Stanley Center
FOR PEACE AND SECURITY

Making the Case for Peace in Cities:

Halving Urban Violence by 2030

60th Strategy for Peace Conference
October 2019 | Airlie Center, Warrenton, VA

From October 16–18, 2019, the Stanley Center for Peace and Security gathered participants at the Airlie Center outside of Washington, DC, for the 60th annual Strategy for Peace Conference. In the roundtable, titled "Making the Case for Peace in Cities: Halving Urban Violence by 2030," discussion focused on strategically aligning the peacebuilding, mass violence prevention, and urban violence prevention communities around a common vision to build more-peaceful cities to significantly reduce lethal violence around the world.

Over half a million people experience lethal violence each year, and over 82 percent of these violent deaths occur in communities, cities, and countries ostensibly at peace (i.e., not in conflict).[1] Research shows that violence in cities is responsible for a significant proportion of overall lethal violence, and it tends to concentrate among specific people and places.[2] Despite high levels of lethal violence in cities worldwide, evidence shows that these trends can be changed with effective practices for reducing and preventing urban violence. Mobilizing civil society, municipal staff, and political leaders around this evidence has the potential to reduce overall levels of lethal violence in cities worldwide and thus help make progress on the global call to action under Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16 to realize the ambition of more-peaceful, just, and inclusive societies.

Participants from the peacebuilding, mass violence prevention, and urban violence prevention communities addressed these issues in the roundtable "Making the Case for Peace in Cities:

Halving Urban Violence by 2030" at the Stanley Center for Peace and Security's 60th Strategy for Peace Conference. The center partnered with Impact:Peace and +Peace to align evidence and advocacy efforts to realize the ambition of SDG 16, focusing on target 16.1 to significantly reduce all forms of violence everywhere. Over the course of two and a half days, participants discussed the state of relevant evidence, lessons learned from the field, and the construction of narratives that could spur global action on violence reduction.

Participants grappled with the following questions during the roundtable: What is the primary metric that can unite all actors working toward the reduction of urban violence? How can actors effectively connect the campaign to global frameworks, especially the SDGs? How can a global campaign address local contexts and needs? This readout provides a review of the discussion and identifies recommendations for aligning peacebuilding and prevention efforts to halve urban violence by 2030.

Recommendations

Described in greater detail at the end of this readout.

1. Strengthen the accessibility and availability of evidence and advocacy tools for municipal leaders and organizations engaged in violence reduction.

   – Compile and share global frameworks as well as local case studies to identify successful approaches to violence reduction.

2. Diversify alliances and knowledge-sharing mechanisms between prevention and peacebuilding actors, government institutions, and the general public.

   – Engage with local actors, including government, public health, and security officials, as well as broader social movements to promote best practices and transparency.

3. Establish an effective, informed, and positive metanarrative for violence reduction that can mobilize global political will for this agenda and be tailored to local contexts.

   – Develop and employ a narrative that is informed by local, national, and global stakeholders and includes immediate actionable items in addition to long-term strategies for violence reduction.

4. Explore opportunities for additional research and engagement.

   – Unite behind urban violence reduction metrics at all levels and identify big political moments to create public pressure and political will for the movement to halve urban violence by 2030.

The **Peace in Our Cities** Campaign

Launched Date:
September 21, 2019,
on the International Day of Peace
to spur concrete progress toward SDG 16.

The campaign includes an action committee of early adopter cities and partner organizations that pledged commitment to lead a 12-month initiative to champion the urgency of reducing urban violence and outline a city-to-city platform that would enable cities worldwide to act on the science of reducing urban violence to build peace.

Getting to Know the Facts

Using an evidence brief shared in advance of the roundtable, participants discussed questions regarding definitions, metrics, and messaging to build more-effective urban violence reduction strategies.[3] The session focused on defining key terms, communicating known facts, and identifying information gaps that could be supported through future research investments, potentially via the recently launched Peace in Our Cities Campaign, https://www.peacebuilding.live/peace-in-our-cities.

Addressing Urban Violence: What Do We Know?

