

THE HENRY M. JACKSON
SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

UNIVERSITY *of* WASHINGTON

TASK FORCE REPORT



Redefining American Leadership for an
Internationalized Era

2017



Cover Image

NASA Earth Observatory. "Night Lights 2012 - Flat Map."
Available from: <http://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/Features/NightLights/>

Printed at the University of Washington in Seattle, Washington.

Redefining American Leadership for an Internationalized Era

Evaluator

Jim McDermott

Former US Representative (WA, 7th District)

Faculty Advisor

Professor Daniel Bessner

Coordinators

Madeline Wiltse

Thomas Zadrozny

Editors

Kaia Boonzaier

Grace DeBusschere

Authors

Cameron Evans

Ezekiel Giron

Matthew Hegyes

Josiah Jones

Alexander Nelson

Esther Oh

Audrey Peronnet

Kevin Salyphod

David Schwartz

Zacharia Tarhouni

Francis Wilson

Peijin Yang

*University of Washington, Seattle
Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies
Task Force Report Winter 2017*

Table of Contents

Title Page.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	v
Acknowledgements	vii
Abbreviations and Acronymds.....	viii
Executive Summary	ix
Policy Recommendations	xiii
I. Introduction	1
II. Global Leadership in a Multipolar World	7
A. Global Threats, Global Solutions <i>Zacharia Tarhouni</i>	9
B. Balancing Unity and Self-Determination in International Community <i>Josiah Jones</i>	33
C. The New American Way of War <i>Ezekiel Giron</i>	42
Conclusion	61
Policy Recommendations	62
III. America Evolved: Harnessing the New Economy	63
A. Competitive Globalization Abroad, Equitable Growth at Home <i>Francis Wilson</i>	67
B. Energy Reform and Strategic Planning for a Volatile Climate <i>Matthew Hegyes</i>	83
C. Ensuring American Innovation Supremacy <i>Alexander Nelson</i>	100
Conclusion	116
Policy Recommendations	118
IV. Fostering and Securing American Identity	119
A. Liberty and Security: Striking a Balance <i>Esther Oh</i>	122
B. American Values Abroad <i>Kevin Salyphod</i>	138
C. Immigration: A Necessity for American Prosperity <i>Audrey Peronnet</i>	151
Conclusion	170
Policy Recommendations	172
V. Stabilizing Regional Crises for a Future Global Order.....	173
A. Maneuvering Towards a Peaceful and Prosperous Middle East <i>Cameron Evans</i>	174
B. China and Its Neighbors: Regional Balancing and Economic Opportunity <i>Peijin Yang</i> ..	187
C. Russia: From Foreign Adversary to Friendly Competitor <i>David Schwartz</i>	196
Conclusion	207
Policy Recommendations	209
VI. Conclusion	210
VII. Appendix	215
Minority Perspective on the role of the UN in Human Rights <i>Josiah Jones</i>	215
Bibliography	217

Acknowledgements

We would like to give our utmost gratitude to the people who had a hand in the completion of this document:

We thank our academic advisor, Professor Daniel Bessner, for his guiding hand and invaluable advice that provided us the support and counsel for us to gain a great deal from this rewarding experience.

Thank you to our evaluator, Representative Jim McDermott, for not only taking the time to give us his commentary and feedback at the end of this project, but also for attending a few of our classes to see our work in progress to offer his insight, proving just how much he cares about this program's success.

Many thanks to Emily Keller, the Political Science and Public Policy Librarian. Her thorough and extensive research guide helped us countless times, as did her advice and availability to those seeking help. She made our research process much smoother and easier to handle.

Thank you to the professors who allowed us a moment of their time away from their busy schedules, in particular Scott Montgomery and Dr. Katharyne Mitchell. We are incredibly grateful for the unique help we received. Your insight on the subjects you are most passionate about is invaluable.

We'd also like to offer our thanks to Carson Gullede for coming to our assistance in a moment of technological need.

Finally, we would like to thank the administrators of the Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies. This project has provided every one of us an experience we will never forget.

Without you and your dedication this project would not be possible.

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AI	Artificial Intelligence
AQAP	Al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula
BBG	Broadcast Board of Governors
BRICS	Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa
CBDR-RC	Common but Differentiated Responsibilities and Respective Capabilities
CBP	Customs and Border Protection
CCP	Chinese Communist Party
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
CYBERCOM	Cyber Command
DHS	Department of Homeland Security
DOD	Department of Defense
EU	European Union
FBI	Federal Bureau Of Investigation
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GED	General Education Diploma
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GPS	Global Positioning System
GW	Gigawatt
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
ICBM	Intercontinental Ballistic Missile
ICJ	International Court of Justice
IMF	International Monetary Fund
INDC	Intended National Determined Contribution
IRBM	Intermediate-Range Ballistic Missile
IRCA	Immigration Reform and Control Act
ISIL	Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant
JCPOA	Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action
JDAM	Joint Direct Attack Munition
JWC	Joint Water Commission
LaWS	Laser Weapons System
LNG	Liquid Natural Gas
MAGTF	Marine Air Ground Task Force
MENA	Middle East North Africa
mSv	MilliSievert
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Agreement
NAM	Non-Aligned Movement

NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NEI	National Export Initiative
New START	New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty
NNSA	National Nuclear Security Administration
NPT	Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty
NSA	National Security Agency
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OODA	Observe, Orient, Decide, Act
OPEC	Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries
P-5	The Five Permanent Members of the UN Security Council
PEPFAR	US President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief
PLA	People's Liberation Army
PTA	Preferential Trade Agreement
PWA	Palestinian Water Association
SEATO	Southeast Asia Treaty Organization
SME	Small and Medium Enterprises
SMR	Small Modular Reactor
SOE	State-Owned Enterprises
TPP	Trans-Pacific Partnership
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNHCR	United Nations High Commission for Refugees
US	United States
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USIA	United States Information Agency
USMC	United States Marine Corps
USSR	United Soviet Socialist Republics
WTO	World Trade Organization

Executive Summary

Not since the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the subsequent dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 has the international system been so upended. Waves of economic and political populism have threatened the bulwarks of the existing global order and questioned the stability of the institutions that have guided the world since the end of World War II. The European Union (EU), still grappling with the economic fallout of the 2008 financial crisis, has been dealt a stinging blow by the United Kingdom's recent decision to withdraw. Across Europe and the United States, fears of economic decline and loss of jobs to globalization have empowered populist isolationism, nationalist politics, and protectionist economics, while free trade deals, both old and new, sputter.

For the United States to remain a global leader and to secure a safe and prosperous future, we must look beyond our isolationist and protectionist instincts to a grander vision: a US that is better equipped to take care of its own citizens, and compete in a more cooperative, globalizing world.

The four following tenets are what we believe must guide the United States in the coming years:

1. Commitment to supranational organizations and international treaties
2. Support for and defense of every nation's sovereignty
3. Defense of American people, soil, and interests against all threats, foreign and domestic
4. Encouragement and protection of liberal institutions around the world.

To accomplish these goals, the United States must employ the many capabilities at our disposal. This report is structured in three primary sections: Political, Economic,

and Sociocultural. Each section addresses a different element of our strategy, with a final concluding section on regional crises that must be addressed in the near future if we are to achieve our broader long-term goals.

Politically, the military desperately needs to modernize and prepare for a more technologically advanced battle climate that has less of a need for an always-ready ground force. Many supranational organizations and treaties need to be amended and revitalized, while others must be supported and enforced. Lastly, the two largest threats to humankind, nuclear proliferation and climate change, must be addressed immediately and substantially.

Economically, we need to rework how the US interacts with the international community, using the mechanisms of trade deals and treaties, tax codes, investment, and exports. The transition to non-carbon energies is essential to creating a more energy independent US while combatting the causes and effects of climate change. Finally, as technological advances continue to disrupt our workforce, more money and attention must be funneled into research and development and our education system to encourage continued American innovation and to ensure our nation is prepared for a rapidly evolving economy.

Socio-culturally, the United States must present itself to the world in the best light possible; to this end, our international aid and outreach programs must be revamped. Immigration needs to be reformed in the US to streamline the visa and admittance procedures. Similarly, we must reform our border control policy so that it may better protect all Americans, including those who have recently entered the country. Domestically, the policies and practices of intelligence agencies like the

National Security Agency (NSA) must be scrutinized so that a stable balance is struck between citizens' privacy rights and national security concerns.

Regionally, Russian aggression towards Eastern Europe and NATO must be met with strength, while areas of common interest, like economic cooperation and nuclear nonproliferation, should be pursued. Likewise, the United States must address Chinese aggression in East Asia and work towards stable relations between the Asian nations and a conclusion to the conflict that will benefit both our allies and China. With regards to the Middle East, we must commit ourselves to working with the Arab States, as well as Turkey and Iran, to fill the political and economic void caused by the ongoing Syrian Civil War and the rise of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL).

Through these and other steps, we believe our grand strategy will aid our nation to build a more cooperative, stable global order.

Policy Recommendations

- Broadly reform the military to prepare for both threats and capabilities unique to the 21st century
- Remain committed to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, showing good faith to the treaty signatories by making significant cuts to our nuclear arsenal while maintaining a credible and effective deterrent force
- Follow through on our commitments in the Paris Climate Deal and become the leading nation in combatting Climate Change
- Work with the UN on both international conflict resolution and human rights, while calling for greater accountability for human rights abusers and regional opportunists
- Foster greater free trade partnerships in critical markets and regions
- Expand American nuclear power while funding the R&D of non-carbon green technology
- Radically reinvent the American education system to best prepare our nation for a disruptive, rapidly changing economy
- Restructure and streamline the immigration process in line with an unabashedly welcoming attitude to retain the United States' status as an attractive, welcoming, and prosperous destination
- Expand American soft power capacities to achieve the national interest through nonmilitary means
- Craft a clear and constitutional balance between national security needs and inalienable privacy rights
- Invest in a modern “Marshall Plan” for the Middle East, sparking economic growth and fostering liberal institutions
- Commit greater military forces to Eastern Europe as a deterrent to Russian aggression while working to lower tensions with the Kremlin in order to make progress on nuclear disarmament and improve our economic relationship
- Increase the US military presence in the South China Sea as a deterrent, while encouraging China to join a US-engaged regional economic group (SEATO)

I. Introduction

At the beginning of the millennium, the world appeared poised to enter a promising new era defined by a rapidly globalizing economy, remarkable technological developments, and enduring stability under a US-led coalition. The collapse of the Iron Curtain in particular had left the United States in a position of military, economic, and cultural dominance. But in recent years, the US and the international community have experienced an isolationist resurgence. The Great Recession, the ongoing fight against terrorism, refugee crises, and environmental issues have all created a political climate that encourages nations to look out only for themselves. The United Kingdom chose by referendum to withdraw from the European Union, while other members of the EU threaten to follow. The spread of democracy around the globe has been dealt a blow, in Egypt, Poland, Venezuela, and the Philippines, to name just a few of the states currently ruled by authoritarian governments that preach populism and nationalism.

Questions have arisen concerning the continued utility of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), a once indispensable military alliance that now faces uncertainties surrounding member states' financial obligations and military preparedness. Meanwhile, Russian aggression in Eastern Europe and the lack of a cohesive response brings into question the treaty's commitment to a policy of collective defense. In East Asia, an increasingly bellicose China weakens the political and economic stability of the region through its aggressive stance over disputed territories in the South China Sea. The ongoing Syrian Civil War and the brutal rise of the Islamic State has displaced millions and created a humanitarian and security crisis in the Mashriq.

In addition to these localized crises, there remain two global threats to humankind, threats that transcend all others in scope: the potential and devastating impact of Climate Change and the persistent menace of a nuclear detonation, whether from a missile launched by a nation or a device in the hands of a non-state actor. These issues surpass all others as they affect every single nation and person on the planet. Likewise, every nation has a critical role to play in halting nuclear proliferation and global warming.

With so much at stake, and with much to address domestically at well, it seems to some a simpler, and perhaps even safer, solution is to turn away from international matters. For many Americans, it is difficult to justify paying our attention and tax dollars to the world's problems when so much is needed at home. But if the United States aspires to continue as a global leader, it cannot draw inwards and try to shut out the world; the end results will be devastating to American prosperity and security.

Nor can we merely respond to crises as they unfold. Instead we must act proactively and decisively to address and mitigate conflicts before they appear. We must develop and implement a grand strategy, a comprehensive vision, an operational plan that utilizes all the resources at our disposal, including but not limited to American diplomatic, military, economic, political, cultural, and technological capabilities.

For this to occur, we must first address three immediate threats facing the United States and the world, which have the potential to hamper our capability to execute our plans: Russian belligerence towards Europe, Chinese aggression in the South China Sea, and the ongoing political and humanitarian crises in the Middle East. While none of these regional crises will be easily or quickly resolved, each must be addressed resolutely, in conjunction with our allies and the international community. Once

progress is made, the United States can begin to work towards its grander goals of global cooperation, prosperity, and security.

The international order we envision and believe this grand strategy will bring about relies on four broad tenets:

1. The United States will actively engage and support supranational organizations, military coalitions, and international treaties, while leading efforts to strengthen existing institutions and foster new ones.
2. The United States will honor and in turn demand from the international community a fundamental respect for all nations' sovereignty, and will remain committed to defending nations whose sovereignty is violated or threatened.
3. The United States will steadfastly defend the American people, territories, and interests from all threats, foreign and domestic, through a robust military and vigilant intelligence community, as well as through other means, such as diplomacy and soft power.
4. The United States will actively promote the creation and development of liberal institutions around the world. While the United States will refrain from "nation-building," we will nonetheless identify and support individuals and organizations that are committed to liberal values and ideals.

The world we envision 10, 20, perhaps 100 years down the line, will be a world in which Russia and China are not our adversaries but our economic partners who enjoy stable and mutually beneficial relationships with their neighbors. The Middle East will be economically and politically rebuilt, as the result of infrastructural and humanitarian aid provided by the United States and international organizations dedicated to

cultivating stable regional relationships, promoting liberal institutions, and fighting the root causes of terrorism.

By improving and strengthening treaties and supranational organizations, we will foster better international cooperation and address persistent and shared threats like nuclear proliferation and climate change. A reformed tax code will encourage greater foreign investment; reformed free trade agreements and bilateral economic treaties will help ameliorate the negative effects of globalization while providing the United States with opportunities in emerging markets. The efficacy of our humanitarian aid programs will improve as foreign aid is funneled directly to organizations like Doctors Without Borders or directly to communities in need, rather than through agencies like the International Monetary Fund (IMF); bilateral cooperation and monitoring by local organizations will guard against money being siphoned or misused.

Looking inward, the US will prosper under updated political, economic, and social policies. The military will adapt its forces to reflect evolving forms of warfare while maintaining its technological and strategic advantage. We will transition to non-carbon energies: both renewable sources like solar and wind, and nuclear power, ensuring our energy independence while curbing our pollution. This, along with other concrete steps, will begin the fight to combat climate change. More money will be invested in the development of research opportunities, which will allow us to tap into the next generation's ingenuity. Reforms in our education system will better prepare Americans, young and old, to find new and well-paying jobs as the economy, globally and domestically, is disrupted by revolutions in Artificial Intelligence (AI), and other technologies.

Regarding domestic security, a better balance will be struck between protecting individual rights to privacy while addressing threats to the US by foreign governments, non-state actors, and criminal organizations. Immigration reform will speed up the visa validation process, encouraging high- and low-skilled immigrants to come to America while at the same time disincentivizing illegal immigration. We will also foster cultural connections between our citizens and the world through improved international educational exchanges and US humanitarian programs. These steps, along with efforts to promote American culture and values abroad, will open the United States to the world and the world to us.

Though we cannot predict the future, we can speculate about it to the best of our abilities. While our plans address the crises of today and the problems of tomorrow, it is impossible to fully anticipate new and unexpected threats. Therefore, this report may be understood as a guide to what we envision will and should happen, and not as a manual that can withstand what might occur. Our solutions are designed to address as broad a series of outcomes as possible, while providing the necessary strategic flexibility to respond to new events and change course if our recommendations are not working.

