need to facilitate the access of faith-based organizations (FBOs) to their data, knowledge, and expertise. Faith-based organizations play a huge role in delivery of vital services in many areas around the world. With the help of governmental and international organizations, FBOs can move towards in-depth and focused operational, analytical, and capacity-building issues to improve service delivery.

Some international organizations are already making this move. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), faith-based drug supply organizations (FBDSOs) provide up to 40 percent of overall health services in developing countries. However, until recently their role in supplying medicines was poorly understood. As a result, WHO collaborated with the Ecumenical Pharmaceutical Network in a multicountry study of FBDSOs. This study found that FBDSOs play a "crucial role" in increasing access to medicines and sought to enhance best practices by sharing information, identifying problems, and proposing benchmarks for improvement.[90]

Learning is, of course, a two-way street. Multilateral organizations can also learn from FBOs. In addition, engagement must extend beyond technical assistance. The United Nations has taken a step in the right direction by including FBOs in the Millennium Development Goals—a recognition of FBOs' crucial role in debt relief. Nevertheless, more needs to be done to institutionalize and broaden the links between the United Nations and FBOs.

90. The World Health Organization and the Ecumenical Pharmaceutical Network, "Multi-Country Study of Medicine Supply and Distribution Activities of Faith-Based Organizations in Sub-Saharan African Countries" (2006), xi-xiv, http://www.who.int/medicines/areas/access/EN_EPNstudy.pdf?bcsi_scan_A8AA4F79F19141A2=0&bcsi_scan_filename=EN_EPNstudy.pdf.

The United States should encourage these efforts. It should also play a leading role in interfaith dialogue that occurs in multilateral forums (both governmental and nongovernmental) such as the UN's Alliance of Civilizations, the Parliament of World Religions, and meetings of the G-8 and the G-20. These consultations should include cooperation on specific issues such as climate change, where religious leaders can play an important role in the broader international effort to tackle these challenges. The role of religion has proved controversial at the UN Human Rights Council, where the OIC has pushed for antidefamation rules that the United States and many other nations believe constitute an assault on freedom of speech and religion. The administration should now seek to restore U.S. leadership and build a coalition of states that can agree on the need to seek common ground and promote mutual understanding rather than focus on divisive issues that further polarize the debate.

In summary, the Task Force's recommended strategy for religious engagement has two components. The first is to build the capacity within the U.S. government to understand the role of religion in world affairs and to engage with religious communities when called upon to do so. The second is a proactive policy of engagement in accordance with a set of guidelines that build upon the important role of religious actors, ideas, organizations, and communities, while diffusing and marginalizing those who seek to use religion to justify armed conflict, terrorism, and other forms of violence. To be successful, the United States will need to proceed along both tracks simultaneously—building long-term capacity, but sensibly using the tools currently available to engage religious communities.

Chapter V
Conclusion

The history of U.S. foreign policy since World War II has focused on preserving international security, while promoting the expansion of economic opportunity and democratic governance. This has involved an ever-increasing set of relationships with states, societies, communities, political parties, and leaders around the world. The United States worked with local partners to rebuild and transform Germany and Japan into prosperous and peaceful liberal democracies. U.S. officials cooperated with democrats in Western Europe to bolster their position against communist revolutionaries. In the 1970s the United States reached out to China to remake the map of international politics. In the 1980s deft diplomacy and personal relationships allowed the Cold War to end with a whimper instead of a bang. And in the 1990s, with varying degrees of success, the U.S. government, NGOs, and the private sector worked with partners in the former Soviet bloc to introduce political and economic reforms.

One should not look back at these experiences with rose-tinted glasses. These initiatives were difficult and fraught with controversy and setbacks. Some observers thought they were not worth the risk, and others warned that the bureaucracy and U.S. political system could not cope with such challenges. But the results of this difficult and controversial work make the effort relevant to this day.