In defining the scope of this roundtable, organizers chose to focus on what Thomas Abt and Christopher Winship refer to as "community violence."[4] This violence, often referred to as group, gang, or criminal, is defined by the Alliance for Peacebuilding as "the use of force/violence by one group in a community to assert power over or intimidate another group within the community, or interpersonal violence which has a demonstrable effect on community cohesion."[5] This definition of community violence does not include urban warfare, or violence that is due to acute or ongoing conflict, but recognizes that it is a critical challenge and often colocates in cities struggling with community violence.

Internationally, there is no consensus on the annual number of deaths occurring in urban environments. It is known, however, that urban violence is the leading contributor to overall lethal violence for many countries.[6] In fact, 44 percent of cities with populations of 250,000–500,000 face epidemic levels of violence, defined as an annual homicide rate greater than 10 per 100,000 people.[7] Research further shows that violence remains concentrated among specific people, generally among those in areas experiencing deep-rooted deprivation and underdevelopment. It should be noted that while evidence exists regarding what works to reduce and prevent urban violence, much of it comes from and is about the United States and Western Europe. This should not hinder action from the peacebuilding and prevention communities, but rather encourage further analysis and investigation into the application of evidence and methodologies in different contexts.

Limitations and Gaps in Knowledge

Participants brought a diverse range of perspectives on how the existing evidence base aligned with the broader goals of the Peace in Our Cities campaign. For example, much of the existing data measuring urban violence and its decline is associated with lethality—that is, violence that results in death. Some participants questioned whether homicide rates are the optimal metric for measuring progress in their municipalities given low lethal violence levels and the presence of other forms of non-lethal violence.

There are significant gaps in accurate data on violence globally, including homicide rates. At the same time, homicide remains a useful proxy for other forms of violence in many contexts. Some participants also noted that a lack of standardized metrics regarding lethal violence has discouraged action from many national governments, as it eliminates the establishment of a baseline for measuring progress.

Participants discussed the possibility of including homicide rates as well as context-specific indicators of other forms of violence (e.g., serious assault, intimate partner violence, femicide) that are of significant concern in their communities. This would allow prevention and peacebuilding actors to develop indicators tied to clear, achievable goals while still addressing the needs of those experiencing the complexities of violence on the ground. Participants also discussed the need to address both immediate "emergencies"—or very high levels of acute incidents of violence—and upstream, systemic issues.

Lingering questions following the discussion included: How will increasing rates of urbanization impact trends in urban violence? How can local data collection and classification capacities be improved? Where are concrete examples of successful violence reduction programs at the subnational level? How can local media be engaged to further these initiatives? What are the economic costs of urban violence as compared to prevention-focused activities, and would this comparison prompt action from governments?

Building Global Momentum with Local Impact

Lessons from the Field

In the ensuing discussion, participants considered the relevance of the presented evidence across diverse local, national, and global contexts, as well as how to coordinate localized actions to build a global coalition for urban violence reduction. Case studies, as presented by select participants, informed the discussion and emphasized the mobilization of civil society, engagement with municipal governments, and the relationship between their work and the goals articulated in SDG 16.

- **The Center for Policy Analysis** in the Horn of Africa works alongside other civil society organizations in the Somaliland SDG16+ Coalition to encourage implementation of 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Since Somaliland self-declared independence from Somalia in 1991, leaders have focused on promoting peace within an unpredictable region. After Somaliland linked its National Development Plan to the 2030 SDG Agenda in 2017, various civil society organizations united to form the Somaliland SDG16+ Coalition to coordinate action on the agenda.

  The coalition translated the SDGs into the local Somali language, hosted workshops to localize the SDG initiatives, and provided support to the government to host a national SDG summit. Civil society organizations assisted with localizing and amplifying these campaigns, as well as producing annual reports on Somaliland's progress on the 2030 Agenda. Although reliable data collection and publication continues to prove challenging, the coalition has successfully localized many aspects of SDG 16. The Center for Policy Analysis continues to build momentum for the coalition by training youth as peace advocates, hosting town hall meetings, and engaging with government officials.

  For further analysis of the coalition's progress on SDG16+, please see https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/24270Somaliland_SDG16_Progress_Report.pdf.

- **Cure Violence Global** is a public health antiviolence nongovernmental organization that works in partnership with hyperlocal organizations, emphasizing the role of local health officials and community members themselves. For Cure Violence Global, it is essential that initiatives have the support of the local community given high levels of violence that inhibit social cohesion and civil society mobilization. In Juárez, Mexico, local businesses paid a special tax used to fund initiatives implemented by Cure Violence Global, most of which focused on violence prevention. Because the funding came from local stakeholders, other local organizations and community members expressed increased support for the success of the programs.