Since World War II, the United States has never shrunk from a challenge, and this is not the time to turn inwards and play a less active role in the international community. As former Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) Director John McLaughlin said in an interview, “No one else aspires to lead the world ... they aspire to follow their own interests and secure them ... the United States for all of its flaws and all of its mistakes, still leads with the interests of others in mind as well as its own interests and

leads in a way that advances values, not just narrow interests.”¹ The US has been and must continue to be the foremost leader of the international community, to advance a world order that serves both American and global interests.

With regards to our sometime-adversaries China and Russia, we must convince them that it is in their best interest to grow and prosper in a revitalized international system that continues to be led by the United States. To developing nations and emerging markets around the world, we must demonstrate that the United States is a willing partner and worthy ally who will support their aspirations within reason. And to our longstanding allies in Europe, Asia, and the Americas, we must reaffirm our unwavering commitment to the partnerships that are responsible for the past seventy years of stability and prosperity. While we do not know perfectly what the future may hold, it is essential that the United States do everything in its control to assure that its position as a leading global power is sustained and that a stronger, more cooperative, and more prosperous international order is established.

¹ Robin Wright, Interview with John McLaughlin and Ryan Crocker. “Diplomacy by Tweet,” *The New Yorker Radio Hour*, podcast audio, Episode 69, Feb 10, 2017. <http://www.wnyc.org/story/diplomacy-tweet>

II. Global Leadership in a Multipolar World

Introduction

The constellation of international organizations built in the post-World War II and post-Cold War eras are undergoing profound change. The European Union's movement towards further integration has sparked a political backlash of populism seen in the rise of parties such as Germany's *Alternativ Für Deutschland* (AFD) party running on a platform of nationalism and in Britain's vote for exit from the union. Similar isolationist sentiments have risen in France, Germany, Poland, Italy, the Netherlands, and Hungary as well as across the Atlantic in the US. These movements are espousing anti-establishment ideals and expressing intention to break away from the post-World War II treaties and pacts that have established and molded the world order up to this present day.

As these key nations threaten to retreat from international cooperation in favor of national sovereignty and economic independence, the world confronts two existential threats that require that very same cooperation: climate change and nuclear proliferation. The effects of climate change and of international action to combat it will involve a diverse group of interests and stakeholders. Correspondingly, the US response to climate change needs to be broad and multifaceted. Similarly, the stakes at play in nuclear negotiations require delicate US utilization of diplomatic, economic, and military methodology. Climate change and nuclear proliferation are the two most crucial threats facing the world, and by extension, the US. Economic and security policies must reflect this in order to build a stable world order for future decades.

The United States should take the lead on these issues of global importance while modernizing its own conventional military forces to respond to a changing mosaic of threats and technologies that will define security in the 21st century. This will require transforming the structure of the US military, updating our technology and doctrines to confront and diffuse low intensity threats, and investing in research and innovation to keep the US military's technological edge.

Therefore, the US must engage in global cooperation to combat the threats of climate change and nuclear proliferation, support and reform supranational organizations, and invest in innovative upgrades to the US military in order to forge and preserve a stable world order for the 21st century.

A. Global Threats, Global Solutions

The United States is less threatened by war, economic depression, disease, terrorism, and natural disasters than most other countries. In many cases, it is because we are less prone to these dangers – such as the possibility of a land war on our territory – and in all cases, we are better equipped to deal with the consequences. Thus, there are few dangers that threaten either the existence of the United States or have the potential for massive loss of American life. These would have to be threats that directly harm our citizens and country or destabilize the world to the extent that our way of life is no longer possible. The only two dangers meeting these criteria are climate change and nuclear proliferation. As with other, more conventional threats, the US is better prepared to avert and deal with the dangers of climate change and nuclear warfare. However, the utter destructiveness – as in the case of nuclear weapons – and the unrelenting, long-term effects – as with climate change – demand immediate action by our government.

The Environment and Security

Our environment – the landscape and climate in which we live, work, and fight – is fundamental to our security. During the 21st century, our global environment will change more than in any other century in modern history because of an exponentially rising population, shifting availability and value of resources, and anthropogenic climate change.² This is a threat that conventional security forces and paradigms cannot meet.³

² H. G. Brauch et al., “Securitizing Global Environmental Change,” *Facing Global Environmental Change: Environmental, Human, Energy, Food, Health and Water Security Concepts 4* (2009), 68.

³ Brauch, “Securitizing,” 66.

Solving the root causes of climate change will require multilateral, collective action that utilizes diplomatic tools in conjunction with economic incentives.

The first step to formulating an effective national policy towards these environmental security challenges is understanding what causes climate change and how it affects human beings, economies, governance, and conflict. After outlining these connections, we will discuss the likely changes in the 21st century to our most important resources: water, food, and energy. Finally, we examine the web of interests in one of the frontiers of climate change, the Arctic Circle, and the US interests that exist in this new region.

Theory

Although scholars are still divided over *the extent* to which climate change translates directly into increased instability, the strength of the evidence for the connection between symptoms of global warming and the causes of conflict nonetheless leaves us no choice but to act in response.⁴ By establishing this internal link, it's clear that climate change around the world and over time represents a major threat to world security and American interests.⁵ The most important conclusion for forming a practical policy in response is that global warming will continue to have different effects on different groups of people around the world.⁶ The occurrence of conflict is highly dependent on how a particular area's resources and culture are affected and even more

⁴ Emily Meierding, "Climate Change and Conflict: Avoiding Small Talk about the Weather." *International Studies Review* 15, no. 2 (2013): 185-203.

⁵ Robin Mearns and Andrew Norton, *Social Dimensions of Climate Change: Equity and Vulnerability in a Warming World* (Washington, D.C.: World Bank, 2010), 88.

⁶ Mearns and Norton, *Social Dimensions*, 80.

importantly, the ability of its economy and political system to adapt to physical changes.⁷ In nearly all cases, climate change is not the precipitator of conflict, but rather an additional burden that exacerbates existing tension.⁸

Global warming, caused by the increase in human generated greenhouse gases (GHG) since the Industrial Revolution, is a measurable, scientifically verifiable reality.⁹ GHG's like carbon dioxide (CO₂) are found naturally in the atmosphere, but worldwide levels are dramatically increased by burning fossil fuels such as coal, oil, and natural gas.¹⁰ Europeans –and later the United States– used fossil fuels because they were relatively cheap and efficient compared to other fuel sources; this process allowed these nations to develop more quickly than others who lacked ready access to fossil fuels or the infrastructure to extract them. Fossil fuels have contributed greatly to the current economically dominant position of the western world, and are the basis of the Common but Differentiated Responsibilities and Respective Capabilities (CBDR-RC) principle laid down by the UN in 1992.¹¹ This officially acknowledges that all nations have an interest in stopping climate change, but that certain nations bear more responsibility for

⁷ Mearns and Norton, *Social Dimensions*, 89.

⁸ Meierding, “Climate Change and Conflict,” 184.

Mearns and Norton, *Social Dimensions* 84.

James D. Fearon and David D. Laitin, “Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War,” *American Political Science Review* 97, no. 1 (February 2003), 75-90.

United States Department of Defense, *Quadrennial Defense Review 2014* (Washington D.C.: US DOD, 2014), 8.

Michael Z. Cutajar, “Climate Change and Security: A Destabilizing Fact of Life,” *Facing Global Environmental Change: Environmental, Human, Energy, Food, Health and Water Security Concepts* 4 (2009): 11.

⁹ Brauch, “Securitizing,” 66.

¹⁰ Baede, Alfons P. M., *IPCC Synthesis Report Annex II*, United Nations, 2007, 77.

¹¹ “Common But Differentiated Responsibilities And Respective Capabilities (CBDR-RC)”, *Climate Nexus*, 2015.

creating the situation and that the ability to adapt differs by country. Today, the correlation between CO₂ emissions and economic development remains, with the US, EU, China, India, Japan, Brazil, and Russia being the strongest economies and largest GHG emitters in the world.¹²

Global warming is causing sea levels to rise, weather extremes to increase, snow and ice fields to retreat, and storms to be more powerful and harder to predict.¹³ The politics of climate change are divisive and intersect with issues of ethics, business, security, and national sovereignty in complex ways, but the science is clear: global warming is happening and it will continue to happen unless world leaders make far-reaching collective agreements on GHG emissions. The United States, as a political and economic super power and as a significant contributor to climate change, must take the lead on international climate agreements if they have any hope of succeeding.

Climate change combined with overuse of resources could increase the likelihood of resource conflict. As we see in California, massive amounts of water used for agriculture are depleting natural aquifers much faster than they can be replenished.¹⁴ Unsustainable resource use like this is evident in more conflict prone and less stable regions of the world, like Syria, or in Sub-Saharan Africa where farming has degraded

¹² "CO₂ Time Series 1990-2014 Per Region/Country", *Emission Database for Global Atmospheric Research*, 2017,

<http://edgar.jrc.ec.europa.eu/overview.php?v=CO2ts1990-2014&sort=des9>.

"GDP Ranking Data", *Data.Worldbank.Org*, 2017, <http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/GDP-ranking-table>

¹³ "Global Climate Change Indicators | National Centers For Environmental Information (NCEI)", *ncdc.noaa.gov*, 2017, <https://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/indicators/>

¹⁴ Laurel Rogers and Claudia C. Faunt, "USGS Fact Sheet 2009-3057: California's Central Valley Groundwater Study: A Powerful New Tool To Assess Water Resources In California's Central Valley", *pubs.usgs.gov*, 2017.

the soil quality.¹⁵ These trends, fueled by the needs of a growing world population, are only exacerbated by global warming's further reduction of resource availability. There are two main types of resource conflict: abundance and scarcity.¹⁶ Examples of abundant natural resource's destabilizing effect can be found in Sierra Leone (diamonds), the Democratic Republic of Congo (coltan), Libya (oil) or other nations afflicted by the "resource curse."¹⁷ These conflicts are devastating to their individual populations and contribute to regional destabilization via spillover, the detrimental effect of neighboring conflicts on political stability, economic productivity, and security.¹⁸ Conflicts like this are likely to occur more often in the 21st century, but because of increasing population rather than global warming.

Resource scarcity on the other hand is clearly tied to both climate change and growing populations. The Synthesized Causal Model, developed by Buhaug, Gleditsch, and Theisen, provides a robust explanation of the links between climate change and conflict because it illuminates the layers of recursive connections between climatic factors, like temperature and sea level, and human factors, like governance and migration. For example, rising sea level destroys infrastructure and uproots populations, which both drive down economic production and therefore lower tax revenue. The government must now address the needs of its internally displaced people (or perhaps refugees from a neighboring country), but must do so with a lower budget

¹⁵ "Soil Quality And Soil Productivity In Africa", *nrcs.usda.gov*, 1997.

¹⁶ Meierding, "Climate Change and Conflict," 188.

¹⁷ Halvor Mehlum, Karl Moene, and Ragnar Torvik, "Institutions and the Resource Curse" *Economic Journal*, 116, no. 508 (2006): 1-20, 13.

Michael L. Ross, "The Political Economy of the Resource Curse", *Princeton Institute for International and Regional Studies* 51, no. 2 (1999): 297-322, 304.

¹⁸ Mearns and Norton, *Social Dimensions*, 82.

and weakened economy, while still attempting to mitigate or repair the original effects of climate change. These climatic changes cause immediate problems, but the consequences of those problems feed back into the system and make any solution more difficult. An important conclusion from this model is that scarcity on its own, even at high levels, does not cause conflict. Instead, increasing scarcity –or changing resource availability– causes uncertainty and therefore conflict.¹⁹ Buhaug et al. name five “catalysts” of conflict during climate change: reduced state income causing a reduction in public goods and services, social cleavages caused by increased resource competition, resource scarcity in subsistence economies leading to unemployment, implementation of climate change solutions having negative effects on certain groups, and finally, deteriorating environment forcing mass migration.²⁰

Resource Conflicts

In the 21st century, water will become the primary source of resource conflict in the world. By 2035, half the people in the world will face water shortages.²¹ This is because water is not only essential for human life, but also necessary for agriculture, industry, and transportation.²² Conflicts over water rights are already occurring between Syria, Iraq, Turkey, and Iran over the Tigris and Euphrates rivers, between China and

¹⁹ Mearns and Norton, *Social Dimensions*, 80.

²⁰ Mearns and Norton, *Social Dimensions*, 84.

²¹ Gregory Treverton, *Global Trends: Paradox of Progress*, (Washington D.C.: National Intelligence Council, 2017) 24.

²² Frederick M. Lorenz and Edward J. Erickson, *Strategic Water: Iraq and Security Planning in the Euphrates-Tigris Basin*. (Quantico: Marine Corps University Press, 2014) 104.

Tibet over the Tibetan plateau, and between Indian and Pakistan over the Indus river.²³ Water's intersection with these other national interests means that it is a central to any possible negotiated resolutions between states. Additionally, the areas that are most likely to be exposed to water deficit –the difference between water needs and availability– are the ones least equipped to deal with it.²⁴ Some nations, like Saudi Arabia, adapt to extremely low water supplies by importing food they would be unable to grow domestically.²⁵ This is possible if the nation has a strong economy, stable political environment, and the infrastructure necessary to adequately distribute water imports to the population. Other solutions include desalinization, which requires a high level of technology and energy.²⁶ These factors are not always present, such as in Iraq and Syria, where ongoing armed conflict make importing and distributing water extremely difficult, and during peacetime, outdated water pipelines and irrigation systems cause unnecessary waste.²⁷ The US has no ability to replenish the Middle East's depleted aquifers, but it can act as a mediator in water disputes to lower the likelihood of conflict by distributing water between riparian nations more fairly. Turkey, our ally, is central to the water conflicts in the Middle East due to its position at the headwaters of the Tigris and Euphrates.²⁸ The US can encourage cooperation by putting pressure on Turkey to see its current water utilization, which is causing shortages further down the

²³ “World Water Conflicts – Map”, *Worldwater.org*, 2017, <http://worldwater.org/water-conflict/>

"South Asia: Pakistan - The World Factbook", *Cia.Gov*, 2017, <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/pk.html>

²⁴ Lorenz and Erickson, *Strategic Water*, 87.

²⁵ Lorenz and Erickson, *Strategic Water*, 10.

²⁶ Lorenz and Erickson, *Strategic Water*, 253.

²⁷ Lorenz and Erickson, *Strategic Water*, 12.

²⁸ Lorenz and Erickson, *Strategic Water*, 94.

river in Iraq and Syria, as a threat to its own long-term security. US grand strategy must recognize that lack of water will be a destabilizing factor in the 21st century and incorporate this fact into decision making, as will be seen further in this document's section on the Middle East.

Food security is inseparable from water security. It could have a more immediate destabilizing effect on populations because inadequate water supplies cause food shortages before drinking water shortages, although water quality is greatly diminished.²⁹ Food security and climate change intersect in several ways. First, agriculture undergoes significant changes as rising global temperatures alter the viable crops at every latitude and rising sea levels inundate fertile farmland, much of which is in valleys and basins at or below sea level.³⁰ Second, for communities and economies dependent on aquaculture, ocean acidification and rising ocean temperatures, combined with worldwide overfishing, are diminishing fish populations faster than they can be replenished. Third, anthropogenic climate change is causing more unstable weather, including more frequent droughts and more severe storms, both of which are harmful to crops and agriculture communities.³¹ To make matters worse, 95% of the world's soil is degraded and less productive because of over farming without crop rotation.³²

²⁹ Lorenz and Erickson, *Strategic Water*, 90.

³⁰ Pradeep Kurukulasuriya and Shane Rosenthal, *Climate Change and Agriculture: A Review of Impacts and Adaptations* (Washington: The World Bank Environment Department, 2003), 42.

³¹ Mearns and Norton, *Social Dimensions*, 88.

³² Treverton, *Global Trends*, 24.