Coming to terms with the role of religion and religious communities in world affairs will not be easy. But it is surely not an outsized challenge when compared with America's diplomatic evolution over the past sixty years. Indeed, it is the next logical step as American global leadership enters a new phase. This is a phase in which what happens inside states is as important, if not more important, as what happens between them; in which state weakness is feared more than state strength; in which the American military comes into daily contact with religious and cultural sensitivities in faraway lands; and in which America's partners are often nonstate actors informed and motivated by faith.

This report is an attempt to come to terms with this changed strategic environment. To do so, the Task Force set itself three objectives: (1) offering an informed understanding of the role that religion plays in world affairs, (2) explaining why this matters crucially for the United States, and (3) charting a strategy for moving forward.

The Task Force has identified six patterns illustrating how religion exerts influence in world affairs. First, religion is not confined to the private sphere, but has become a major presence in the public sphere, for good and for ill. Second, changing patterns of religious identity in the world are already having a significant impact on local and national politics, and there is evidence that poorer nations are becoming more religious than wealthy nations. Third, religion has benefited and been transformed by globalization, but it also has become a primary means of organizing opposition to it. Fourth, religion can play a pivotal public role where governments lack capacity and legitimacy in periods of economic and political stress. Fifth, religion is often used by extremists as a catalyst for conflict, a means of escalating tensions. Sixth, religion's growing salience deepens the political significance of religious freedom, both as a human right and as a source of social and political stability.

Together these patterns constitute a powerful force on the local, national, and international stage, making them impossible to ignore in the conduct of foreign policy. Without understanding the local religious context, it is harder to accomplish goals that are both strategic and morally worthy, including development, conflict resolution, and the promotion of human rights.

In addition, many of our strategic dilemmas illustrate why incorporating religion into our broader thinking is so necessary. First, while the United States has an interest in religious communities' realizing their legitimate aspirations, including the right to democracy, it must also protect its strategically important system of bilateral alliances and partnerships. This is particularly challenging in the Middle East, where elections may bring anti-American parties to power. Second, the United States must find ways to promote human rights that are not perceived as a Western assault on local custom and faith. Promoting religious freedom is a component of this, but the challenges of doing it are real and require attention from the new ambassador-at-large for international religious freedom and the Department of State as a whole. And third, while debates inside religious communities have a bearing on the wider world, including the United States, outsiders often lack the standing and leverage to influence them. The policy of engagement recommended in this report will increase the U.S. capacity to influence these debates over the long term.

How should the United States cope with these opportunities and challenges? The United States should build, cultivate, and rely upon networks and partnerships, which will vary in scope and size,

with religious communities. This strategy rests on two assumptions. First, religion should not be approached as a problem that needs to be fixed, but as a set of beliefs and values that can and often does offer opportunities for greater dialogue and understanding. Second, we must acknowledge the vital importance of religion in the lives of individuals and societies and how it influences American interests.

Such a strategy will enable the United States to avail itself of opportunities and facilitate the constructive role that religious organizations and leaders play in the world. It also recognizes that the United States cannot reduce the appeal of destructive religious forces by promoting an uncompromising Western secularism. Such a position can have the unintended effect of feeding extremism by further threatening traditional sources of personal, cultural, and religious identity. Instead, engaging religious communities can create an atmosphere that marginalizes extremists.

This report makes recommendations for (1) building the internal capacity in the United States to implement a strategy of engagement and (2) for *how* to engage effectively with religious communities. Some proposals are specific and others general, some immediate and others long-term goals. All are necessary if the United States is to ready itself for the road ahead.

Events in 2009 have made the issues raised in this report even more pressing. In December 2009 President Obama announced his decision to send 30,000 additional U.S. troops to Afghanistan under an eighteen-month timeline to degrade the enemy and restore security. Among the many questions being posed about this strategy is whether the Afghan government and Afghan people will be prepared to defend their fledgling democracy, already tarred by corruption, by the summer of 2011. One cannot even imagine a realistically positive answer to this question in the absence of the kind of constructive (i.e., savvy, selective, strategic, and targeted) engagement with religious actors and communities recommended in this report.