Through its work in Syria, the organization sought to discuss and address violence that was happening amid conflict—but not as a result of the war itself—through locally led consultations and initiatives. Cure Violence Global emphasizes the importance of establishing partnerships with public health officials to design and implement effective programming.

For more detailed information on Cure Violence Global's work, please see https://cvg.org/where-we-work/.

– **International Alert** works to build positive peace and address the root causes of violence across the globe. In Tunisia, International Alert worked to analyze and address issues facing vulnerable youth, which the population often associated with concerns of violent extremism. Research completed by the organization in 2014 showed that sympathy for violent extremism in Tunisia was not generally tied to political or religious affiliations but came from a shared understanding of vulnerability associated with daily violence and marginalization. This research led International Alert to pursue programming focused on strengthening the political participation of youth at the local level, particularly during municipal elections following the Tunisian Revolution.

The organization created a platform for approximately 35 youth to participate in the mapping of local infrastructure, highlighting the areas of greatest need. International Alert established a partnership between the youth and municipal officials, allowing them to contribute to the allocation of resources within their own communities. This group led the implementation of projects, which both empowered individuals and destigmatized municipal officials' views of "violent youth." International Alert further engaged and supported local media to encourage pride and ownership of the youth-led projects. These projects bridged the gap between marginalized youth, local officials, and journalists, allowing those on the ground to define the struggles of daily violence as well as the solutions.

For more information on International Alert's work in Tunisia, please see https://www.international-alert.org/where-we-work/tunisia.

Applying Lessons to New Contexts
Following a presentation of these case studies, participants discussed how these examples could help further their own work related to the prevention and reduction of urban violence. A central theme in this discussion was developing ways to target those most directly involved in or at risk of experiencing violence without stigmatizing groups or cities as a whole. The case studies highlighted the importance of working with local actors and allowing them to define what constitutes communal violence in their neighborhood. By framing these initiatives as addressing violent behaviors as opposed to violent people, implementers can better target affected communities without stigmatizing individuals or groups. Consultations with local organizations, officials,

and constituents further ensure problems are framed responsibly and that cities themselves maintain ownership over solutions.

Building Support at All Levels
Participants then broke out into working groups to identify strategies for mobilization across different levels of society, focusing on differences between promoting local and global engagement in violence reduction. Participants analyzed relevant stakeholders to anticipate questions or forces of opposition as well as develop strategic messaging for specific actors.

At the local level, participants worked to balance the need for collaboration with municipal officials and the desire to generate long-term systemic changes, noting that governments and security forces can be part of both the problem and the solutions for violence. Local organizers emphasized the importance of engaging multiple government ministries as well as supporting local radio and social media initiatives to promote accountability.

Participants agreed that city officials might be concerned about the indicators for success and whether concretely measuring the progress—or the lack thereof—could harm their political futures. Additional concerns included adequate funding for local initiatives and a need to establish a network of cities that through global reputation or achievements could encourage others to join.

Through discussion, participants highlighted the strengths of employing a public health approach, as it allows actors to address immediate emergencies and implement long-term interventions focused on educational initiatives and behavioral changes. This model further allows organizations to tailor implementation plans to each city and reduces the threat of stigmatization.

To mobilize at the global level, discussion focused on justifying to international actors the potential of targeting city government and subnational leaders in addition to international organizations and national governments. To encourage engagement, organizations should work to humanize those affected by urban violence and promote success stories as they occur in cities. To maximize potential, it is essential to develop a clear, consistent, and global call to action for private sector engagement.

A key tension was reconciling the local and global implementation of these initiatives, including defining what success would look like at different levels. Participants agreed that violence reduction initiatives need to be locally relevant but should also meet international policy demands.

While a set of standardized indicators such as homicide rates may allow for comparison between cities, it does not reflect the complexities of daily violence experienced by all communities. To this end, many participants acknowledged the possibility of developing midlevel indicators that could connect the progress of local initiatives to global metrics reflective of SDG 16.