Oil is a significant source of state income for many countries in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA), as well as Nigeria.³³ Falling oil prices, caused recently by discovery of newly available oil deposits and increased production, could remain low throughout the 21st century due to a global shift away from fossil fuel energy.³⁴ While this search for alternative energy is a vital step towards solving climate change and the fundamental energy problem our world faces, it represents yet another destabilizing factor for the Middle East and an impediment to Africa's development. Low oil prices will prevent Arab states from providing for their population's basic needs due to loss of state income.³⁵ Furthermore, the movement away from a welfare state and a weakening of the social safety net is coinciding with weak political institutions and low faith in government ability and legitimacy across MENA in the wake of the Arab Spring. Lower oil revenues will hinder stability at both ends. States like Iraq and Syria, all other problems aside, will be unable to build and maintain crucial infrastructure the population depends on. Meanwhile, in states plagued by chaos and lawlessness, such as Libya, low oil prices mean that there is no longer enough oil wealth to share amongst the population, and conflict will therefore be prolonged until factions are satisfied with the oil production they control.

In addition, oil is central to our Middle East security network, specifically our main regional ally, Saudi Arabia. US-Saudi relations have been increasingly rocky over the past decade because of domestic mistrust in both nations over US military presence

³³ "OEC - Nigeria (NGA) Exports, Imports, And Trade Partners", *Atlas.Media.Mit.Edu*, 2017, <http://atlas.media.mit.edu/en/profile/country/nga/>

³⁴ "U.S.-Saudi Relations". *Council On Foreign Relations*, 2017. <http://www.cfr.org/saudi-arabia/us-saudi-relations/p36524>

³⁵ Treverton, *Global Trends*, 38.

in the Middle East, the perpetrators of the September 11th attacks, and human rights. Despite this, the US still relies on Saudi Arabia for counterterrorism efforts and as a regional counterweight to Iran. Arm sales from the US to Saudi Arabia have nearly tripled in recent years as armed conflict has broken out across the region and Saudi Arabia has gotten involved in a proxy war against Iran in Yemen.³⁶ Saudi Arabia has the world's largest oil reserves,³⁷ and crude petroleum constitutes 76% of exports.³⁸ Protecting oil producers in the Gulf has been a long-term goal of US foreign policy, but new technology and techniques are allowing cheaper production of oil in North America, which has lowered our energy dependence on Saudi Arabia.³⁹ The Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) still has great control over the oil market; for example, their decision in November 2014 to keep production high in order to drive down the price of oil and force out US companies engaged in costlier shale projects. Since that time, the cost of accessing shale and tar sand oil deposits has decreased, pointing towards a possible future where the US oil industry is impervious to Gulf influences. This could have a dramatic effect on the long-standing US-Saudi alliance by removing a point of mutual benefit and magnifying the differences between the two nations, all in a time when Russia and Iran are both seeking to expand their influence in the Middle East.

³⁶ "U.S.-Saudi Relations." *Council On Foreign Relations*, 2017.

³⁷ "U.S.-Saudi Relations." *Council On Foreign Relations*, 2017.

³⁸ "OEC – Saudi Arabia (SAU) Exports, Imports, And Trade Partners," *atlas.media.mit.edu*, 2017. <http://atlas.media.mit.edu/en/profile/country/sau/>

³⁹ "How Much Petroleum Does The United States Import And Export? - FAQ - U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA)", *eia.gov*, 2017. <http://www.eia.gov/tools/faqs/faq.cfm?id=727&t=6>.

The Arctic

Anthropogenic climate change is causing global temperatures to rise, with this past year being the hottest in human history.⁴⁰ One of the most visible signs of this is rising sea levels around the world caused in part by melting polar ice caps and ice shelves. Rising seas rightly receive most of the international attention, but US security in the 21st century also requires a thorough and coherent policy towards the Arctic Circle. This region, roughly defined as above the 66° 33'3 N, is already undergoing profound change.⁴¹ Where previously it was locked by perennial sea ice and only navigable by plane or submarine, the thinning ice is becoming increasingly accessible by ice breakers throughout the year. If global warming continues the Arctic Circle will be completely free of ice, but long before that it will be navigable by conventional craft, both civilian and military.⁴²

This changing northern landscape presents multiple challenges for the United States. The first challenge concerns military: we are a northern hemisphere super power in a long-standing military alliance with 27 other northern hemisphere nations, four of which border the Arctic. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was created to halt the advance of Soviet power into Europe and create an umbrella of protection from Soviet conventional and nuclear forces.⁴³ Today, Russia is again a primary antagonist of

⁴⁰ "2016 Climate Trends Continue To Break Records," NASA, 2017, <https://www.nasa.gov/feature/goddard/2016/climate-trends-continue-to-break-records/>

⁴¹ Klaus Dodds and Mark Nuttall, *The Scramble for the Poles*, (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2016), 6.

⁴² Treverton, *Global Trends*, 24.

⁴³ "North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), 1949," *history.state.gov*, 2017. <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/nato>

ours on the world stage. Open hostilities between Russia and the United States have never occurred, but they are still a military competitor and potential threat to US security.⁴⁴ Viewing the world from the North Pole rather than the traditional Mercator projection makes clear how geographically close the US and its allies are to Russia, a fact which prompted the US government to install nuclear missile defense installations in Canada during the Cold War.⁴⁵ Although those Cold War-era military bases have been decommissioned, Arctic competition today is not an abstract concept. Russian President Vladimir Putin has designated the Arctic a strategic priority in a seven-year plan published in 2013.⁴⁶

The second challenge is political, in that the Arctic represents competing interests for various groups within the United States and abroad. Conservationists, environmentalists, the fishing industry, oil industry, tourists, and scientists all lay claim to the Arctic and advocate mutually exclusive uses for the region.⁴⁷ The existence of newly available oil deposits in the US and Canada reduce our national need to drill in the Arctic. Arctic drilling would also be unpopular domestically and internationally with conservationists and scientists. Most importantly, it would put America on a path to further reliance on fossil fuels, precisely at the time when political and economic forces are pushing toward sustainable energy. Energy exploitation in the Arctic has little benefit for the US when compared to the costs, the US and its allies should do everything possible to keep development and human activity, particularly Russian activity, out of the Arctic Circle.

⁴⁴ Treverton, *Global Trends*, 30.

⁴⁵ Dodds and Nuttall, *Scramble*, 30.

⁴⁶ Dodds and Nuttall, *Scramble*, 39-40.

⁴⁷ Dodds and Nuttall, *Scramble*, 13.

Nuclear Proliferation

The existence of nuclear weapons presents a differently formed threat than any other. They are the only machines ever built that are able to make the globe unlivable for humans. The atomic bombs used by the United States on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945 remain the only nuclear weapons used in a conflict despite six more nations acquiring them since then.⁴⁸ This is because a miraculous combination of diplomacy, game theory, and international treaties have lessened the value and raised the cost of using nuclear weapons. Complete denuclearization of the world's arsenals will not happen soon, perhaps not even in this century; but the goal of the United States must continue to be denuclearization, disarmament, and non-proliferation. To this end, the US should take more aggressive steps to lower its nuclear stockpile to demonstrate our faith in the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT). Preferably this would happen in cooperation with the other recognized nuclear powers, but the US needs to be willing to take the first step towards the complete elimination of nuclear arms. A nuclear weapons free world benefits the United States because it removes the single existential military threat to our territory, maximizes our conventional military advantage over rivals like Russia and China (as well as rogue states like North Korea), and ensures the future of life on Earth. Before we reach this goal, we must confront five primary nuclear threats to the US and the world order: a nuclear confrontation between the US and Russia or China, a North Korean nuclear strike against South Korea, Japan, or the United States, a nuclear war between India and Pakistan, a nuclearized Iran, and the possibility of unsecured nuclear material accessible to non-state actors.

⁴⁸ Volha Charnysh, "A Brief History of Nuclear Proliferation," *Nuclear Age Peace Foundation*, 2009.

North Korea

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea, or North Korea, is the single greatest nuclear threat to US interests and global stability. This is mainly due to its leader, Kim Jong-un, who has no accountability to his own population and whose political power and legitimacy are not derived from the international order or connected to following international norms.⁴⁹ In fact, the opposite is true in North Korea. The twin state policies of *junge*, meaning "self-reliance," and *sungun*, "military first," are explicitly isolationist and anti-multilateral agreements and treaties,⁵⁰ and understanding them is crucial to US-North Korean relations. Kim Jong-un feels directly and personally threatened by the United States and not without reason. George W. Bush named him, along with Iraq and Iran, as the "Axis of Evil" in a 2002 speech shortly before invading Iraq and eventually toppling Saddam Hussein.⁵¹ In an international environment like this, North Korean nuclearization can be seen as the only viable deterrence against what appears to be an imminent invasion. Kim Jong-un's leadership is illegitimate and his government is guilty of massive, ongoing human rights violations; the normalizing the North Korean government should continue to be a regional goal.⁵² In the meantime, we must understand that US interventionism has telegraphed a credible threat to his rule

⁴⁹ Miriam Barnum and Bryan L. Fearey. "Sanctions as a nonproliferation tool: Lessons from Libya." *Comparative Strategy* 35, no. 4 (August 2016): 234-245.

⁵⁰ Anthony DiFilippo, "Steady State: The North Korean Nuclear Issue from Bush to Obama." *Asian Affairs: An American Review* 41, no. 2 (April 2014): 56-82, 67.

⁵¹ DiFilippo, "Steady State," 60.

⁵² "World Report 2014: North Korea". *Human Rights Watch*, 2014.

<https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2014/country-chapters/north-korea>.

"Report of the Commission of Inquiry on HR in the Democratic People S Republic of Korea" (*UN OHCHR*, 2014) 346.

and his response has endangered global security. Our priority is to denuclearize North Korea, and only after that can we begin instituting political and economic reforms.

North Korea's nuclear arsenal remains relatively small and primitive but they are seeking to improve it. They have conducted multiple atomic bomb tests, but have probably not succeeded in building a thermonuclear hydrogen bomb despite North Korean media claiming so. Their KN-08, a road-mobile intercontinental ballistic missile can theoretically reach the Alaskan border but no populated American centers. Additionally, North Korean missile technology is not yet reliable enough to for a trans-Pacific attack using one of their few nuclear warheads to be likely any time soon. They are more than capable of striking with accuracy South Korea and Japan, the two most important US security and economic allies in East Asia.⁵³

Any lasting solution to the North Korean situation will require Chinese involvement, if not cooperation. The Chinese government has been a longtime supporter of the North Korean regime and is currently jockeying for regional influence. Almost all North Korea's illicit trade and sanctions-violating imports are smuggled through the Chinese border at checkpoints like Quanhe and Wonjong.⁵⁴ This is a main reason that a broad and thorough sanctions regime has not deterred Kim's government from pursuing nuclear development. The other reason is their lack of accountability to the people, and a demonstrated willingness to allow widespread starvation before cutting military and research budgets as prescribed by the *sungun* strategy.⁵⁵

⁵³ Park, Diana. "The Final Axis: North Korea and Nonproliferation Negotiations." *Kennedy School Review* 16, (January 2016): 76-80. 77.

⁵⁴ Park, "The Final Axis," 77.

⁵⁵ DiFilippo, "Steady State," 79.

Chinese aid to North Korea may be less ideological and more strategic than it seems. The US and China have different but non-mutually exclusive goals in North Korea. The US wants a de-nuclearized North Korea while China wants a stable government on their border. The worst-case scenario for China would be a failed state nearby creating a massive refugee and humanitarian problem in addition to general instability.⁵⁶ To avoid this, they have shown themselves willing to tolerate an irrational dictator armed with nuclear weapons.⁵⁷ The United States is similarly willing to overlook dictatorships and human rights violations in the name of regional and international security, provided nuclear weapons are not involved. A de-nuclearized, but stable and totalitarian, North Korea under Kim Jong-un is a disagreeable but tolerable compromise for the United States and China.

Iran

An Iran with nuclear weapons capabilities would be devastating to US security and regional interests. Iran's government is explicitly anti-American and they are currently funding non-state actors across the Middle East who do not align with our interests.⁵⁸ If Iran acquired a nuclear weapon, their bargaining power in the region would change profoundly, and the US would lose its weapon of last resort, military intervention. To prevent this possibility, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), commonly referred to as the Iran Nuclear Deal, was established in July

⁵⁶ Park, "The Final Axis," 79.

⁵⁷ Stephen J. Cimbala, "The Asian Attraction: Pivotal Priorities and Nuclear Dangers in U.S. Security", Policy." *Comparative Strategy*, 2014, 33, no. 2: 177-188.

⁵⁸ Karim Sadjadpour, "How America Could Stumble Into War With Iran", *The Atlantic*, February 9, 2017.

2015.⁵⁹ The deal is politically unpopular with American conservatives and Israeli hardliners.⁶⁰ Distrust in the deal has been exacerbated by provocative Iranian missile testing which, although it does not violate agreement, is seen by Iran's enemies of intent to develop nuclear missile capability.⁶¹ The Iran nuclear deal is flawed, but there is no alternative. Keeping a nuclear weapon out of Iranian hands for the near future is worth the cost of an economically empowered and regionally active US enemy.

Russian cooperation during the negotiation of the Iran deal demonstrates Russia's reluctance to allow nuclear proliferation for similar strategic reasons as the US.⁶² It is important to note, however, that Russia cooperation was likely tied to the downfall of Bashar al-Assad's regime in Syria, an event that seemed imminent at the time as US-backed rebels closed in on the capital and the large swathes of the country fell from government control, either to ISIS or other militias.⁶³ Syria is Russia's only reliable ally in the Middle East, and the perceived loss of an important toe-hold weakened Russian ability to stand up to US and international pressure on the Iran deal. The tactical situation in Syria and the rest of the Middle East has changed dramatically

⁵⁹ "Joint Comprehensive Plan Of Action". *state.gov*, 2015.

<https://www.state.gov/e/eb/tfs/spi/iran/jcpoa/>

Graham Allison, "After The Nuclear Deal: Is Iran Still Israel's Top Threat?" *The Atlantic*, March 8, 2016. <https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2016/03/iran-nuclear-deal-israel/472767/>

⁶⁰ Gallup Inc. "After Nuclear Deal, U.S. Views Of Iran Remain Dismal," *gallup.com*, 2016. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/189272/after-nuclear-deal-views-iran-remain-dismal.aspx>.

⁶¹ Sadjadpour, "How America Could Stumble"

⁶² Viet Phuong Nguyen and Man-Sung Yim, "Post-Cold War civilian nuclear cooperation and implications for nuclear nonproliferation." *Progress In Nuclear Energy* 93, (November 2016): 246-259.

⁶³ Lukasz Rules, "Russia and the West." *Harvard International Review* 38, no. 1 (Fall 2016): 17-21.

since that deal was signed. An aggressive Russian bombing campaign has neutralized opposition to the Assad regime in the capital, and recent peace talks excluding the US signaled a marked decline in American influence as a power broker in the region.⁶⁴ A resurgent Russia has consequences for the future of the Iran deal as well. Should Iran decide to restart their nuclear weapons program, Russian support would dramatically improve their economic and security prospects withstanding a US retaliation. Russia, already at odds with US interest in the Middle East, could potentially gain another regional partner, and this time a nuclear power to counter Israel and the United States.

India and Pakistan

In the order of nuclear powers, India and Pakistan are fundamentally different. The most basic and important of their differences is the purpose of their nuclear arsenals. India maintains minimal levels required for deterrence and has a no first use policy.⁶⁵ Pakistan's arsenal, by contrast, is used as a counterweight to India's larger and more powerful conventional military, meaning it's intended to deter a conventional attack with the threat of nuclear retaliation on Indian cities. This assessment is not universally agreed upon, especially when reading Pakistani sources.⁶⁶ Despite this discrepancy, it is fair to say that Pakistan's weapons represent a greater nuclear threat to global stability than India's do.

⁶⁴ Efraim Inbar, "U.S. Mid-East Retreat a Boon for Moscow and Tehran." *Middle East Quarterly* 23, no. 3 (Summer 2016): 1-13.

⁶⁵ Arundhati Ghose and Manpreet Sethi. "Can Pakistan's Nuclear Dangers be 'Normalised'?" *Survival* 57, no. 1 (February 2015): 117-132, 121.

⁶⁶ Zahir Kazmi, "Normalising the Non-proliferation Regime," *Survival* 57, no. 1 (February 2015): 133-150, 140.