Consider the impossibility of a modern nation and vibrant democracy emerging in Afghanistan (or elsewhere) without a foundation in respect for the rule of law and human rights, including religious freedom, free and fair elections, transparency in government, and dedication to a national common good that transcends narrow tribal interests or personal ambition. And then consider the virtual impossibility of such concepts and practices taking hold in the popular or elite political imagination without the support and guidance of Afghani religious leaders, who serve invariably as arbiters of local wisdom and communal values—and who now compete with the

Taliban for cultural hegemony. If the United States again overlooks these erstwhile invisible actors and fails to engage them successfully in the nation-building task, the project will have no chance of success.

It is for this reason that the president's Afghanistan strategy relies heavily upon "civilian engagement," which assumes that improving conditions in Afghanistan society cannot be accomplished by military power alone and recognizes that a "civilian surge" is necessary if the United States is to empower Afghan communities, both religious and tribal. Indeed, the civilian engagement in Afghanistan can be viewed as the first "test run" of the civilian engagement strategy more broadly. Success may bring new insights and lessons, while failure may constitute a setback that resonates beyond Afghanistan and Pakistan.

Successfully engaging Muslim communities is a vital task, but in the medium and longer term it is only one component of a larger challenge—engaging all major religions globally. The time has come to build on President Obama's Cairo speech—to expand its scope and add substantive initiatives to the concept. We trust that the analysis and recommendations of this Task Force will be of value in that important endeavor.

A Dissent on the Establishment Clause

The undersigned members of the Task Force dissent from the assertion that the Establishment Clause "does impose constraints on the means that the United States may choose to pursue" the engagement of religious communities abroad. We also dissent from the report's recommendation that the Obama administration clarify such constraints.

The primary purpose of American foreign policy is to defend and pursue the nation's vital national interests abroad. As this report abundantly indicates, ours is a world highly influenced by religious actors and ideas, for good and for ill. Accordingly, we believe that in the absence of compelling evidence to the contrary (evidence which, as the report demonstrates, does not now exist), no administration should impose constraints on American foreign policy that are imagined to derive from the Establishment Clause.

We agree with the report's statement (page 62) that "there is little doubt that those who drafted and ratified the [Establishment] clause were principally concerned with government support or favoritism of particular religions within the United States, which suggests that it was not meant to apply to relations with foreign countries."

We recommend that the Obama administration issue clear, short policy guidance that "the Establishment Clause does not bar the United States from engaging religious communities abroad in the conduct of foreign policy" (page 64). Any further interpretation of the Establishment Clause on this issue will inevitably restrict American flexibility in implementing vital programs involving diplomatic counterterrorism and the promotion of democracy and civil society.

We note that this report includes a section on the Establishment Clause only because some members of the American foreign policy establishment—in particular from the State Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development—have interpreted the clause in such a way as to dissuade or prevent them from engaging with religious ideas and actors, even when it is in America's interests to do so.

Submitted by:

Jean Bethke Elshtain
Thomas Farr
William Inboden
David Neff
Timothy Samuel Shah

A Response to the Dissent

The undersigned members of the Task Force agree that the Establishment Clause does not bar the United States from engaging religion and religious communities abroad in the conduct of its foreign policy. However, the idea that the conduct of U.S. foreign policy is wholly exempt from the Establishment Clause is untenable. It ignores the many reasons detailed in the report why the clause should be understood to constrain the manner in which the United States pursues its foreign policy objectives.

It is beyond question that all branches of the U.S. government must act in accordance with the Constitution when conducting American foreign policy. There is no reason to believe that the Establishment Clause is an exception to this requirement. As the report explains, the relevant precedents and authorities permit a range of reasonable conclusions about whether or how the clause constrains particular foreign policy actions and initiatives, but a conclusion that the clause never applies is not supportable.