Constructing an Effective Metanarrative, Globally and Locally

Learning from Strategic Communications in the Climate Community

A key component to a successful global campaign is the meta-narrative that accompanies it. One aim of the roundtable was to explore the communications strategy employed by the climate change policy community and the ways prevention and peacebuilding actors could elevate the discussion and increase mobilization around the reduction of urban violence. Within these global movements, the sheer number of involved actors means there are many opinions and solutions under exploration, as well as large numbers of invested individuals who are impacted in very different ways. Despite these challenges, the climate community recognized two core commonalities across its efforts: the need for global, national, and subnational political attention to further its overarching goal; and how actors relied on the existing data, as compiled in the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) reports.[8]

Communications teams across climate organizations united to create a joint strategy, which included a central metanarrative and mutual opportunities for engagement during major political moments related to international climate negotiations. Representatives of these organizations set the following group priorities: public mobilization, clarifying national commitments, emphasizing the science, and sustaining attention for the movement, particularly noting the difficulty in balancing the dire need for urgent action with long-term, optimistic solutions. Using these priorities, the community drafted a global metanarrative with opportunities to incorporate localized proof points and community-specific stories. This narrative sought to balance the existential threat of climate change with knowledge that there is a better way forward, reinforced by the uncontroverted IPCC reports. The climate organization representatives were also sure to discuss the headlines they hoped to generate, the importance of sharing data across the community, and the need to amplify the communications and publications of one another when appropriate.

Aligning Messages in the Peacebuilding and Prevention Communities

Participants then discussed commonalities between the strategic communication efforts of the climate change and urban violence reduction communities, focusing on the following questions:

– How can the urgency of the situation be elevated?

– What are the consequences of inaction?

– How can the pessimistic reality be balanced with optimistic solutions?

– How can data support this narrative?

While beginning to develop strategic messages for the violence reduction movement, participants emphasized the importance of incorporating factual, political, economic, and emotional arguments to build a narrative that is persuasive and applicable across diverse stakeholders. Participants identified urban violence as an issue that requires immediate and collective action to protect current and future generations. As a driving force behind societal divisions, urban violence incites other forms of violence and deteriorates the pillars of just and inclusive societies. Despite these threats, what works to reduce urban violence is known, and data-driven, cost-effective programs can be implemented to spur sustainable change. By mobilizing cities and civilians as agents of change, the peacebuilding and prevention communities can implement a range of localized initiatives to determine best practices for different communities. Within each community, trust can be built between people and institutions to promote peace and accountability.

Outcomes and Recommendations for Engagement

Throughout the roundtable discussion on existing evidence, local initiatives, and global coalitions, participants sought to identify lessons learned and areas for future research and engagement. The following recommendations are primarily intended for actors working to mobilize subnational leaders and communities on violence reduction initiatives but could be useful for the broader peacebuilding and prevention communities.

For Peacebuilding and Prevention Actors

Strengthen the development and accessibility of evidence and advocacy tools for municipal leaders and organizations engaged in violence reduction initiatives by:

– Compiling existing global frameworks for community violence reduction programs, clarifying the successes and failures of specific methodologies.

– Creating a reference library with local case studies of cities that have successfully reduced levels of violence for replication and adaptation by other cities.

– Investing in tools that convey the cost effectiveness of prevention-centric approaches.

– Ensuring findings are shared and communicated to relevant policymakers in a manner that discourages misuse of data for political purposes.

Diversify alliances and knowledge-sharing mechanisms by:

– Continuing to engage with diverse actors, including public health and security sector officials, to promote local ownership and build trust between municipal institutions and civil society.

- Supporting the creation of municipal violence prevention committees to assist in the implementation of initiatives with realistic timelines.

- Exploring tools used by social movements, including antigun violence, gender equality, and migrant rights, and their application to the violence reduction and prevention community.

- Encouraging the establishment of channels of communication with other movements, institutions, and the general public to promote best practices and transparency.

Craft an effective, informed, and positive narrative for violence reduction by:

- Encouraging input from local, national, and global actors to solidify a unifying message that can mobilize global political will for this agenda and be tailored to subnational contexts with localized data and stories.

- Ensuring the approach incorporates immediate actionable items as well as a long-term strategy for promoting inclusion and overcoming stigmatization.