The second difference is their histories of political stability, corruption, and terror sponsorship. Pakistani territory, particularly along the Afghanistan border, has been used by terror networks like the Taliban for years, a high-profile example being the 2011 raid by US special forces on a compound in Abbottabad that result in the death of Osama bin Laden.⁶⁷ More troublesome are the connections between terrorists and the Pakistani government, which indicate not merely negligence in combating terror presence, but collusion.⁶⁸ The government also has a history of sanctioning nuclear proliferation through the AQ Khan network, which provided nuclear knowledge to Libya, Syria, Iraq, and North Korea (all countries antagonistic towards the US, despite Pakistan being our nominal ally in the war in Afghanistan).⁶⁹,

Demographic trends in Pakistan point towards increased instability, with a rapidly growing population, low levels of education and low GDP per capita.⁷⁰ These are problems that the US can assist with by increasing foreign aid to Pakistan that is aimed at addressing these issues. Solving these issues in Pakistan will take time, so forming a 123 Agreement with Pakistan, as we have with India and twenty-five other nations, is unlikely to take place soon.⁷¹ Additionally, the Pakistani government has thus far shown

⁶⁷ Charlie Savage, "How 4 Federal Lawyers Paved the Way to Kill Osama bin Laden," *New York Times*, October 28, 2015.

⁶⁸ Malcolm M. Craig, "'Nuclear Sword of the Moslem World?': the United States, Britain, Pakistan, and the 'Islamic Bomb', 1977–80." *International History Review* 38, no. 5 (October 2016): 857-879.

⁶⁹ Mathew Manning, "Peeking Into the Abyss: What Pakistan and the A.Q. Khan Network Tell Us About the Future of Nuclear Proliferation." *Texas Review Of Law & Politics* 19, no. 2 (Spring 2015): 307-336.

Ghose and Sethi, "Pakistan's Nuclear Dangers," 128.

⁷⁰ Ghose and Sethi, "Pakistan's Nuclear Dangers," 126.

⁷¹ "123 Agreements For Peaceful Cooperation". *National Nuclear Security Administration*, 2017.

itself to be unwilling to desist from terror support, and remains fixated on a preparing for a nuclear confrontation with India.⁷² However, an agreement of this type could be a first step towards denuclearizing South Asia and removing a major nuclear threat to the world, but only if it comes after verification of Pakistan's intent to denuclearize and their ability to protect nuclear material.

Terrorism

The 21st century began with the deadliest attack on American soil in history.⁷³ The September 11th attacks signaled an end to the era following the collapse of the Soviet Union in which the US seemed invulnerable to international events.⁷⁴ It also elicited monumental changes in US foreign and domestic policy that fundamentally changed America's image abroad and American citizen's way of life.⁷⁵

In the ensuing fight against global terror networks, the US has relied on foreign allies for intelligence sharing and military basing. Doing so has required overlooking significant political disagreements we have with, for example, Turkey and Pakistan. The US must be willing to face the realistic costs of fighting asymmetric warfare, one of which is cooperation with nations who might otherwise be our enemies. The US is not the only nation threatened by terrorism. By acknowledging this area of mutual interest and working with any country willing to fight this threat, the US has a much greater

⁷² Manning, "Peeking into the Abyss," 307-336.

⁷³ "Historic Timeline - National Counterterrorism Center", *nctc.gov*, 2017.
<https://www.nctc.gov/site/timeline.html>

⁷⁴ Hal Brands, *What Good is Grand Strategy*, (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2014), 164-165.

⁷⁵ Surveillance Under The Patriot Act", *American Civil Liberties Union*, 2017,
<https://www.aclu.org/infographic/surveillance-under-patriot-act>

chance of success. This type of compartmentalization is necessary to continue fighting the greater danger: unpredictable, unaccountable, increasingly powerful non-state actors.

Terrorism has extraordinary power to influence politics by using indiscriminate violence to create fear. This process deepens cultural and religious divides, obscures the erosion of civil liberties, and excludes pressing issues from the public debate. Because of this, terrorism is a threat to national consensus and international cooperation, which lowers the likelihood of successful solutions to global threats like climate change and nuclear proliferation. Terrorism's effect on global cooperation elevates it to an existential threat. The Iran Nuclear Deal is a clear example, as Iran's funding of militias and terrorist cells across the region remains a major source of contention with the US escalation of this conflict could seriously endanger the JCPOA, potentially leading to a nuclearized Iran, and subsequently to a nuclear confrontation between Iran and Israel.⁷⁶

The US needs to eliminate the danger to American civilians posed by terrorism. The lack of a large foreign terrorist attack since 2001 points to the effectiveness of the post-9/11 security apparatus. In the current political conversation exaggerated, or wholly fabricated, claims of terror network's immediate threat to American lives are harmful distractions from the more important task at hand: eliminating the source of terrorism. The US must also take steps to mitigate Americans as a target for terrorism. Human rights abuses like those perpetuated by US military personnel at Abu Ghraib and the ongoing treatment of prisoners at Guantanamo Bay serve as vindication of anti-American terror groups like al-Qaeda's mission. In more recent developments, the

⁷⁶ Sadjadpour, "How America Could Stumble"

executive order aimed at halting immigration from countries associated with terrorism is a misguided piece of legislation that is ultimately detrimental to US security. Likewise, the raid on an al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) compound in western Yemen appears to be a tactical victory, but a strategic defeat. The raid netted valuable intelligence and killed three AQAP officials, but resulted in the heavy civilian casualties and prompted the Yemeni government to withdraw permission for US Special Forces to operate on the ground.⁷⁷ In addition to losing access to an important terror-prone region, these mistakes severely damage US public opinion internationally and can be used to further the inaccurate portrayal of the US war on terror as a war on Muslims. American alliances with over 60 nations and US military bases in 65 countries demonstrates that the United States cannot effectively fight global terrorism unilaterally; it is politically, financially, and militarily unsustainable.⁷⁸

Removing the source of terrorism requires more complex solutions than increased border security and heightened domestic surveillance. It will require a combination of hard and soft power as well as increased diplomacy with our geopolitical competitors. Finding a solution to the economic and political disenfranchisement that breeds terrorism, as well as the instability that allows it to thrive, is the only way to permanently end this threat.

The US can concentrate hard power on non-state actors by increasing immigration security, domestic surveillance, military personnel, and equipment in

⁷⁷ David E. Sanger and Eric Schmitt, "Yemen Withdraws Permission For U.S. Antiterror Ground Missions", *New York Times*, February 7, 2017.

⁷⁸ Charlie Laderman, "Donald Trump's 1950s Self-help Foreign Policy", *Foreign Policy*, February 10, 2017, <http://foreignpolicy.com/2017/02/10/donald-trumps-1950s-self-help-foreign-policy/>

nations with a large US ground presence (Afghanistan, Iraq), and drone or air strikes and special forces operations in nations without (Yemen, Libya, Somalia).⁷⁹ This tactic is politically problematic at home and abroad, as public willingness to accept American casualties is extremely low, and international allies chafe at US presence and collateral damage.⁸⁰ There are also serious disputes over the effectiveness of American military might against diffuse non-state actors who enjoy anonymity and local support.

The alternative is to widen the fight against terrorism by including our allies, as well as Russia and China, in the broader battle against criminal non-state actors.⁸¹ The US is by no means the only target of terrorism. France and Belgium have seen the deadliest terror attacks in the Western world in a decade, while non-state actors have continuously plagued the Middle East in the power vacuum since the 2003 US invasion.⁸² Turkey has likewise experienced a recent increase in deadly terror attacks and has been fighting the Kurdish separatists designated as terrorists since the Cold War.⁸³ Russia and China are less publicly and less often exposed to terror, but both are acutely sensitive to instability and both are powerful regional players with extensive security and intelligence apparatuses.

⁷⁹ Defense Manpower Data Center, "Total Military Personnel and Dependent End Strength By Service, Regional Area, and Country," 2016.

⁸⁰ James Fallows, "The Tragedy Of The American Military," *The Atlantic*, January 2015, <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2015/01/the-tragedy-of-the-american-military/383516/>

⁸¹ "Historic Timeline" *nctc.gov*.

⁸² Scott Anderson, "Fractured Lands: How The Arab World Came Apart", *New York Times*, August 10, 2016.

⁸³ Amanda Sloat, "In Syria, Trump Faces A Tough Balancing Act Between Turks And Kurds", *Foreign Policy*, February 6, 2017. <http://foreignpolicy.com/2017/02/06/in-syria-trump-faces-a-tough-balancing-act-between-turks-and-kurds/>

Policy Recommendations

- Adhere to the requirements of the Paris Agreement and set ambitious Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC) levels
- In response to water and food scarcity, increase foreign aid to countries negatively affected by climate change and who are least capable of adapting. Aid should be earmarked for infrastructure development like irrigation and desalination facilities
- Establish a treaty through the Arctic Council, comprised of the US, Canada, Russia, Iceland, Denmark, Finland, and Sweden, strictly limiting or prohibiting non-scientific access to the Arctic Circle
- Remain committed to the Iran Nuclear Deal despite Iranian missile testing. New sanctions imposed after the missile tests are likely to provoke an aggressive response from Iran and endanger the JCPOA while having very little effect on Iran's capacity for either nuclear arms development or terrorism funding. Preventing Iran from gaining a nuclear weapon is the priority
- Evaluate the removal of some sanctions towards North Korea in reward for their admission of International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) inspectors. North Korea's totalitarian regime and human rights violations can be addressed afterwards, particularly because US bargaining power will increase once North Korea is denuclearized

B. Balancing Unity and Self-Determination in International

Community

The world is presently witnessing a possible rejection of institutions that affect the sovereignty and economic freedom of its countries, yet it is essential to preserve the diplomatic stability these organizations offer in sustaining international norms, alliances, and economic prosperity. A reimagining of the institutions created after 1945 and during the Cold War is in order; furthermore, the US should start exploring new pacts with those who are not as integrated into the functioning core of the global economy in order to better stabilize the world.

United Nations

Having the United Nations continue as an organization that promotes cooperation and international norms between countries is in America's best interest, especially as the world is moving from a unipolar American-led world to a multipolar world. A dissolution or abandonment of the UN by key world powers will not work to serve US interests or those of its allies. Dissolution could cause countries to abandon international norms of self-determination and pursue goals revolving around more unilateral conquest, especially amongst non-nuclear weapon states who can fight wars unconventionally without the threat of mutually-assured destruction. Keeping the organization in legitimacy is in the best interest of the US and the global community. As the world continues to morph, the UN will continually be in need of reform, meeting the need to develop new rules for new times.

If the UN wishes to discuss the world's issues and to arbitrate conflicts, it should embrace conflict resolution as its most vital goal. Countries or groups within countries that have conflicts should be offered the chance to have the UN or select councils within the UN such as the International Court of Justice (ICJ) arbitrate on affairs. Currently, the ICJ is composed of 15 judges, each elected for nine year terms by the General Assembly and the Security Council, which does not represent the complete international community.⁸⁴ Arbitration cases that require adjudication should have a judicial representative from every UN member. This would help ensure a fair ruling if all UN members participated.

Finally, a reinvigoration of countries coming together to fund global projects will help promote economic and political cooperation. These projects have been in place with the UN and they should continue to be a major priority of the UN

Economic Organizations: The WTO, the World Bank, and the IMF

The World Trade Organization (WTO) has helped lower tariffs across the world to usher in better trade. Concurrently, since its implementation in 1994, manufacturing in the US has been outsourced to other countries, dropping manufacturing jobs from a little over 17 million to a little over 12 million in November 2016.⁸⁵ Consumer goods have also dramatically decreased in price in the US, which has made commerce boom and benefitted many US-based multinational corporations. Yet, while the WTO

⁸⁴ "Uphold International Law," United Nations, accessed February 20, 2017.

<http://www.un.org/en/sections/what-we-do/uphold-international-law/index.html>

⁸⁵ "Overview of BLS Statistics by Industry" Bureau of Labor Statistics, accessed February 21, 2017. <https://www.bls.gov/bls/industry.html>

promotes free trade, many provisions allow for covert protectionism, which China and many other developing countries use to exploit free trade nations.

Furthermore, the WTO has no regulatory power in enforcing its measures, other than ascribed power by other nations. Thus, most participants in the WTO simply ignore most of the statutes and cherry-pick what they will follow. Many trade disputes are left up for arbitration that can take up to ten years to be resolved. Additionally, a total of 300 Preferential Trade Agreements (PTAs) have arisen since the WTO's implementation, compared to 70 PTAs that were in place before it.⁸⁶ This sends the message that the WTO is still circumvented constantly to better address the needs of individual countries, often to create deep regional trade integration between them. The WTO serves as an international norm-creating organization to foster free trade but has little power to enforce members to participate in free trade. The US should, to the best of its ability, relegate the institution to a role as an advisory think-tank rather than as an international body with power. Its legitimacy has been diminished by years of relaxed rule enforcement and ineffectiveness in resolving trade disputes, resulting in countries' resorting to bilateral means.

In the same sense, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), while playing a beneficial role in bailing out economies, has harmed others with its enforcement of conditionality on developing countries. The IMF's tendency to try to enforce open markets on developing countries can still plunge the country into further depression after a brief recovery. Still, its ability to serve as an intermediary in crisis cannot be disregarded, as it can "raise awareness of cross-border spillovers" in crises from external

⁸⁶ Centre for Economic and Policy Research, accessed February 20, 2017.
<http://cepr.net/>

economic factors and help prevent financially-stricken governments from “policies that could endanger domestic and international finance stability” with its overarching view of all international economic data.⁸⁷ Thus, the IMF should focus on being much more involved in an economic advisory role but be less involved in overseeing development. To achieve this, the yearly amount that the countries are required to put into the IMF will be open for negotiation to receive from a developing country. A developing country like Chad could negotiate directly with the US for 5% of its IMF fund and Germany for 10% of its IMF fund; each of the countries should be able to adjust the terms correctly. Therefore, the US should encourage the IMF to serve this role, in the hopes that these tailored loans to developing countries will prevent universal conditionality loans that may harm some countries more than they help.

The US should encourage the World Bank, too, to follow the example outlined for the IMF in having greater purpose and uniqueness in its loans for projects. It will always be needed for development since “private capital flows have tended to be selective” in the choice of developing only countries with visible return on investment.⁸⁸ However, the World Bank often gives out blanket loans with vague goals that lack real concrete objectives in countries that are not receiving investment. It should become more involved in appropriating funds and overseeing that the funds are used in projects, guarding against their use in feeding government corruption and waste. These regulatory measures should ensure that the money invested by the international community gives better returns and helps develop nations more efficiently.

⁸⁷ Barry Eichengreen and Ngaire Woods. “The IMF’s Unmet Challenges,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 30, no. 1 (2016): 30.

⁸⁸ Martin Ravallion, “The World Bank: Why It Is Still Needed and Why It Still Disappoints,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 30, no. 1 (2016): 80.

The goal of reforming these economic institutions is to make countries not less involved but actually *more* involved in states' development. By having countries more connected to the resources that they pay into the system, they will be more invested and willing to ensure economic success for all. Creating a personal element in economic development rather than perpetuating the bureaucratic nature of economic institutions will begin a new era in which renewed resources will build up the countries that have been formerly left behind.

NATO

If the economic strength of the EU is kept together, America will be able to enforce stricter adherence to NATO guidelines amongst its member. Presently, only five members of NATO (the US, Greece, Poland, Estonia, and the UK) are meeting the required two percent amount of GDP allocated to military expenditure.⁸⁹ Many others are beneath one percent in GDP which is adding to the overall burden on American military expenditure. With out-of-control debt and an unsustainable debt-to-GDP ratio in the US, this is becoming a burdensome investment for the US.

Members of NATO should stick to its originally agreed upon standard for military spending or be multilaterally penalized within NATO. Grace periods will be instated to allow NATO members to reform their economies, but once the deadlines are passed without correction, then they will be penalized. After so many years of penalties without willing adjustment, the state will then be removed from NATO.

⁸⁹ Ivana Kottasova, "Which NATO members are falling short on military spending?" *CNNMoney*, April 15, 2016. <http://money.cnn.com/2016/04/15/news/nato-spending-countries/index.html>

This will reinvigorate sovereignty and cooperation amongst NATO members instead of being completely reliant on US protection. It will help the US economy by reducing overseas deployments, as well as by boosting the defense industry since most NATO countries will buy from the US to build up their military stockpiles. Furthermore, military spending within NATO will create jobs.