Submitted by:

Frederick Mark Gedicks

Kent Greenawalt

Abner Mikva

George Rupp

David Saperstein

Cochair Biographic Summaries

R. Scott Appleby
Director, Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies
University of Notre Dame
R. Scott Appleby is professor of history and the John M. Regan Jr. Director of the Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies at the University of Notre Dame. A historian who studies modern religions, including their capacity for both violence and peacebuilding, Appleby is the author or editor of eleven books, including *The Ambivalence of the Sacred: Religion, Violence, and Reconciliation* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2000), *Strong Religion* (Chicago, 2003), and *Spokesmen for the Despised: Fundamentalist Leaders of the Middle East* (Chicago, 1997). With Martin E. Marty he edited the award-winning series of volumes on global fundamentalisms published by the University of Chicago Press (1991 to 1995). From 1988 to 1993 Appleby was associate director of the Fundamentalism Project, an international public policy study conducted by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. From 1985 to 1988 he chaired the religious studies department of St. Xavier College, Chicago. Having earned a PhD from the University of Chicago in 1985, he is also the recipient of three honorary doctorates.

Richard Cizik
President
New Evangelical Partnership for the Common Good
The Reverend Richard Cizik has recently been appointed president of the newly formed New Evangelical Partnership for the Common Good, a faith-based nonprofit that seeks to offer a renewed Christian public witness for the sake of the Gospel and the common good. He also currently serves as an Open Society Fellow and a senior fellow at the United Nations Foundation. Previously, he served for ten years as vice president for governmental affairs of the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE). In 1996 he served as professional staff to the Religious Leader's Delegation to the People's Republic of China at the invitation of President Clinton. Rev. Cizik was instrumental in creation of the Evangelical Climate Initiative introduced in 2006, and in 2008 he was named to TIME magazine's list of the "TIME 100" for collaborative efforts to bring science and religion into conversation. He is author and editor of *The High Cost of Indifference* (Regal Books) and a contributor to *On Christian Freedom* (University Press of America), the *Dictionary of Christianity in America* (Inter-Varsity

Press), and the landmark document "For the Health of the Nation: An Evangelical Call to Civic Engagement." He received a BA in political science from Whitworth College, an MA in public affairs from the George Washington University School of Public & International Affairs, and a master of divinity from Denver Seminary. He also studied overseas at the National Political Science University and the Taipei Language Institute, both in Taipei, Taiwan. Postgraduate research awards include a Scottish-Rite Graduate Fellowship to George Washington University and a Rotary International Graduate Fellowship to the Republic of China.

Member Biographic Summaries

Michael Barnett
Harold Stassen Chair of International Relations, Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs
University of Minnesota
Michael Barnett is the Harold Stassen Chair of International Relations at the Humphrey Institute and professor of political science at the University of Minnesota. He also directs a Luce Foundation project on "Religion, Humanitarianism, and World Order," which has held workshops in Cairo and Geneva. In 1993-94 he was a Council on Foreign Relations International Affairs Fellow and served at the U.S. Mission to the United Nations, where he advised on peacekeeping operations, including Rwanda.

Henry Bienen
President Emeritus
Northwestern University
Henry S. Bienen served as the fifteenth president of Northwestern University from 1994 to 2009. Mr. Bienen was the James S. McDonnell Distinguished University Professor and dean of the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University prior to his appointment at Northwestern. Mr. Bienen began his association with Princeton University in 1966, earning the positions of William Stewart Tod Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton in 1981 and the James S. McDonnell Distinguished University Professor in 1985.

José Casanova
Professor of Sociology and Senior Fellow, Berkley Center for Religion, Peace, & World Affairs
Georgetown University
José Casanova is professor of sociology at Georgetown University and senior fellow at Georgetown's Berkley Center for Religion, Peace, & World Affairs. He moved to Georgetown from the New School, where he served as professor of sociology from 1987 to 2007. He is a leading authority on religion and world affairs and has published widely on sociological theory, migration, and globalization.