- Developing a public education campaign to shift the narrative surrounding community violence to destigmatize the subject and emphasize positive developments.

- Communicating the narrative to local media and encouraging their engagement to promote government accountability related to violence reduction efforts.

Explore additional opportunities for research and engagement by:

- Investigating and uniting behind metrics related to violence reduction to determine how local, municipal, and international actors will assess progress.

- Identifying big political moments related to global forums, international summits, days of recognition, and key political elections and explore ways to create public pressure and political will for the movement to halve urban violence by 2030.

Conclusion

The peacebuilding, mass violence prevention, and urban violence prevention communities need to strategically align evidence and advocacy efforts in order to build peaceful cities and halve urban violence by 2030. By engaging subnational leaders and diverse actors on the ground, it is possible to realize the ambition of more-peaceful, just, and inclusive societies, as articulated in Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16. Fostering and maintaining collaboration and information sharing across cities is key to supporting the success and sustainability of initiatives working to significantly reduce and prevent urban violence across the globe.

This Readout & Recommendations summarizes the primary findings of the roundtable as interpreted by the rapporteur, Jessica Kline, and the organizers, Jai-Ayla Quest, Kelsey Paul Shantz, Rachel Locke, and Madeline Rose. Participants neither reviewed nor approved this publication. Therefore, it should not be assumed that every participant subscribes to all of its recommendations, observations, and conclusions.

Resources for Further Reading

Alliance for Peacebuilding. *Violence Reduction Subsector Review & Evidence Evaluation.* April 17, 2019. https://allianceforpeacebuilding.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/AFP_Violence_reduction_subsector_WEB_FINAL_4.17.2019.pdf.

Bellamy, Alex. *Reducing Risk, Strengthening Resilience: Toward the Structural Prevention of Atrocity Crimes.* Stanley Center for Peace and Security. April 2016. https://stanleycenter.org/publications/reducing-risk-strengthening-resilience-toward-the-structural-prevention-of-atrocity-crimes/.

Bernard van Leer Foundation. *Communicating about Violence in the Lives of Young Children: Research Findings, Messaging and Media Recommendation.* May 2013. https://9d5151c9-f6cf-48e7-a993-201acb72e6e1.filesusr.com/ugd/5bd0b2_f9f73d167fdb4400b9bfe9edb2ca9a0a.pdf.

Carbonari, Flávia. *Reducing Urban Violence: A Common Vision for the Western Hemisphere.* Chicago Council on Global Affairs. December 2018. https://9d5151c9-f6cf-48e7-a993-201acb72e6e1.filesusr.com/ugd/5bd0b2_5eaf3d64ce5741cfba69b37b5898e086.pdf.

Cure Violence Global. *A Comprehensive Health System to Substantially Reduce Violence Nationwide.* January 2017. https://cvg.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/2017.02.10_Policy-Proposal.pdf.

Impact:Peace. *Making the Case for Peace in Our Cities: Halving Urban Violence by 2030.* 2019. For a copy of the evidence brief, please email Rachel Locke at rlocke@sandiego.edu.

Joan B. Kroc School of Peace Studies. *Global Violence, Urban Innovation: Launching the Peace in Our Cities Campaign.* Kroc Insights. October 9, 2019. http://catcher.sandiego.edu/items/peacestudies/KrocInsight-ImpactPeace.pdf.

Ransford, Charles, and Gary Slutkin. *Seeing and Treating Violence as a Health Issue.* Know Violence in Childhood. 2017. https://cvg.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Know-Violence-2017.pdf.

Street, Jordan, Ivan Campbell, and Abdijalil Afqarshe. *Time to Invest: How to Support Action on SDG16.* Saferworld. September 2019. https://www.saferworld.org.uk/resources/publications/1224-time-to-invest-how-to-support-action-on-sdg16.

Waal, Thomas de, ed. *Think Peace: Essays for an Age of Disorder.* Carnegie Europe. October 14, 2019. https://carnegieeurope.eu/2019/10/14/think-peace-essays-for-age-of-disorder-pub-79969.

+Peace, Impact:Peace, and Pathfinders for Peaceful, Just and Inclusive Societies. *Peace in Our Cities Campaign Concept Note.* August 2019. https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5c76cd68d7456258530625f7/t/5d88fff-824d54e33986d57c3/1569523342760/Peace+In+Our+Cities+Background.