Also, a new focus on international terrorist groups will work to better secure European and American borders. NATO should still work as a containment force to stop any further aggressive actions by Russia but it should begin redirecting some of its combined efforts into combatting terrorist groups. A revamping of NATO military to be more prepared for futuristic conflicts will also be needed along with better research into cybersecurity.

Future Organizations and Treaties

At the moment, the US, Russia, and China are becoming more confrontational, creating a second Cold War. To guard against this devolution of world order, a future trade treaty of economic linkage with Russia will be a deterrent to Russia reclaiming its land empire. In shifting Russia towards a trade empire (much like China currently) so that Russia, China, and the US are main importers and exporters of goods, Russia will not only gain national pride and jobs but will also create competition between China and Russia (instead of further collaboration against the US).

Thus, with China being very dependent on US success, Russia could also soon be dependent on US success. This would hopefully create more cooperation between the three countries and bring better prosperity to all. William Pomeranz, Deputy Director of the Wilson Center, stated that an objective following the collapse of the Soviet Union

was to enhance “trade relations” between America and Russia, in order to “bring stability in relations.”⁹⁰ Unfortunately, economic collapse following the fall of the USSR hampered those goals and further problems between the East and West have put these goals in moratorium. However, the US should not abandon efforts to eventually open up Russian markets to America and to the rest of the globe.

Of course, Russia is in no position to be rewarded with trade deals at this point because of their incursions into Ukraine and their involvement in Syria. Yet, just as President Nixon began a tour of hostile China in the 70s to start US-China relations, the US should keep exploring the possibility of having Russia be a more cooperative competitor tomorrow rather than being a sworn rival today. It took almost fifty years to have healthy US-China relations and the US should keep this timeframe in mind for Russia.

Of course, US-China relations are presently not the most cordial due to the Chinese expansion in the South China Sea and China’s acts of currency manipulation. However, since China relies on the US for its economic prosperity as much as the US relies on China for its own, a compromise will likely be reached eventually. In the meantime, an appropriate action to help guard against future territory disputes with China could well be in order.

A resurrection of a less imposing SEATO (Southeast Asia Treaty Organization) could be used as a response to China’s expansionist policies. However, not only would this organization include its initial member countries—it would also extend a

⁹⁰ William Pomeranz, Deputy Director of Woodrow Wilson Center, phone call with Josiah Jones, January 14, 2017.

membership offer to China. The organization would be built on the principle of collective security and establish international recognition of present (or renegotiated) borders. Any encroachment on the present borders by any country would warrant a collective response within the collective security organization. Essentially, China will be given the option to join an organization that helps safeguard the borders every country within China's reach or it will have to decline and face a collective security organization designed to contain Chinese ambition. This ultimatum may also work as a method to again start talks on disputed territories such as Taiwan or on China's continued support of North Korea, who has never truly been recognized by the international community as a legally sovereign state.

Policy Recommendations

- Reform the International Court of Justice so that it is comprised of at least one judicial representative from every UN member state in order to better represent world opinion
- Relegate the WTO to a more global economic advisory role and lose its legal status as a trade enforcement organization
- Reform the International Monetary Fund in order to allow member states more autonomy over their IMF investments
- Modify the World Bank to supervise its loans' projects instead of giving out money without careful oversight and involvement in projects
- Enforce the original 2% of GDP military spending required to stay within NATO. Allow a reasonable grace period for countries to implement it
- Advocate for a collective security organization within East Asia designed to protect present state borders

C. The New American Way of War

Embarking on a military policy for a new multipolar world will require the US military to undergo a significant transformation to meet future security threats. Rather than containing communism or fighting a global war on terror, the US military must deal with a resurgent Russia, an increasingly powerful China, a zone of destabilization stretching across the Middle East, and a proliferation of non-state actors. It must maintain the ability to fight a conventional war in a time when the battlefield is increasingly cyber, all while being asked to do more with less. Within this framework, the military must also sell itself to an American public skeptical of military intervention and increasingly disconnected to the military and its culture.

Current State of Affairs

The US spends more on defense than the next seven countries combined as well as having more aircraft carriers than the entire world combined.⁹¹ Some believe that military spending is a travesty, and that social services and welfare programs should be a priority instead. While the US military is the largest and most powerful, it exists to serve a mission: to defend the United States and enforce our interests of upholding sovereignty, ensuring strong US leadership in supranational organizations, and pursuing economic and educational empowerment around the globe in order to forge a stable world. This can only be achieved if the US military serves as the cornerstone of a global security system, deters near peer powers, and maintains the ability to dominate

⁹¹ “Comprehensive Plans to Address the National Debt.” Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.pgpf.org/finding-solutions/comprehensive-plans>
One Chart Shows The Magnitude Of US Naval Dominance.” Brian Jones, *Business Insider*. Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.businessinsider.com/magnitude-of-us-naval-dominance-2013-11>

all battlespaces. In recent years, the demands of the military have greatly increased. In 2015, former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger declared, “The United States has not faced a more diverse and complex array of crises since the end of the Second World War.”⁹²

In the face of this increase in threats, the military has faced fallen budgets which has forced it to sacrifice readiness to maintain operational tempo.⁹³ The Heritage Foundation’s *2017 Index of Military Strength* reports that the United States Air Force currently has a force of 1,159 tactical fighters, yet has a shortfall of 700 pilots and almost 4,000 maintenance personnel which severely affects its ability to conduct its missions.⁹⁴ This means essential maintenance is not being performed, pilots are not receiving required training, and our forces are degrading due to a high operational tempo and lack of replenishment. The Marine Air Wing is in even worse shape, as the *2017 Index of Military Strength* reports that, “At times during 2016, less than one-third of its F/A-18s, a little more than a quarter of its heavy-lift helicopters, and only 43 percent of its overall aviation fleet were available for operational employment. Pilots not already in a deployed status were getting less than half of needed flight hours.”⁹⁵ The awesome force of our military is degrading through lack of replenishment, and our already aging equipment is seeing more use than ever. The US military, as of the writing of this report, is currently conducting multiple low intensity operations, such as advising the Kurdish

⁹² Henry A. Kissinger, Opening Statement, Global Challenges and U.S. National Security Strategy, Committee on Armed Services (2015) http://www.armed-services.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Kissinger_01-29-15.pdf

⁹³ Dakota L. Wood, “2017 Index of U.S. Military Strength,” *Heritage Foundation*, (December 2016): 267.

⁹⁴ Wood, “2017 Index,” 316.

⁹⁵ Wood, “2017 Index,” 14.

Peshmerga, conducting drone and special operations in Yemen, aiding in the war on drugs in South America, and fighting piracy around the globe. In addition, it is tasked with deterring two near peer powers, namely Russia and China, building up new cyberwarfare capabilities from scratch, and modernizing aging hardware with a shrinking budget. This is not sustainable, and while it can be done now, we are sacrificing the future for the present.

Budgetary Concerns

While budgeting constraints will always exist, the fact remains that the United States must significantly raise defense spending to provide for the modernization programs and reforms which will allow for an effective transition from a bipolar world to a multipolar one. Currently, US defense spending is \$610 billion, 3.3% of its GDP.⁹⁶ An increase of up to 5.5% (the percentage in 1988, at the end of Reagan's military buildup) would increase US defense spending to a little over 1 trillion dollars.⁹⁷ This increase in spending is not permanent and could be allocated to last no longer than four years, but would be a necessary investment for reform, equipment upgrades, and R&D, which would ensure US military capabilities for another century and save money in the long term. This increase could then be decreased gradually over another four years, back down to 3.3-4%. Some may question why we need to maintain these capabilities. The response is clear: the US military needs to meet all obligations placed upon it by the President of the United States, and those obligations are being increased rather than being reduced.

⁹⁶ "Military Expenditure (% of GDP) | Data," World Bank, accessed February 7, 2017. <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/MS.MIL.XPND.GD.ZS>.

⁹⁷ "Military Expenditure" World Bank.

Principles of the New American Way of War

In an era of decreasing budgets and increasing threats, and as technology proliferation increases lethality of non-state actors, a switch to a warfare philosophy that best plays to America's strengths –primarily technology and education– is needed. The US is the 8th most educated country in the world –after Singapore, Finland, the Netherlands, and several other small European countries– and is among the most technologically advanced.⁹⁸ Therefore, the American Way of War should seek to play to our advantages in these sectors by following the “maneuver warfare” philosophy. This theory can be defined as a “warfighting philosophy that seeks to shatter the enemy's cohesion through a variety of rapid, focused, and unexpected actions which create a turbulent and rapidly deteriorating situation with which the enemy cannot cope.”⁹⁹ In essence, it calls for the US military to be not the strongest on the battlefield, but rather the most able to fight in a way which focuses on rapid strikes against critical vulnerabilities (such communications, headquarters, and logistics) in an enemy military's infrastructure. Theoretically, this will create a rapidly changing and deteriorating situation which traditional, heavily centralized militaries cannot respond to.

But how does this play to technology and education? American forces must rely on technology as a force multiplier in order create those rapid and focused strikes. The development of Joint Direct Attack Munition (JDAM) shows the importance of

⁹⁸ “The Global Competitiveness Report 2016–2017” Klaus Schwab, *World Economic Forum*, accessed February 20, 2017. <https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-global-competitiveness-report-2016-2017-1>

⁹⁹ United States Marine Corps, *Warfighting*, (1997).

technology in this type of warfare. In the Persian Gulf War, laser guided bombs made up of 8% of the ordinance dropped but accounted for 84% of destroyed targets. Laser guided weapons, however, were curbed by weather and expense and were in limited supply. Replacing the large arsenal of regular “dumb” bombs that the US already maintained was far too expensive; rather, the JDAM was developed at a much cheaper cost. Essentially a conversion kit, it outfits a regular “dumb” bomb with a GPS and laser guidance system. This gives the US a chance to modernize its existing “dumb bomb” arsenal cheaply and gives us the capability to drop fewer bombs and destroy more targets. It avoids the indiscriminate bombings in the style of prior wars and allows for specific accurate strikes, which limit civilian casualties. Employing technology, US forces could destroy more targets with fewer strikes, reduce US and civilian casualties while only destroying the infrastructure required of a particular mission.

Education plays into this as well. Per Secretary of Defense James Mattis, “The most important six inches on the battlefield is between your ears.”¹⁰⁰ Our warfighters need to be educated and able to act and think independently in order to take advantage of the enemy’s disarray. The nature of warfare does not always allow the luxury of waiting for orders; rather, independence and leadership must be instilled in our junior leaders through their matriculation and graduation from basic combat courses, through their acceptance of increasing responsibilities as delegated by senior leadership, and, generally, through the expansion of education and development programs at non-commissioned officer schools in all branches. Additionally, as the military engages in

¹⁰⁰ Paul Szoldra, “19 Unforgettable Quotes from Legendary Marine Gen. James ‘Mad Dog’ Mattis,” *Business Insider*, last modified December 1, 2016.
<http://www.businessinsider.com/general-mattiss-best-quotes-2016-11>

advising missions and counter insurgency operations, or as they operate in foreign countries –whether that be on liberty or conducting operations of any type– our men and women need to think and be aware of the consequences of their actions to global affairs. From Secretary of Defense Mattis again, “If in order to kill the enemy you have to kill an innocent, don't take the shot. Don't create more enemies than you take out by some immoral act.”¹⁰¹ Our way of war needs to play to our strengths of education and technology as well as adhere to our moral standards. Sun Tzu once said, “The supreme art of war is to subdue the enemy without fighting.” Our way of war should not only seek to defeat our enemy, but also to preserve the moral high ground to which we hold ourselves. Educating our warriors in how to fight a decentralized war is important, but we also must instill in them the understanding that the American Way of War is brutal and precise to the enemy while remaining humane and friendly to civilians. In 2003, thousands of Iraqi soldiers surrendered because of America’s reputation for humane treatment.¹⁰² Our reputation saved both American and Iraqi lives, and no doubt served as an advantage when we began to rebuild Iraq. US forces must be educated, not only to be able to fight the technologically advanced, decentralized warfare of the future, but also to conduct themselves in accordance with the high standards we set ourselves.

The corollary to that idea is the fact that the US must maintain a technological and strategic edge to her rivals. This reports posits that the “OODA Loop” theory is the best way to maintain that. The “OODA Loop” is a decision cycle (Observe, Orient, Decide, Act) which seeks to define the parts of a decision in order to speed it up. If we

¹⁰¹ Szoldra, "Best Quotes of Gen. James Mattis"

¹⁰² "Thousands of Iraqi Soldiers Surrender," *Fox News*, March 22, 2003.

<http://www.foxnews.com/story/2003/03/22/thousands-iraqi-soldiers-surrender.html>

can observe the situation faster than our opponent and orient ourselves on the best course of action before they can, then we can decide and act faster, therefore operating long before the enemy has had a chance to decide. This applies to the battlefield but also to grand strategy and technology acquisition. If we can be observing and orienting ourselves in the world and in technology faster than our rivals, we can remain one step ahead of them, forcing them to be reactive. We can implement this by teaching this concept at all levels of command, but it serves more as a guiding philosophy which we seek to apply to our policymaking. In a multipolar world with a variety of actors, The US must stay one step ahead of our rivals to stay proactive rather than being reactive.

Naval Power

Modernization

Examining the US Navy, one sees a powerful but rapidly aging force, which risks losing the technology gap so important to the American Way of War. Modernization is required to meet the mission of the US Navy. However, modernization efforts so far have seen massive cost overruns and extremely disappointing results. The USS Gerald R. Ford (CVN-78) has been delayed by over two years due to reliability issues related to new technologies.¹⁰³ The USS Zumwalt (DDG-1000) went from a 32 ship program to a three ship program due to cost, has poor seamanship, breaks down regularly, and requires ammunition which is too expensive to fire for its main selling point, the 155mm

¹⁰³ "Delivery of Navy's Most Expensive Aircraft Carrier Delayed Again," *Military.com*, November 7, 2016. <http://www.military.com/daily-news/2016/10/07/delivery-navys-most-expensive-aircraft-carrier-delayed-again.html>

gun.¹⁰⁴ The USS America (LHA-6) was supposed to be a new class of amphibious war ship designed to put Marines on beaches; however, it was designed without a well deck, which is the deck from which amphibious craft are launched and the program was cancelled after two ships due to the lack of this capability. In short, Navy modernization has been an expensive failure. It has been plagued with cost overruns, unreliable technology, and unreliable ships. This is due to an approach which seeks to create the next perfect warship based on unproven experimental technology rather than taking an incremental path. The US Navy must make a more conservative and common sense approach to modernization like it did with the Laser Weapons System or LaWS program. This program sought to weaponize lasers, which would reduce the amount of ammunition carried and provide a cheap defensive weapon. It underwent a four-year development and then a year-long trial run. It is currently operational and the Navy has its first laser weapon capable of destroying small incoming threats (such as aircraft or small boats), which previously would have required far more expensive and less effective missiles to achieve. The Navy should follow this approach and focus on incremental increases, rather than large programs hoping on untested technology to succeed.

Capabilities

The Navy needs over-the-horizon amphibious capabilities to ensure the United States can land troops anywhere in the world. This doctrine exists, calling for Navy ships positioned over the horizon, and out of the range of Anti Access/Area Denial (or A2/AD) missiles and other land based threats, to conduct an amphibious landing. This requires

¹⁰⁴ "The Navy's Zumwalt Problem," *Washington Times*, November 28, 2016, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2016/nov/28/the-navys-zumwalt-problem/>

modernizing ship-to-shore vehicles and air assets, as well as creating naval gunfire support capabilities.

Climate Change

The opening of the Arctic, due to decreasing amounts of sea ice, will create new shipping routes and expose new oil and natural gas reserves. Currently, Russia is in the most advantageous position to benefit from this development. Russia's Northern Fleet composed of 2/3rds of the Navy is in prime position to control the Arctic and has recently conducted military operations there as well. In 2015, the Arctic and Atlantic were designated as the focal points of the Russian Navy.¹⁰⁵ This is problematic, as the United States has always sought primacy in the global commons –whether sea, space, or cyberspace– and ensuring US leadership in the region is vital to establishing this primacy. Attaining dominance in the Arctic will allow us to pursue an agenda of environmental protection and freedom of trade, as well as serving as a deterrent to Russian attempts to violate international agreements such as the Svalbard Treaty. The Svalbard Treaty was signed in 1925 and demilitarizes the Svalbard archipelago while recognizing Norwegian sovereignty over it. However, Russia is beginning to conduct military operations in the archipelago, violating Norwegian sovereignty and showcasing their contempt of international law. It is in the interests of the US to ensure sovereignty, and Russia's recent behavior in the Arctic sets the stage for conflict between the United States and Russia. The Navy must be prepared to ensure US naval domination in the Arctic in order to deter Russian threats, while also respecting its sovereign rights to the region.