Bob Edgar
President and Chief Executive Officer
Common Cause
In May 2007 Bob Edgar was named president and CEO of Common Cause, a national nonpartisan, nonprofit "citizens" lobby. He was the general secretary of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA for seven years before arriving at Common Cause and previously served in the U.S. Congress for six terms. He is also a past president of the Claremont School of Theology.

Virgil Elizondo
Professor of Pastoral and Hispanic Theology and Fellow, Institute for Latino Studies and Kellogg Institute
University of Notre Dame
Father Virgil Elizondo is professor of pastoral and Hispanic theology at the University of Notre Dame. Father Elizondo has been a visiting professor at various major universities and pastoral institutes throughout the United States and the world and is considered a leading interpreter of U.S. Latino religion by the national and international media. In 1997 he received the Laetare Medal, the highest honor of the University of Notre Dame.

Jean Bethke Elshtain
Laura Spelman Rockefeller Professor of Social and Political Ethics
The University of Chicago Divinity School
Jean Elshtain is currently the Thomas and Dorothy Leavey Chair in the Foundations of American Freedom at Georgetown University, a three-year visiting appointment in the Department of Government, in addition to her permanent position at the University of Chicago. She is also a senior fellow in residence at Georgetown's Berkley Center for Religion, Peace, & World Affairs. In 2006 she was appointed to the Council of the National Endowment for the Humanities. She taught at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst and Vanderbilt University before joining the faculty at the University of Chicago in 1996.

Thomas F. Farr
Visiting Associate Professor and Senior Fellow, Berkley Center for Religion, Peace, & World Affairs
Georgetown University
Thomas F. Farr is visiting associate professor of religion and international affairs at Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service and a senior fellow at Georgetown's Berkley Center for Religion,

Peace, & World Affairs, where he directs the Religion and Foreign Policy program. Farr was the U.S. State Department's first director of the Office of International Religious Freedom and is a recipient of the Jan Karski Wellspring of Freedom Award for his contributions to religious freedom.

Frederick Mark Gedicks
Guy Anderson Chair and Professor of Law
Brigham Young University
Frederick Mark Gedicks is Guy Anderson Chair and Professor of Law at the J. Reuben Clark Law School of Brigham Young University, where he teaches constitutional law. Professor Gedicks has published and lectured widely in the United States and Europe on religion and its place in the American constitutional and social order.

Kent Greenawalt
University Professor
Columbia Law School
Kent Greenawalt is University Professor at Columbia Law School. Professor Greenawalt served as a law clerk of Justice John M. Harlan of the U.S. Supreme Court and as a special assistant in the Agency for International Development. In 1971-72 he was deputy solicitor general of the United States. In the past decade he has concentrated on issues of religious freedom and disestablishment of religion as well as the place of religion in public political life.

Ken Hackett
President
Catholic Relief Services
Ken Hackett has been president of Catholic Relief Services (CRS) since 1993. Prior to becoming president, he was the regional director for Africa, guiding CRS' response to the Ethiopian famine of 1984-85 and the crisis in Somalia in the early 1990s. Mr. Hackett was the North America president of Caritas Internationalis and in 2004 was named a Knight Commander of the Papal Order of Saint Gregory the Great, one of the highest papal honors. From 2004 to 2009 Mr. Hackett served on the board of directors of the Millennium Challenge Corporation.

William Inboden
Senior Vice President
Legatum Institute
William Inboden is senior vice president of the Legatum Institute. He has he served as senior director for strategic planning on the National Security Council and worked at the U.S. Department of State as a member of the policy planning staff and a special advisor in the Office of International Religious Freedom. Mr. Inboden also worked on drafting and negotiating the passage of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998.

Martin Indyk
Vice President and Director of Foreign Policy
The Brookings Institution
Martin S. Indyk is the director of the Saban Center for Middle East Policy and senior fellow in the Foreign Policy program at the Brookings Institution. Dr. Indyk served two tours in Israel as ambassador and as special assistant to President Clinton. He also served as senior director of Near East and South Asian Affairs at the National Security Council. Before entering government service, Dr. Indyk served as founding executive director of the Washington Institute for Near East Policy.

