Date: Tue, 01 Dec 2009 14:00:45 -0500
To: "Dr. Baruch Fischhoff - Chair, National Academy of Sciences Study on Social & Behavioral Science and Improving Intelligence for National Security" <baruch@cmu.edu>
From: Lloyd Etheredge <lloyd.etheredge@policyscience.net>

Subject: Measures Needed: Relationship Building

Dr. Fischhoff and Colleagues:

   I suggest that your Report recommend a project to create new and thoughtful measures of relationship-building.

   As this new line of investigation develops (e.g., as part of a study of complex, adaptive systems), I think it will become one of the most important contributions of the social and behavioral sciences to the study (and future) of world politics. The work will add a new chapter to the next generation of international relations textbooks.

Relationship-building in the world system
   The world system can be seen as a complex, adaptive system (itself, a congeries of different complex, adaptive systems) that has been evolving these relationship-building mechanisms at a range of points.<1>

   Examples include: The Trilateral Commission initiative (from 1973, now quietly expanded to include regional groups, www.trilateral.org); the annual Davos meetings; investments to strengthen conflict prevention and two-track, multi-track, and professional diplomacy (the US Institute of Peace, the Dubai campus of Georgetown University); the evolution of the British government's (BBC's) global television channel providing a shared cognitive map of events and a cheerful "global village" sensibility ("Good morning! This is Nigel . . . ") for a globalizing economy and elites with an intercontinental lifestyle. Previously national corporations and financial institutions are globalizing and building partnerships/relationships. The new Princeton UChannel application of the global internet (http://uc.princeton.edu) helps to support policy networks of academics, government and NGO professionals, and students: and the language of science itself - focusing on problems, models, and problem-solving rather than nation-state interests - also build relationships at several levels. America's leading

colleges and universities have been quietly globalizing themselves to provide shared sensibilities and links to new generations of students from many countries.

      1.) <u>Professional management as an element of relationship-building</u>. Another relationship-building component is *professional management* [itself, an expression of complex, adaptive systems (evolving from medieval codes of chivalry to the invention of professional identities and, via Drucker, to professional management mindsets).] Thus, although David Rockefeller and other founders of the Trilateral Commission obliquely described themselves as "private citizens," they - like the founders of Davos - combined international economic interests with a new commitment to good, professional management of world politics.

      2.) <u>The Unification of Europe as an example</u>. In the background, we also have the extraordinary unification of Europe - which has miraculously given the world more than 65 years without a war between the UK, France, and Germany and is one of the most extraordinary achievements in institutionalization and relationship-building in history.

      3.) <u>President Obama's US-China Initiative</u>. In recent headlines, relationship-building is central to the decision by President Obama and the President of China to begin large-delegation meetings, across all the major Cabinet Departments in both countries, every six months, to discuss mutual interests and joint projects.

<u>New Measurements Needed</u>
      What's afoot is extraordinarily important, but it also is, in many of its facets, elusive to conceptualize and measure - and use social science to monitor, understand, critique, and improve. [People who think about *governance* think about strengthening formal organizations for authoritative decisions, like the UN - but of course the Trilateral Commission and Davos were [by some people] self-reflective, systemic adaptations/decisions to move beyond the UN.]   <2>

      The relationships that develop are not merely between institutions but in cross-institutional networks of people who may *subjectively* relate, partly, as human beings (or professionals) in addition to specific government/bureaucratic roles. Nor is relationship-building only measured in the growing number of international "everyday work" telephone calls and emails between government employees that do not go through the Department of State or their Foreign Ministries or

Ambassadors. The subjectivity, the psychology, also changes.<3>

Lloyd Etheredge

<1> To discuss/characterize systems as "adaptive" does not mean that they will survive or evolve into higher and more intelligent forms. GM was the world's leading automobile company and with poor leadership - adapting to comfort and wealth - in a changing world, slowly adapted into bankruptcy.

<2> The distinction between formal institutions/laws and constitutive processes/actual mechanisms is well-recognized in jurisprudence. See, for example, the work of W. Michael Reisman, Myres McDougal, Lasswell, and others. Of interest to your work also might be Reisman and James E. Baker, Regulating Covert Action: Practices, Contexts and Policies of Covert Coercion Abroad in International and American Law (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992). Note that the regulation of DNI covert action is a question of applied social and behavioral science.

<3> I wrote a draft paper about the relationship-building framework many years ago (on the www.policyscience.net Website, with references to the work of Harold Saunders.) The subjective component was critical in the early shuttle diplomacy of Kissinger and his team in the Middle East. They were beginning from the background of depersonalized enemy images. One of their agendas was to bring people to life, for one another, as human beings with understandable injury and anger from their circumstances; and also operating within domestic political systems and networks of pressures that, if shaped by a peace process, could make further steps in a peace process possible. They also hoped (as did Kelman and others) to build degrees of trust and relationships of people, as human beings, that could become part of the admixture with their formal roles and accountabilities. The history of the peace process helps to clarify some of the contributions and limitations of relationship building - but its stronger sense that peace is possible may yet contribute, with further leadership, to further progress. Genuine spiritual leadership, when available (e.g., Nelson Mandela, Bishop Tutu, Gandhi, Martin Luther King) also can build relationships powerfully.

Dr. Lloyd S. Etheredge - Fellow, World Academy of Art & Science

Director, Government Learning Project
Policy Sciences Center Inc.
127 Wall St., Room 322 - Box 208215
New Haven, CT 06520-8215
URL: www.policyscience.net
301-365-5241 (v); lloyd.etheredge@policyscience.net (email)