¹⁰⁵ Wood, "2017 Index"

The Cyber Battlespace

Cyberspace

The idea of cyberspace conjures ideas of a mystifying world that connects cars, phones, vital infrastructure, and the Internet all together. Yet cyberspace is simply the connection of computers through a network. In creating a cyberspace strategy, the US must first define cyberspace and then develop a metric which determines which critical vulnerabilities can be neutralized by cyber-attacks, ascertaining at which point they affect the health of the United States and, furthermore, when a cyberattack inhibits US ability to respond to crisis. Next, the United States needs to make Cyber Command (CYBERCOM) an independent Combatant Command, due to the importance and scope of cyber warfare. Currently, it is a subsection of Strategic Command; making it a Combatant Command will grant Cyber Command far more resources and capabilities. Cyberspace is far more complex and expansive than any regional Combatant Command and desperately needs the resources. The United States must then work with the civilian sectors –through partnerships with corporations– toward building defenses for vital national infrastructure while working with contractors and internet security organizations in developing cyber-attack and information warfare capabilities. The private sector has far more growth potential than the US government and this should be taken advantage of through a partnership. The US military should build strong ties to the information security sector to help create awareness within the United States about the dangers of cyber threats, as well as to create a relationship that will provide personnel and advanced technology.

Threats

When examining threats, the US needs to realize that it is behind Russia in the cyber warfare field. Russia's experience with cyber warfare during the Chechen war led it to realize its potential. The Chechen insurgency took down the Russian army's Internet servers several times with cyberattacks.¹⁰⁶ This experience was instrumental in developing the Russian focus on cyber warfare. Russia has employed information warfare to great extent since using it in Ukraine, Estonia, and Georgia, and expanding to the US. According to a cyberwarfare report published by the Strategic Studies Institute, the view among many is that the Russia is increasingly threatened by the United States and that the US is such a threat that we have supposedly developed, "the capability to manipulate the weather and cause natural disasters."¹⁰⁷ The same report quotes supposed Russian defense expert Yuri Boylov, who claimed that everything that occurred in the Indian Ocean tsunami of December 2004 was the direct result of US local tests of radio-physical and geographical superweapons."¹⁰⁸ While this may seem ridiculous, it is a worrying point of view from a state that is increasingly pulling ahead of us in the cyber realm. More importantly, Russia increasingly sees cyber warfare as a way to level the playing field. Their military doctrine published in 2010 and 2012 promoted using cyber and information warfare to destroy an enemy's will to resist by creating unrest at home, destroying communication technology, and hindering an enemy force

¹⁰⁶ Phil Williams and Dighton Fidler, "Cyberspace: Malevolent Actors, Criminal Opportunities, and Strategic Competition," (Washington: United States Army War College Press, August 2016).

¹⁰⁷ Williams and Fidler, "Cyberspace"

¹⁰⁸ Williams and Fidler, "Cyberspace"

(by destroying satellites and attacking the electronic command and control network).¹⁰⁹
In the cyber field, Russia poses a grave threat to which we must catch up.

Space Warfare

The United States currently maintains a huge advantage in space, both in its number of satellites and in its capabilities and infrastructure. The US maintains 576 active satellites while Russian and China maintain 140 and 181 respectively.¹¹⁰ This by no means indicates that the US will always have its advantage; rather, as technology gets cheaper and proliferation increases, other nations will find it far easier to launch satellites. Even then, satellite dominance does not mean that the US alone can experience the advantage conferred on it by GPS, satellites imagery, and other technologies; rather, neutral civilian satellites could convey the same information to foreign powers. The US satellite system is also vulnerable to land-based missiles. Developing any defense against these land-based missiles in space is prohibitively expensive and could serve to start a new arms race. Ultimately, space dominance is something which the US can only maintain through continued technological advances. Satellites are increasingly vulnerable to earth-based missiles as well as to cyber threats. Most alarmingly, this network serves as a vital communication hub to US forces and is key to the US command and control network. However, it is important to remember that we have been fighting long before the creation of satellites; while a great advantage, these satellites must not be relied upon to the point that we cannot operate without

¹⁰⁹ Williams and Fidler, "Cyberspace"

¹¹⁰ "UCS Satellite Database," *Union of Concerned Scientists*, accessed February 11, 2017, <http://www.ucsusa.org/nuclear-weapons/space-weapons/satellite-database#.WJ-qfzsrJEY>

them. Rather, the US military must maintain traditional methods of land and oceanic navigation via compass and sextant, and develop in our junior leaders an ability to think and act effectively to accomplish their missions in a communications vacuum.

Land Domination

Reforms

While the Navy experiences increased modernization funding, the US Army must undergo retrenchment and reorganization. It should undergo reorganization from 460 thousand troops into a 400 thousand man force along the lines of the Macgregor Transformational Model.¹¹¹ This model posits reorganizing the army from separate armor, infantry, and support units into combat brigades that would maintain all three elements. This would significantly reduce troop numbers by eliminating repetitive jobs (by, for example, consolidating the support troops from each separate unit) and reducing top brass by reducing repetitive commands, therefore creating units which are easier to train and modernize.¹¹² This would allow for a focus on training ‘two-speed’ soldiers able to fight both conventional and unconventional warfare such as counterinsurgency, advising, and guerilla warfare. It would enable modernization to be achieved more easily as there would be fewer units to equip; furthermore, it would decentralize and strengthen US forces. This would serve as the baseline for a small, agile army, heavily trained and professionalized. The National Guard would increase from 520 thousand to 600 thousand troops, which would maintain deterrence through the ability to rapidly create a large force capable of response to near-peer threats. The US

¹¹¹ Douglas MacGregor, Mark Fitzgerald, and David Deptula, “Macgregor Transformation Model,” (General Billy Mitchell Institute for Aerospace Studies, 2013).

¹¹² MacGregor, Fitzgerald, and Deptula, “Macgregor Transformation Model”

army must move from a large standing army, to a smaller one, and rely on a more capable National Guard as a back-up source of strength.

Crisis Response

To fill the void of an increasingly smaller Army, the United States Marine Corps must be called upon for forward deployment in the Pacific and the Mediterranean. Its natural relationship with the US Navy and Marine Air Ground Task Force (or MAGTF) structure enables it to deploy rapidly anywhere in the world. As of 2016, the Marine Corps needs 27 Battalions to meet all requirements but is currently at 24. Fulfilling the objectives of this report would require the Marine Corps to be increased to 30-36 battalions, with 15 battalions to be deployed (the average the Marine Corps has deployed to a conflict), six to serve as a reserve, and another 15 to maintain US presence in other parts of the world.¹¹³ Including additional funding for aviation with an estimated three billion cost, this would increase US Marine Corps funding from 24 to 28 billion dollars.¹¹⁴

Geopolitical Requirements

Currently the US maintains troops forward deployed in Europe, the Middle East, South Korea, and Japan. It maintains troop rotations in Georgia, Bulgaria, Ukraine, Australia, the Philippines, Australia, Singapore, Iraq, Afghanistan, Kuwait, and numerous African countries, training their militaries and ensuring their security, as well as several air bases throughout the Middle East and Africa. Should the US seek to

¹¹³ Wood, "2017 Index," 271.

¹¹⁴ Wood, "2017 Index"

continue leading the world, it must maintain these obligations, as withdrawal would leave a vacuum that could be exploited by rivals. The global requirements placed on the military demand that the US maintain a large standing force.

Military Nuclear Policy

The United States, as the global hegemon, has the most to lose in a nuclear war. Even in an ideal situation with absolutely no US casualties, the resulting destruction would significantly damage the world economy on which we rely. Even more so, the dominance of our military in all areas except cyberspace means that the only threat to our security is nuclear weapons. Thus, United States should continue the no-first use policy and push for nonproliferation as a significant priority.

Current State

However, until this goal is achieved the US must maintain a nuclear deterrent. The US achieves this by maintaining a stockpile of over 1,480 nuclear warheads and 741 delivery vehicles.¹¹⁵ Many of these vehicles, such as the Minuteman III, currently only carry one warhead but have the capability to carry up to three.¹¹⁶ The most serious concern facing the US nuclear arsenal is its age. According to the National Nuclear Security Administration, by the end of 2017, the NNSA will lack a single engineer involved in developing existing warheads. Over 40% of employees at the NNSA are over 50. Aging diagnostic equipment and infrastructure complicates readiness, and more importantly, the US military is growing complacent with its nuclear forces. In 2007, the Air Force transported nuclear-armed missile across the United States without

¹¹⁵ “New START,” United States State Department, accessed February 20, 2017.

¹¹⁶ Wood, “2017 Index of Military Strength”

authorization because they did not realize they were nuclear missiles. The crew in charge of transporting them assumed they were regular cruise missiles. This incident led to the creation of a Task Force on DOD Nuclear Weapons Management which found that, “The readiness of forces assigned the nuclear mission has seriously eroded.”¹¹⁷ The United States has managed to maintain an effective number of warheads and reliable delivery systems, and yet the infrastructure which supports our nuclear weapons, scientists, diagnostic equipment, and crews, are rapidly degrading in their capabilities.

Threats

More importantly, the fact that the US nuclear technology has remained stagnant is a major threat to our perceived effectiveness. As other states, such as Russia, modernize their nuclear forces, the US risks facing a technology gap due to its stagnant nuclear arsenal. This puts US nuclear dominance at risk. The US must maintain its position as the dominant nuclear power due to its obligations in providing nuclear security for NATO, Japan, South Korea, and other allied states. A significant perceived degradation in US nuclear capabilities could encourage allies to develop their own weapons to ensure security resulting in increased proliferation and an increased threat to the United States.

Recruiting and Retention

Modernizing and reorganizing the US military around the American Way of War starts with recruiting and retaining quality personnel. General Krulak, USMC, stated, “For over 221 years our Corps has done two things for this great nation. We make

¹¹⁷ “Independent Review of the Department of Defense Nuclear Enterprise,” United States Department of Defense (2008).

Marines and we win battles.” It’s notable that he places making Marines before winning battles and one would question why. In fact, 40% of the US military has never deployed, and 80% serve in non-combat jobs. The clear majority of the US military will never see combat and a significant number will never even leave the US. The implication of this are that the US military has a mission to win wars, but it also has a mission to develop the millions who will serve in its ranks into responsible law abiding citizens. The military can accomplish this through education and through holding service members to high standards of conduct.

Recruiting should be focused on advertising the challenges as well as the job training and opportunities that the US military offers. The focus should be on high school and college graduates, with military service being portrayed as a viable career but also as a stepping-stone in life. Under the draft, military service was something one did before starting real life; this same idea can be offered up to high school seniors, many of whom have been told college is essential but have no idea what they want to do and may not have the means to pay for it. Military service allows for further education, self-discovery, and life experience, which will prepare many to enter the civilian sector.

The US military must also sell itself to the American public. As many people no longer have a direct connection to servicemen and women, due to the burden of military service falling on fewer and fewer people, the US military must increase its public relations. Films, TV shows, and social media go a long way in shaping public perception of the military and can be far more effective than a recruiting advertisement. Shaping public perception of the military will also inform what it can or cannot do. A democratic people should be educated in what their military can do; for example, public

disillusionment with the slow results of nation building compromised the military's strategy in Vietnam, Iraq, and Afghanistan. Educating the American public and shaping their perception will be vital for recruiting and retention, as well as communicating the military's needs and realities to the American people.

Conclusion

The US military is by far the most powerful fighting force in history. For the last 16 years, it has conducted continuous combat operations in the Middle East and in Central Asia, served as a deterrent in Southeast Asia and Eastern Europe, and has safeguarded shipping lanes around the world. The United States military is global in every aspect. It is, however, the product of an era that was focused on peer-to-peer world war and must modernize and reform to deal with the greater number of low intensity multipolar threats of today. Its aging weapons systems suffer from reduced maintenance and a high deployment rate. New fields such as cyberwarfare pose brand new threats that the military must counter, while old ones such as nuclear weapons must be maintained and modernized to ensure credibility. New warfighting strategies must be developed to take into consideration the new interconnected world that now exists, and high professionalization must be ensured, as technology has become the edge that gives us victory.

Policy Recommendations

- Invest up to 5.5% of GDP for four to eight years with a subsequent drawdown to 3.5% should be made in to modernize and reform the military
- Reduce and reorganize the US Army's Active Duty force and shift its strength to the National Guard, allowing us to maintain a large military at a much lower cost,

as well as providing bridging the civil-military relations gap

- Adapt the smaller Active Duty force towards intense professionalization and specialization, forming the core of a much larger citizen-soldier force
- Modernize the United States' nuclear infrastructure and ordinance, allowing us to reduce our arsenal while maintaining deterrence and placing greater importance on nuclear readiness and research
- Designate CYBERCOM as a combatant command and with it provide the necessary resources to ensure development of cybersecurity supremacy, as well as pursue partnerships with the civilian information security sector

Conclusion

In charting the United States' interface with the world in the 21st century, we propose that the American military will still be the foremost protector of American security and global peace, constantly updated to best counter the threats of a newly multipolar world. With the combined soft power and hard power of American leadership, reflected in both international organizations and military superiority, we will be better suited to tackle global threats to peace. The continued instilment of international norms and, if necessary, the military enforcement of these norms will help curb the ambitions of future rogue states wishing to acquire nuclear weapons. And, finally, to solve any global crisis that requires the cooperation of all nations –whether it be climate change or an unforeseen future struggle– we stress that the United States must do our utmost to encourage global unification.

Policy Recommendations

- Invest in our military to ensure it has the capabilities needed for a new multipolar world by increasing the Defense budget in the short-term to address critical needs, and then drawing back down to a stable expenditure for the maintenance of US military advantage
- Reorganize the US Army into a small well-trained specialized body and a larger reserve force based out of the National Guard, providing flexibility in addressing various forms of conventional warfare
- Build upon our commitments to the Paris Climate Treaty and set ambitious goals for further cuts to carbon emissions, as well as work with other nations to sustain the progress made
- Establish a treaty through the Arctic Council, prohibiting non-scientific access to the Arctic Circle, based on the Antarctic Treaty System (1959)
- Encourage the reformation of supranational bodies such as the International Court of Justice to better reflect world opinion and international consensus
- Demonstrate our commitment to the tenets of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) by making substantial cuts to our nuclear arsenal while modernizing our remaining force, and push for greater oversight by the IAEA of NPT signatories and nuclear weapon-possessing states like India and Pakistan

III. America Evolved: Harnessing the New Economy

Introduction

America's status as the world's most vital nation is as dependent on its prosperity as it is on its military might and ability to project power worldwide. The federal government's capacity to allocate resources to our armed forces, the private sector's ability to develop beneficial products and technologies, and the satisfaction of the domestic public are all closely tied to the continued growth of American wealth at home and abroad. This has been proven repeatedly during periods where the United States has faced its greatest existential threats: Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan were unable to keep up with the sheer industrial output of the American heartland, while the Soviet Empire lost control of its satellites in great part due to their desire to benefit from the Western free market system.

Therefore, the formulation of a long-term strategy that anticipates the potential disruptions and opportunities of the new global economy is as important as questions of diplomacy and military strategy. As the United States evaluates how it will face the rapidly changing and increasingly interconnected world of the 21st century, it must take into account its economic interests as well as the potential economic costs associated with achieving its political objectives.

Since the beginning of the Cold War, America's unparalleled ability to influence countries through nonviolent means has been critical to the preservation of global stability. The most relevant example of this in our history is the Marshall Plan, which leveraged American capital to provide a devastated post-War Europe with almost 120

billion dollars (adjusted for inflation) in aid. This aid was critical to preventing the spread of Soviet influence into Western Europe, and laid the foundation for an economically strong region stretching from Portugal to Austria that has been free from inter-state conflict since 1945. Because of the pragmatic exercise of economic influence, the European Union is now our strongest ally as well as our largest trading partner.