Douglas Johnston
President
International Center for Religion and Diplomacy
Douglas M. Johnston is president and founder of the International Center for Religion and Diplomacy. He has served in senior positions in government, business, the military, and academia, including six years at Harvard University, where he taught international affairs and was founder and director of the university's Executive Program in National and International Security. His most recent assignment was as executive vice president and chief operating officer of the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

Katherine Marshall
Senior Fellow and Visiting Professor, Berkley Center for Religion, Peace, & World Affairs
Georgetown University
Katherine Marshall is a senior fellow at Georgetown University's Berkley Center for Religion, Peace, & World Affairs and visiting professor in the Government Department and the School of

Foreign Service. She is also executive director of the World Faiths Development Dialogue. Ms. Marshall has close to four decades of experience on development issues, including a career with the World Bank (1971 to 2006), where she continues to work as a senior advisor.

Radwan A. Masmoudi
President
Center for the Study of Islam and Democracy
Radwan A. Masmoudi is the president of the Center for the Study of Islam and Democracy (CSID), a Washington-based nonprofit organization dedicated to promoting freedom, democracy, and good governance in the Arab/Muslim world as well as to improving relations between the United States and the Muslim world. In 1998 Mr. Radwan founded and incorporated CSID and became its full-time president in 2002. He is also the editor-in-chief of the center's quarterly publication, Muslim Democrat.

Ruth Messinger
Executive Director
American Jewish World Service
Ruth W. Messinger is president of American Jewish World Service. She served for twelve years on the New York City Council and eight as Manhattan borough president. She was the first woman to secure the Democratic Party's nomination for mayor in 1997. In 2006, in recognition of her work to end the genocide in Darfur, Sudan, she received the Jewish Council for Public Affairs' prestigious Albert D. Chernin Award. Ms. Messinger is also a visiting professor at Hunter College.

Abner J. Mikva
Schwartz Lecturer Emeritus and Former Senior Director, Mandel Legal Aid Clinic
The University of Chicago Law School
Abner J. Mikva is Schwartz Lecturer emeritus and former senior director at the Edwin F. Mandel Legal Aid Clinic of the University of Chicago Law School. He served as White House counsel from October 1, 1994, until November 1, 1995. Prior to his appointment, he served as chief judge on the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. Before coming to the bench, Judge Mikva was elected to Congress for five terms, representing portions of Chicago and its suburbs. He started his political career in 1956 in the Illinois House of Representatives, where he served five consecutive terms and served as chairman of the House Judiciary Committee. Judge

Mikva received his law degree from the University of Chicago in 1951 and was a law clerk to United States Supreme Court Justice Sherman Minton. After his clerkship he returned to Illinois, where he entered the practice of law, becoming a partner of the late Justice Arthur Goldberg. He presented several constitutional cases to the U.S. Supreme Court. Judge Mikva has taught courses at the law schools of Northwestern University, Duke University, Georgetown University, the University of Pennsylvania, American University, the University of Chicago, and the University of Illinois. He is the coauthor of a political science text, *The American Congress: The First Branch.* He was a founding member and serves on the advisory board of the American Constitution Society. He and his wife, Zoe, helped to found the Mikva Challenge, which inspires Chicago high school students to participate in elections and civic activities, develop leadership skills, and delve into complicated issues of public policy that affect their lives.

Dalia Mogahed
Senior Analyst and Executive Director
Gallup Center for Muslim Studies
Dalia Mogahed is a senior analyst and executive director of the Gallup Center for Muslim Studies. Ms. Mogahed directs the Muslim-West Facts Initiative and is a member of the Women in International Security. In addition, she serves on the leadership group of the Project on U.S. Engagement with the Global Muslim Community and is a member of the Crisis in the Middle East Task Force of the Brookings Institution.