Participant LIst

Organizers

Rachel Locke, Director of the Impact:Peace Initiative, Kroc School, Institute for Peace and Justice, University of San Diego

Kelsey Paul Shantz, Associate Program Officer, Mass Violence and Atrocities, Stanley Center for Peace and Security

Jai-Ayla Quest, Program Specialist, Mass Violence and Atrocities, Stanley Center for Peace and Security

Madeline Rose, Director, +Peace Coalition, Alliance for Peacebuilding

Rapporteur

Jessica Kline, Program Associate, Mass Violence and Atrocities, Stanley Center for Peace and Security

Participants

Juma Assiago, Coordinator, Safer Cities Programme, UN-HABITAT

Mehdi Barhoumi, Programmes Director, Tunisia, International Alert

Sara Batmanglich, Senior Operations Officer, Fragility Conflict and Violence Group, The World Bank Group

Tyler Beckelman, Director, International Partnerships, U.S. Institute of Peace

Flavia Carbonari, Nonresident Global Cities Fellow, The Chicago Council on Global Affairs and Social Development/Citizen Security Specialist- Senior Consultant, The World Bank

Maria Eugenia Carbone, Director for Latin America, Latin American Network for Genocide and Mass Atrocity Prevention, Auschwitz Institute for Peace and Reconciliation

Mark Clark, CEO, Generations for Peace

Larisa Epatko, Senior Communications Officer, Peace Direct

Bojan Francuz, Program Associate, Pathfinders for Peaceful, Just and Inclusive Societies, Center on International Cooperation, New York University

Brian T. Hanson, Vice President for Studies, The Chicago Council on Global Affairs/Chair, Stanley Center for Peace and Security

Nancy Hanson, Associate Member, Stanley Center for Peace and Security

Michel Pierre Mbei Mbei, Country Program Manager, CAR Program, Search for Common Ground

Ismail Mohamed, Acting Director, SDG16+ Champion, Center for Policy Analysis in the Horn of Africa

Enrique Roig, Director, Citizen Security, Creative Associates

Julia Roig, President and CEO, PartnersGlobal

Kate Schwartz, Consultant, Pathfinders for Peaceful, Just and Inclusive Societies, Center on International Cooperation, New York University

Mark Seaman, Director of Communications, Stanley Center for Peace and Security

Karen Volker, Director, Strategic and International Partnerships, Cure Violence Global

Thomas Wheeler, Conflict Advisor, Department for International Development

Margaret Williams, 16+ Forum Coordinator and Senior Policy Officer, World Federation of United Nations Associations

Uzra Zeya, CEO and President, Alliance for Peacebuilding

Affiliations are listed for identification purposes only. Participants attended as individuals rather than as representatives of their governments or organizations.

Endnotes

[1] Impact:Peace, *Making the Case for Peace in Our Cities: Halving Urban Violence by 2030*, 2019. For a copy of the evidence brief, please email Rachel Locke at rlocke@sandiego.edu.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Thomas Abt and Christopher Winship, *What Works in Reducing Community Violence: A Meta-Review and Field Study for the Northern Triangle*, United States Agency for International Development, February 2016.

[5] Alliance for Peacebuilding, *Violence Reduction Subsector Review and Evidence Evaluation*, 2019.

[6] United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, *Global Study on Homicide: Homicide, Development and the Sustainable Development Goals*, 2019.

[7] Small Arms Survey, "Urban Violence or Urban Peace: Why Are Some Cities Safer Than Others?" Medium, January 12, 2018, https://medium.com/@SmallArmsSurvey/urban-violence-or-urban-peace-why-are-some-citiessafer-than-others-8626435dd5c7.

[8] United Nations, *IPCC Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5 °C*, December 2018, https://unfccc.int/topics/science/workstreams/cooperation-with-the-ipcc/ipcc-special-report-on-global-warming-of-15-degc.

About Us

The Stanley Center for Peace and Security partners with people, organizations, and the greater global community to drive policy progress in three issue areas—mitigating climate change, avoiding the use of nuclear weapons, and preventing mass violence and atrocities. The center was created in 1956 and maintains its independence while developing forums for diverse perspectives and ideas. To learn more about our recent publications and upcoming events, please visit stanleycenter.org.