Worldwide, the liberal economic system that the United States has promoted through international trade organizations like the WTO has contributed to unprecedented economic cohesion between states. When countries are tied together in the mutually beneficial exchange of goods, the opportunity cost of war goes up significantly, making political leaders much more likely to de-escalate and rely on nonviolent means to resolve conflicts.

Our economy also plays a key role in helping the United States deal with states that threaten stability. The American ability to impose sanctions has been a formidable tool for discouraging nuclear proliferation and punishing violators of international norms. When more direct means of coercion are required, a powerful industrial and technological base enables the maintenance of a well-funded and technologically advanced military.

America's advanced 17 trillion-dollar economy has allowed it to exert the influence that it does in the world today. However, our economic strength and the skill of our workforce, which have always underwritten our international influence, should not be taken for granted. Rapid growth in the developing world means that American companies and workers must now contend in an increasingly crowded global marketplace. In the new "knowledge economy," educating America's workers and ensuring that the United States retains its role as an innovation capital must take the

highest priority. On the business side, reforming America's institutions and removing barriers to expansion and innovation will encourage the companies of the future to make their start here.

At the same time that economic convergence alters the global market, the creeping impact of climate change will also significantly alter the environment as we know it. If climate change continues unchecked at its current pace, it will hinder US industry and development, particularly in the agricultural sector as breadbasket regions become too hot to sustain plant growth. Most significantly, vital economic centers on the coast such as New York, Miami, Boston, and New Orleans will be affected by encroaching ocean waters.

Issues like climate change and globalization are too great for one country alone to address. We thus require multilateral solutions as well as constant engagement with the international system on America's part. As advances in technology and communications bring us ever closer together, the United States cannot afford to close itself off to the world. This is even truer than in the past, now that economic interconnectedness can exacerbate what might have been formerly domestic crises. Grain shortages in Ukraine can spark political unrest in Egypt, while a drop in Chinese manufacturing growth can destroy American wealth on the S&P 500.

Finally, the next few decades will see job creation in the developed world slow as new technologies disrupt industries and workers. Because of the scalability of technology and mobile platforms, disruptive startups like Uber and Snapchat can replace entire labor forces. One of the most poignant examples of this is the collapse of the camera company Kodak, a fixture of the American economy for more than one hundred years. At its peak in 1988, Kodak employed more than 150,000 employees

worldwide. Now, outcompeted and out-scaled by mobile cameras, its workforce has shrunk by 96%. By comparison, the mobile photo app Snapchat employs just over three hundred people. To mitigate the unrest and suffering caused by disruptions of this kind, the United States must take a direct hand in assisting those who are left behind. Any government that wishes to take full advantage of creative destruction must also foster new opportunities for reeducation and reemployment to close the gap between the fluctuating job market and the labor force.

At first glance, these challenges may seem insurmountable. After 70 years of dominance and prosperity, the United States faces unprecedented economic threats both at home and abroad. Not only is the future bound to be more disruptive and more volatile, the diffusion of economic power and the shift of growth from the global north to the south means that the world economy will also become harder to control. Tackling these challenges will require proactive and aggressive policies. The following sections illustrate just how America's inherent advantages can be leveraged to ensure that the threats of the future can not only be addressed, but also harnessed for the betterment of the nation.

A. Competitive Globalization Abroad, Equitable Growth at Home

The current global order remains distinctly American in no small part due to the economic might and industrial power of the United States. Through the promotion of free trade and open investment, the United States has been able to reduce conflict, increase interconnectedness, and encourage development across the world. Both the United States and the world as a whole have benefitted from the American promotion of a liberal world order since the end of the Cold War. Due to the benefits of globalization, 88% of Americans enjoy a standard of living above that of the international middle class standard.¹¹⁸ A billion people worldwide have been lifted out of poverty since 1990, while the spread of technologies and goods developed in the United States has brought unprecedented advances in communications, medicine, and computerization. Over the next two decades, two billion more people will begin to enjoy a high standard of living that would be unimaginable to their parents before them.¹¹⁹

A prosperous and open world economy directly benefits the American vision of a more stable and liberal world order, while an America that is economically strong will have sufficient resources to achieve its foreign policy goals. Nevertheless, the future trajectory of the international economy is not inevitably guaranteed to be solely in America's favor, unless we make serious policy changes. America's weight as a share of global GDP fell from 16.82% in 2010 to 15.6% in 2016, while the economies of competitors in the developing world have taken an increasing slice of the pie.¹²⁰

¹¹⁸ Rakesh Kochhar, "How Americans Compare with the Global Middle Class," *Pew Research Center*, July 09, 2015.

¹¹⁹ Richard Dobbs, J. Manyika, and Jonathan R. Woetzel, *No Ordinary Disruption: The Four Global Forces Breaking All the Trends* (New York, NY: PublicAffairs, 2015), 8.

¹²⁰ United States - Share of global gross domestic product (GDP) 2020 | Statistic."

According to the McKinsey Global Institute, half of all GDP growth during the next ten years will be driven by seven emerging markets: China, India, Brazil, Mexico, Russia, Turkey, and Indonesia.¹²¹ More than ever before, potential disruptive threats to American workers and companies are likely to emerge from places outside the orbit of the developed world. The United States must prepare for a future where the next Facebook or Uber might emerge from Southern India's Technopark or one of China's innovation zones, rather than from Silicon Valley. The demand side of the economy is changing as well –according to the Office of the United States Trade Representative, 95% of the world's potential consumers now reside outside of the United States.¹²² As economic convergence raises purchasing power in formerly poor countries, the ability to sell to the ever-growing global middle class will be the primary determinant of success for both American corporations and small businesses.

However, in these key markets of the future, American companies face fierce competition from foreign multinationals. Many of these companies are fully state-owned, heavily subsidized, and are often extensions of their parent countries' economic objectives. Rather than being held accountable to shareholders, state-owned enterprises (SOEs) in key sectors like aviation, telecommunications, finance, and energy answer only to government bureaucrats.¹²³ For these bureaucrats, SOEs allow the state to create

Statista. 2016. Accessed February 03, 2017.

<https://www.statista.com/statistics/270267/united-states-share-of-global-gross-domestic-product-gdp/>

¹²¹ Dobbs, Manyika, and Woetzel, *No Ordinary Disruption*, 96.

¹²² US Trade Representative. "TPP Chapter Summary: State Owned Enterprises." Office Of The United States Trade Representative, last modified November 5, 2015. Accessed January 13, 2017. <https://ustr.gov/sites/default/files/TPP-Chapter-Summary-State-Owned-Enterprises.pdf>

¹²³ "Fixing China Inc." *The Economist*, August 30, 2014.

artificially competitive companies in critical industries while making it difficult for foreign firms to effectively enter the domestic market.

Compounding this, American businesses trying to export to new markets find themselves challenged by unfavorable rules in target countries. At home, labyrinthine tax and regulatory regimes incentivize American companies to move both their headquarters and capital abroad, while making it more difficult for foreign companies to invest. Most significantly, sluggish productivity and GDP growth after the 2008 recession have been accompanied by a growing public distrust of multilateral trade agreements and a greater populist shift towards more protectionist policies. The slow recovery and stagnation of wages since the recession now means that the millennial generation will be the first generation to be economically worse off than their parents. In the current political climate, articulating an outward looking yet domestically palatable economic plan will be one of the next administration's greatest challenges. Any long-term economic strategy must make a strong case for globalization to the American public while also ensuring that those who are left behind are taken care of and provided with new opportunities.

Thus, to ensure American prosperity in an inevitably more interconnected world, the United States must re-evaluate and even renegotiate trade agreements, reform the business environment at home, and leverage international bodies and government agencies to ensure a level playing field for US companies abroad. In the long-term, proactive policies must be implemented that increase American competitiveness in the markets and industries of the future.

Because of their expertise and economies of scale, America's multinationals have always led the competitiveness charge, bringing considerable benefits to American

workers. Despite only comprising .3% of companies, large firms in the US create a third of new jobs every year.¹²⁴ These firms also pay significantly higher wages than their smaller counterparts. As a result, helping our multinationals to expand will be critical to the wellbeing of American workers.

This does not mean, however, that small businesses cannot also be at the forefront of global competitiveness and domestic wealth creation. Contrary to the popular belief that increased globalization will only benefit wealthy individuals and large multinationals, the unprecedented ease with which economies of scale can now be created by private individuals means that small and medium businesses, which employ 56% of Americans, also stand to gain from globalization.¹²⁵ Technology and the digitization of commerce have made it infinitely easier for American entrepreneurs to reach millions of new consumers with nothing more than a big idea and an Internet connection. Where our workers and entrepreneurs excel is in what the entrepreneur and venture capitalist Peter Thiel describes as going from “0 to 1,” or creating innovation and new ideas from scratch. Therefore, the implementation of policies that make the United States fertile ground for this sort of entrepreneurship and value creation will be integral to ensuring the future creation of jobs and opportunities, agnostic of class.

American Trade Agreements and the Future of Regional Relations

During the 2016 presidential campaign, foreign trade quickly became one of the most controversial and significant issues debated by the candidates. The current administration owes much of its electoral success to its ability to tap into a broad

¹²⁴ Rachel Weiner and Justin Jouvenal, "Who Actually Creates Jobs: Start-ups, Small Businesses or Big Corporations?" *The Washington Post*, April 25, 2015.

¹²⁵ Weiner and Jouvenal, "Who Actually Creates Jobs"

American sentiment: The feeling that the benefits of globalization, accompanied by increased trade and outsourcing, have benefited a small segment of the United States at the expense of the middle class and traditional sectors such as manufacturing and heavy industry. The political debate on trade thus far has centered around two multilateral trade agreements, one already in effect and one whose negotiations the United States recently withdrew from: The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), respectively. There is a great deal of overlap between the two treaties: all of the signatories of NAFTA are also involved in the TPP talks.

Entered into force in 1996, NAFTA did much to lower tariffs and ease the flow of goods between the three major North American nations. Some economists estimate that the passage of this treaty added .5% to US GDP, or approximately 80 billion dollars.¹²⁶ However, policymakers on both sides of the aisle believe that American manufacturing has left the country in great part due to outsourcing to Mexico. Mexico has been the primary beneficiary of NAFTA, due to the fact that it is a developing economy able to use its lower labor costs to attract American factories and export its products to two developed economies. However, American companies have also benefited from NAFTA, creating highly efficient supply chains that extend along the US-Mexico border. Despite overall GDP gains and the fact that 200,000 export related jobs are created every year due to NAFTA, the treaty's adoption has had a conspicuous cost for auto manufacturing: the American auto sector has lost 350,000 jobs since 1994, while the Mexican auto sector gained approximately 430,000 new jobs during the same period.¹²⁷

¹²⁶ James McBride and Mohammed Aly Sergie, "NAFTA's Economic Impact," *Council on Foreign Relations*, January 24, 2017.

¹²⁷ McBride and Sergie, "NAFTA's Economic Impact"

While NAFTA has been a modest net positive for the United States economy, the 1994 agreement is in many ways outdated. A renegotiation that sets standards for new digital enterprises and eases the flow of information and data between the three participants would benefit both US workers and businesses. The US currently maintains a \$41.5 billion services surplus with its NAFTA partners, and so a renegotiation should also focus on continuing to increase that surplus as much as possible through the further removal of tariffs. Opting for higher labor and environmental standards with our southern neighbor would also be an important step towards slowing the losses to our manufacturing sector. While the president does indeed retain the power to unilaterally withdraw from NAFTA if a renegotiation does not turn out favorably, this would not be a wise move, as it would force individual negotiations of bilateral treaties and the costly unraveling of a complex network of supply chains that facilitate trade between the three.

On the other hand, the TPP is a multilateral trade agreement conducted with 12 other countries in one of the most important regions for US interests. The potential to open up these markets to American businesses, especially small and medium service providers, is tremendous. Moreover, the standardization of trade and tariffs among Asian countries representing a combined 40% of global GDP will likely give China a strong incentive to join, pressuring China to abide by global best practices such as labor regulations and intellectual property laws. One of the most significant components of the TPP is the regulation of state owned enterprises, which would be a tremendous step towards reducing government intervention in the free market amongst developing nations. Our recent withdrawal from this agreement signals to our rivals the beginning of the end of US political and economic commitment to the region. While imperfect, the foundation set by the TPP would have been a way for the United States to exert its

influence and protect the interests of Americans in one of the world's most important regions. Should the opportunity to participate in similar negotiations arise, American policymakers must not shirk the opportunity.

Already, the negative sentiments leveled at the TPP by American politicians have inspired more assertive Chinese leadership on trade. At the recent Davos meeting of the World Economic Forum, Chinese President Xi Jinping used the gathering of economic leaders as a platform to tout an increasing role for China as a global free trade leader. In an uncharacteristically trade-positive speech, President Xi spoke out against protectionism, stating "Pursuing protectionism is just like locking oneself in a dark room... No one will emerge as a winner in a trade war."¹²⁸ Xi's boldness in the face of his own country's rampant protectionism reveals that without strong US leadership, China will quickly fill the vacuum as the world's primary economic influencer, shaping the global market in their state capitalist image.

Much of the controversy surrounding American participation in free trade agreements comes from the potential threat that they pose to American manufacturing. However, we must recognize that the growth of manufacturing has been diminished even in developing nations, while the American services industry has grown rapidly and continues to be a net surplus for the United States. Any future trade agenda must therefore heavily focus on the liberalization of the trade in services, an industry that America's highly educated workforce is particularly suited for.

As a long-term trade strategy, the liberalization of the services trade and the removal of barriers to sectors like technology, construction, and communications must

¹²⁸ Peter S. Goodman, "In Era of Trump, China's President Champions Economic Globalization," *New York Times*. January 17, 2017.

take the highest priority. Currently, the main obstacles to American service providers consist of high tariffs that range from 45-70% in emerging markets, which is considerably higher than the tariffs imposed on commodities and manufactured goods. For comparison, service tariffs in the developing world average a paltry 15%.¹²⁹ Much of the reason for this disparity has been the rising leadership and clout of the BRICS, who have obstructed the removal of these tariffs in WTO negotiations. Therefore, the United States should sidestep these multilateral talks and actively negotiate bilateral trade agreements with developing countries, focusing primarily on removing service tariffs in emerging markets such as Africa and Southeast Asia, in exchange for reductions in American tariffs on agriculture and manufactured goods. These agreements would establish an American foothold in these key regions, ensuring that the businesses of the future are positioned to sell to the markets of tomorrow. Proactive and long-view policies like this will guarantee American competitiveness in a world rapidly coming towards economic convergence.

Reshaping Our Domestic Environment

In the coming decades, the future of developed economies will be closely tied to the growth of the services industry and the promotion of the knowledge economy. It is critical therefore that the United States ensures that the businesses of the future are created here and have strong incentives to keep both their capital and headquarters in-country. At the same time, as other economies begin to take their place on the international stage, attracting foreign companies for the purpose of domestic job creation will be as important as competing with these companies for new markets. In

¹²⁹ Edward Alden and Rebecca Strauss, *How America Stacks Up* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press, 2016), 70.

fact, a Brookings Institution report found that 5.6 million Americans are currently employed by foreign affiliates.¹³⁰ While the United States continues to be the most attractive country for foreign investment, efforts to attract and distribute capital must be redoubled as the global economic center shifts. Despite the greater political and economic risk, emerging markets are becoming more appealing to international investors, causing the American share of global Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) to drop by almost 50% since 2000.¹³¹

The first step towards maintaining America's attractiveness as a destination for both foreign and domestic companies is a significant restructuring of our convoluted tax and regulatory system. In its current form, our tax code neither attracts foreign investment nor incentivizes domestic companies to keep their money here. The top corporate tax rate is currently one of the highest in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), putting the United States dead last in an annual tax competitiveness survey of developed nations put out by the Tax Foundation. Nevertheless, due to loopholes in the system, many American corporations pay minimal tax and keep their profits abroad, doing little to advance US interests. Lowering the corporate tax rate to a more manageable 25% (more in line with our OECD counterparts) and removing all deductions but research and development incentives would allow for a much more sensible tax system. Combined with a onetime repatriation rate of 15% that would incentivize the return of some of the 2.1 trillion dollars being held abroad by our multinationals, the United States would benefit from increased revenues,

¹³⁰ Devashree Saha, Kenan Fikri, and Nick Marchio, "FDI in US Metro Areas: The Geography of Jobs in Foreign-Owned Establishments." *Brookings Institution*, July 28, 2016.