Emile Nakhleh
Independent Consultant
Emile Nakhleh was a senior intelligence service officer and director of the political Islam strategic analysis program in the Directorate of Intelligence at the Central Intelligence Agency. Previously, he was chief of the regional analysis unit in the Office of Near Eastern and South Asian Analysis. Prior to joining the CIA, he taught for twenty-six years and was the John L. Morrison Professor of International Studies at Mount St. Mary's University. Dr. Nakhleh is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations.

David Neff
Editor-in-Chief and Editorial Vice President
Christianity Today International
David Neff is editor-in-chief and vice president of the Christianity Today Media Group. Before coming to *Christianity Today,* he edited *HIS,* InterVarsity Christian Fellowship's magazine for college students. Mr. Neff serves on the executive committee of the board of the National Association of Evangelicals. He has previously served on the boards of the Association of Theological Schools, Bread for the World, and Evangelicals for Middle East Understanding.

Eboo Patel
Founder and Executive Director
Interfaith Youth Core
Eboo Patel is the founder and executive director of Interfaith Youth Core. He serves on the Religious Advisory Committee of the Council on Foreign Relations and the National Committee of the Aga Khan Foundation USA. Dr. Patel is a Young Global Leader in the World Economic Forum, an Ashoka Fellow, and was named as one of ten young Muslim visionaries shaping Islam in America. He is author of *Acts of Faith* and writes a featured blog on religion for the Washington Post.

Edward Perkins
William J. Crowe Chair in Geopolitics, Emeritus
University of Oklahoma
Edward J. Perkins is the William J. Crowe Chair emeritus of the International Programs Center at the University of Oklahoma's School of International and Area Studies. Prior to that, Dr. Perkins had a distinguished career as a diplomat, including positions as U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, the Commonwealth of Australia, Liberia, and the Republic of South Africa. Dr. Perkins also served as director general of the Foreign Service and director of personnel in the Department of State.

Gerard Powers
Director of Catholic Peacebuilding Studies, Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies
University of Notre Dame
Gerard Powers is director of Catholic Peacebuilding Studies for the Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies and coordinator of the Catholic Peacebuilding Network. He has served as director

of the Office of International Justice and Peace of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops and was a foreign policy advisor in the same office. Mr. Powers writes on religion and U.S. foreign policy, the right to self-determination, the role of religion in conflict and peacebuilding, and the ethics of war.

Asifa Quraishi
Assistant Professor of Law
University of Wisconsin Law School
Asifa Quraishi specializes in Islamic law and legal theory at the University of Wisconsin Law School. She has served as a judicial law clerk in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California. Dr. Quraishi is a founding member of the National Association of Muslim Lawyers and its sister organization, Muslim Advocates, as well as serving on the governing boards of the *Journal of Law and Religion,* the Section on Islamic Law for the Association of American Law Schools, and the Lubar Institute for the Study of Abrahamic Religions at the University of Wisconsin.

George Rupp
President and Chief Executive Officer
International Rescue Committee
George Rupp is the president and chief executive officer of the International Rescue Committee (IRC), overseeing the agency's relief and rehabilitation operations around the world and its refugee resettlement and assistance programs throughout the United States. Before joining the IRC, Dr. Rupp was president of Columbia University and has served as president of Rice University. Before going to Rice, Dr. Rupp was the John Lord O'Brian Professor of Divinity and dean of the Harvard Divinity School.

Rabbi David Saperstein
Director
Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism
Rabbi David Saperstein is the director of the Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism. During his tenure as director, he has headed several national religious coalitions and serves on the boards of numerous national organizations. In 1999 Rabbi Saperstein was elected as the first chair of the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom created by Congress. Rabbi Saperstein also teaches seminars in both First Amendment church-state law and in Jewish law at Georgetown University Law School.

Father Donald Senior
President
Catholic Theological Union
Rev. Donald Senior, C.P., is president of the Catholic Theological Union in Chicago, where he is also a member of the faculty as professor of New Testament. He is immediate past president of the Association of Theological School of the United States and Canada and an appointed member of the Pontifical Biblical Commission. Father Senior also serves on the executive committee of the Council of Religious Leaders of Metropolitan Chicago.

Timothy Samuel Shah
Senior Research Scholar, Institute on Culture, Religion, and World Affairs, Boston University
Joseph R. Crapa Fellow, U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom
Timothy Shah became a senior research scholar with Boston University's Institute on Culture Religion and World Affairs in 2007 after holding senior positions at the Council on Foreign Relations and the Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life. In 2010 he is among the first Joseph R. Crapa Fellows with the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom. With Daniel Philpott and Monica Toft, he is coauthor of the forthcoming *God's Century: Resurgent Religion and Global Politics* (W.W. Norton, 2011).

Peter Steinfels
Codirector
Center on Religion and Culture, Fordham University
Peter Steinfels is an author, University Professor at Fordham University, and codirector of the Fordham Center on Religion and Culture. From 1988 to 1997 he was the senior religion correspondent of *The New York Times,* and he continued to write a biweekly column on religion and ethics for the paper until January 2010. Among his publications are *Neoconservatives: The Men Who Are Changing America's Politics* (1979) and *A People Adrift: The Crisis of the Roman Catholic Church in America* (2003). He has been a visiting professor of history at Georgetown University, of American studies at Notre Dame, and of religious studies at the University of Dayton.

Karin von Hippel
Codirector, Post-Conflict Reconstruction Project and Senior Fellow, International Security Program
Center for Strategic and International Studies
Karin von Hippel is codirector of the CSIS Post-Conflict Reconstruction Project and senior fellow with the CSIS International Security Program. Previously, she was a senior research fellow at the Centre for Defence Studies, King's College London, and spent several years working for the United Nations and the European Union in Somalia and Kosovo. Dr. von Hippel has also advised the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development on the role of development cooperation in discovering the root causes of terrorism.

Task Force Session Speakers

*Task Force member

Session 1: The National Landscape

James L. Guth
William R. Kenan Jr. Professor of Political Science
Furman University

Leo P. Ribuffo
Society of the Cincinnati George Washington Distinguished Professor of History
George Washington University

Session 2: The Role of Religion in the Making of U.S. Foreign Policy

***José Casanova**
Professor of Sociology and Senior Fellow, Berkley Center for Religion, Peace, & World Affairs
Georgetown University

***Thomas F. Farr**
Visiting Associate Professor of Religion and World Affairs
Senior Fellow, Berkley Center for Religion, Peace, & World Affairs
Georgetown University

***Douglas Johnston**
President and Founder
International Center for Religion and Diplomacy

Barnett Rubin
Director of Studies and Senior Fellow, Center on International Cooperation
New York University

Session 3: Legal Issues and Case Discussions

John Campbell
Former U.S. Ambassador to Nigeria

John Gallagher
National Security Council, Office of Iraq and Afghanistan Affairs

***Frederick Mark Gedicks**
Guy Anderson Chair and Professor of Law
Brigham Young University

Allen Hertzke
Presidential Professor of Political Science, University of Oklahoma
Senior Fellow, Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life

Session 4: Religion and Development, Religious Literacy, and Discussion of Draft Outline

Andrew Natsios
Distinguished Professor in the Practice of Diplomacy, Walsh School of Foreign Service
Georgetown University

***Timothy Samuel Shah**
Senior Research Scholar, Institute on Culture, Religion, and World Affairs, Boston University
Joseph R. Crapa Fellow, U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom

Session 5: Review of First Draft of Report

The Chicago Council on Global Affairs, founded in 1922 as The Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, is a leading independent, nonpartisan organization committed to influencing the discourse on global issues through contributions to opinion and policy formation, leadership dialogue, and public learning.

THE CHICAGO COUNCIL
ON GLOBAL AFFAIRS

332 South Michigan Avenue
Suite 1100
Chicago, Illinois 60604
thechicagocouncil.org