¹³¹ Alden, and Strauss, *How America Stacks Up*, 70.

which could then be used to fund public education and job retraining programs.

Almost as hostile to American innovation for both major corporations and small businesses is the American regulatory regime. In 2016 alone, the last year of the previous administration, almost 4,000 regulations were pushed through the federal system.¹³² Currently, our system of regulations has not eroded investment due to a high level of trust in American stability and the strength of our institutions. However, should other countries in the BRICS bloc improve their institutions and ease the process of starting a business, American overregulation will quickly become a competitive liability. In fact, a recent Gallup Poll found that 49% of Americans believe that there is too much regulation of business and industry, up from 37% in 2004.¹³³

In its policy documents, the current administration has proposed that over the next four years, government agencies must specify two existing regulations to be removed for each new regulation proposed. A more modest one-to-one ratio would serve to put a hold on overregulation while a ten year “expiration date” on preexisting regulations would ensure that the system stays up to date and is constantly audited for inefficiency.

Addressing these two areas would help to discourage corporate inversions that allow American companies to move their headquarters, wiping out service industry positions and pushing away research and development opportunities. However, our domestic reforms must also account for the fact that the gains of globalization and FDI have not reached many areas of our country. One way that the United States can remedy

¹³² Timothy Noah, "Obama Pushing Thousands of New Regulations in Year 8." *The Agenda*, January 4, 2016.

¹³³ Gallup, Inc. "In US, Half Still Say Gov't Regulates Business Too Much." gallup.com, September 18, 2015.

this is by encouraging investment beyond our major urban hubs. Currently, 55% of the jobs created by foreign investment are located in the top third of American cities – metropolises like New York, San Francisco, and Seattle.¹³⁴ The bottom third of cities occupy only 7% of the total. Despite the fact that the skilled workers, political stability, and industrial infrastructure that make the United States such a strong investment destination exist in all these areas too, they occupy only a fraction of the investment total. The Departments of Commerce and State should therefore initiate programs that aggressively connect foreign companies to new opportunities in America’s “forgotten cities,” revitalizing these areas and creating a slew of job opportunities. A flagship example of this approach is South Carolina’s highly successful courting of foreign companies through business mission trips and trade shows. This strategy has brought considerable benefits to a state not traditionally considered as an economic hub: \$2.3 billion dollars in investment and 2,600 jobs were brought there in 2013.¹³⁵ Enacted on a federal level and with the full backing of our diplomatic resources, South Carolina’s success could be replicated and expanded on a national scale.

Leveling the International Playing Field

One of the greatest economic challenges faced by the United States on the global stage is the behavior of foreign competitors in emerging markets, especially regarding the People’s Republic of China. While a top beneficiary of globalization, the Chinese approach to international trade has been less than evenhanded. Through currency manipulation, preferential treatment of strategic industries, and the turning of a blind

¹³⁴ “McKinsey Global Institute,” 2017. <http://www.mckinsey.com/mgi/overview>

¹³⁵ Bill Lewis, "Foreign Direct Investment Flows into SC," *Business Climate*, June 02, 2016.

eye to intellectual property violations, China has consistently engaged in unfair trade practices to gain an advantage.¹³⁶ The future of American global competitiveness hinges on the next administration's ability to resolutely confront Chinese violations and infringements, both on the domestic front and through international organizations.

Due to the considerable decline in American manufacturing since China's 2001 entry into the WTO, the trade deficit with China was a pivotal campaign issue. Free trade is not a one-sided arrangement, and the United States needs to take active measures that can effectively counter unfair practices. Moreover, taking a strong position against China and tying it to the need for American participation in the global economy would build support for open trade and pro-globalization policies amongst the voting public.

Firstly, the United States can actively work to help American companies, especially SMEs (small and medium enterprises), go abroad and enter new markets. The increasing global presence of large state owned enterprises, whose corporate direction is directly tied to the interests of their government handlers, means that the playing field is not ever equal. This fact especially applies to "strategic" industries such as manufacturing and raw materials extraction.

Every possible advantage will be needed as companies go abroad. While America's bureaucratic institutions will never be able to choose winners and losers as well as the free market, they can nevertheless provide key regional expertise and diplomatic leverage, reducing the transaction costs associated with going abroad. The United States should consider a serious expansion of programs such as President

¹³⁶ Peter Navarro and Greg Autry, *Death by China: Confronting the Dragon - A Global Call to Action*, (Upper Saddle River: Pearson FT Press, 2011).

Obama's National Export Initiative (NEI), which used the resources of the Commerce and State Departments to find foreign buyers for American products. Developed world exporters such as France, Germany, and Canada advocate aggressively for their exports— there is no reason that the United States should not do so as well.

In some cases, government capital can fill a unique role in the market for loanable funds, without crowding out private sector investment. The digital age has removed many of the barriers that used to discourage smaller companies from going abroad, but SMEs lack the economies of scale and ability to attract the capital that their larger counterparts benefit from. In fact, 90% of the loans provided by the Export-Import Bank are to small and medium enterprises.¹³⁷ Increasing the purview and funding of the Export-Import Bank, which provides loans to finance American exports abroad, would give American manufacturers and service providers the edge that they need.

While the United States should enact policies that make its companies more competitive internationally, it should also play offense against China on the home front. A measured, but more aggressive approach towards unfair Chinese business practices must take front and center. Chinese violations, such as IP theft, currency manipulation, and unfair subsidies must be faced head on in the dispute resolution courts of international organizations like the WTO. While threats of blanket 45% tariffs on Chinese exports are excessive, there is a strong case for placing tariffs on very specific goods, such as when Chinese exporters dump commodities such as copper, steel, and rare earth metals onto the US market and price out their American counterparts.

¹³⁷ Simone Pathe, "Stop pretending you know what the Export-Import Bank is," *PBS NewsHour*. September 15, 2014.

Additionally, the threat of implementing domestic policies such as stricter “Country of Origin Labeling” rules and tougher restrictions on Chinese corporate acquisitions in the US would give the United States considerable leverage, something that it has lacked in recent years. The goal of these moves would not be to initiate a mutually destructive trade war, but rather to illustrate that there will be consequences for not adhering to the conventions of international free trade.

There are even economic issues that the US and China can approach in a collaborative manner. A report from the Joint Economic committee estimated that intellectual property theft costs the average intellectual property intensive American company \$43 million in lost profits – with China responsible for 44% of all violations.¹³⁸ Because of deliberately lax Chinese enforcement of IP laws, American companies’ comparative advantages gained from high investment in R&D and branding are quickly co-opted and then undercut by their Chinese competitors. While it will be difficult to pressure the Chinese to step up their enforcement of IP laws in the short-term, it may be possible to convince the Chinese that intellectual property enforcement is also in their interest. Chinese IP intensive companies also lose an estimated \$7.2 million a year to IP theft, and as China transitions from a manufacturing economy to a services and knowledge economy, this number will only go up.¹³⁹ In fact, China’s Intellectual Property Office received no fewer than 1 million patent applications in 2015, an astounding 18.7% increase since 2014.¹⁴⁰ As Chinese companies and entrepreneurs develop more and more homegrown technology, they will have an increased stake in

¹³⁸ “Can You Keep a Secret?” *The Economist*, March 16, 2013.

¹³⁹ “Can You Keep a Secret?”

¹⁴⁰ “China vs. US. Patent Trends. How Do the Giants Stack Up?” *Technology & Patent Research*. April 28, 2016.

laws that to protect it from piracy and theft.

Conclusion

We are living in an age where change is no longer incremental and is instead exponential. The rapid pace of technology growth and the increasingly close interdependence between nations means that the risks and rewards of capitalism are more dispersed throughout the world than ever before. In the new multipolar economy, we cannot necessarily predict what the next challenges or disruptions will be, or even from where they will originate. Properly addressing the sheer scope and unpredictability of the issues that will be presented in the next few decades will require both the agility of the private sector and the guidance and discipline of the public sector. Working together and leveraging their comparative advantages, the government institutions and companies that have made America so successful in the past can ensure that America continues to be the world's foremost economy in the future. While we cannot necessarily control the world around us, by increasing our competitiveness and enhancing our unique advantages, America can be prepared for whatever the next decades will bring.

Policy Recommendations

- Renegotiate NAFTA for the 21st century and the digital age
- Maintain US participation and influence in international free trade agreements
- Negotiate bilateral trade deals with emerging markets to open up new areas for US service providers
- Reform the American corporate tax code to be on par with the best systems in the developed world
- Scale down the American regulatory regime
- Promote foreign direct investment in less densely populated American regions
- Increase the size and purview of government organizations that assist American exporters
- Prosecute Chinese trade violations in international institutions like the WTO
- Apply selective tariffs to Chinese commodities
- Collaborate with the Chinese government on intellectual property protection

B. Energy Reform and Strategic Planning for a Volatile Climate

It is in the United States' best interest to transition from fossil fuel dependence to non-carbon energy sources due to the future economic consequences that will result from the negative effects of climate change. This transition should be gradual, facilitated through the use of subsidies on non-carbon energy sources, taxes on oil, natural gas, and coal, and through the implementation of job training and job relocation in the renewable energy sector. Additionally, the US should pursue cooperation with other countries that consume large quantities of fossil fuels, such as China, India, and the EU.

Numerous irreversible consequences will result from climate change. These consequences will include crop die-offs and food shortages, important American economic hubs being submerged under a rising ocean, mass migrations and refugee crises. All of these will prove catastrophic to American economic prosperity. However, the adverse economic effects of climate change can be mitigated through reformed energy policy. Though solar, wind, and nuclear energy are currently more expensive than fossil fuels, with time and further research, these energy sources will become less costly. Technological improvements will decrease costs, increase efficiency, and make renewable energy sources more accessible to the average individual. Additionally, a greater emphasis on renewable energy sources will lessen the United States' dependence on Middle Eastern oil—simultaneously strengthening US national security.

Non-Carbon Energy

Nuclear, Solar, and Wind Energy Potential

Due to its versatility, negligible negative environmental impact, and capability for widespread use, nuclear energy has the potential to assume a large role in America's future energy diversification. Nuclear energy currently accounts for 20% of the US' electrical energy production. Additionally, nuclear energy is America's largest producer of non-carbon emitting electric power.¹⁴¹ The US is also the largest producer of nuclear energy generated electricity in the world at current levels of 30%.¹⁴² While this is a sizeable number, there is much room for growth in the nuclear energy sector. There are about 100 nuclear reactors scattered throughout the US, generating a total revenue of between \$40-50 billion each year.²⁴ The large majority of these plants are situated in the Eastern half of the US, with only nine plants positioned in the western half of the US. Among these 100 nuclear reactors, close to 100,000 workers are employed in the US, with each reactor producing about \$470 million in sales of goods and services annually. The growth of nuclear energy in relation to total US energy output has not been proportionate as of late due to widespread political opposition to nuclear energy following the 3 Mile Island Disaster of 1979. However, in recent years, momentum for increased nuclear energy usage has picked up, with four nuclear power plants currently

¹⁴¹ "Reliable & Affordable Energy," Nuclear Energy Institute, accessed February 02, 2017, <https://www.nei.org/Why-Nuclear-Energy/Reliable-Affordable-Energy>

¹⁴² "Nuclear Power in the USA," World Nuclear Association, January 2017, accessed February 03, 2017, <http://www.world-nuclear.org/information-library/country-profiles/countries-t-z/usa-nuclear-power.aspx>

under construction in the US.¹⁴³

In future years, the US must increase its share of nuclear energy generated electricity in relation to total domestic electricity production. Many of the nuclear reactors constructed in the 1960's are close to reaching their 60-year retirement mark at which point they will be shut down. This is a significant issue as the retirement of aging nuclear plants could cause CO₂ emissions to be 500 million tons higher by 2040 as it forces the US to return to a greater dependence on fossil fuels. The US Department of Energy's Light Water Reactor Sustainability plan seeks to address this problem by developing a scientific basis to prolong the operating life of aging nuclear reactors, as well as guarantee the long-term productivity, reliability, security, and safety of these reactors.¹⁴⁴ The US should continue funding this initiative, as it ensures the long-term security of US energy diversity. Moreover, this plan also stipulates a realistic strategy to maintain nuclear energy production as a non-greenhouse emitting option in the face of climate change. Another innovation which could make nuclear power more accessible and versatile to the masses are Small Modular Reactors (SMRs), which are reactors the size of shipping containers that can be transported by rail or truck. These reactors could make a significant impact against climate change due to their versatility and low initial capital investments.¹⁴⁵

¹⁴³ "Nuclear Power in the USA," World Nuclear Association

¹⁴⁴ "Light Water Reactor Sustainability (LWRS) Program." United States Department of Energy. <https://www.energy.gov/ne/nuclear-reactor-technologies/light-water-reactor-sustainability-lwrs-program>

¹⁴⁵ "Small Modular Reactors (SMRs)." United States Department of Energy, <https://www.energy.gov/ne/nuclear-reactor-technologies/small-modular-nuclear->

Perhaps the most exciting advancements in nuclear technology are Generation 4 Nuclear Reactors. These reactors emit little harmful nuclear waste, and are safe and cost efficient. Additionally, they are impervious to proliferation and terrorist attacks because they produce a very low amount of weapons grade Plutonium 239 due to the high temperatures of the reactor.¹⁴⁶ Despite the potential of nuclear power to assume a significant role in US energy policy, the fear surrounding nuclear energy has hindered its development. However, many of these fears are unfounded or largely incorrect. For example, while there has been much publicity surrounding nuclear accidents at Fukushima, Chernobyl, and 3 Mile Island, in the 60 years that the world has used nuclear power, only three major accidents have occurred. These accidents have involved only five reactors out of a global average of 312.

Furthermore, no proven radiation deaths have resulted from the accidents at 3 Mile Island and Fukushima, and only 56 deaths have resulted from Chernobyl. The accident at Chernobyl spread to an area of 19,300 miles, affecting 5 million individuals.² While this is a sizeable number, the average exposure was only 1 milliSievert (mSv) per year—less than the average background levels of 2.4 mSv. Another concern is the disposal of nuclear waste. This is an issue that can be entirely addressed by modern technology but has been hindered by political opposition. Billions of gallons of harmful biological and chemical waste are pumped deep underground into geological repositories already. Thus, it is hypocritical that the US pumps chemicals such as potassium cyanide and infected human blood and organs into the grounds, but refrains

reactors

¹⁴⁶ "Generation 4 Nuclear Reactors." World Nuclear Association, accessed February 03, 2017. <http://www.world-nuclear.org/information-library/nuclear-fuel-cycle/nuclear-power-reactors/generation-iv-nuclear-reactors.aspx>

from doing so with nuclear waste.¹⁴⁷ If the US chose to dispose of nuclear waste into geological repositories, these concerns would be proven invalid.

The US must invest in the Light Water Reactor Sustainability Plan, Small Modular Reactors, and Generation 4 Reactors in order to make nuclear power effective and sustainable in the long-term. Additionally, further investment must be made to dispose of nuclear waste in geological repositories. Nuclear energy provides the largest amount of electricity, with the smallest amount of environment impact. Thus, its continued use and development in the future is integral in addressing climate change.

Solar power has the potential to meet many of the energy demands facing our country in the future. In fact, if .6% of the US land was covered in solar panels, this energy could account for the nation's entire energy needs.¹⁴⁸ However, while market barriers currently hinder implementation and production, recent cost reductions are promising. According to the International Energy Agency, the cost of solar energy is expected to drop by a quarter over the next five years. This is largely driven by strong implementation policies by the US, China, Mexico, India, and improved technologies.¹⁴⁹ Solar energy costs have decreased significantly in the past five years and will continue to decrease in the future. In 2010, the cost of solar energy was \$500 megawatts/hour, declining to \$200 by 2016. Moreover, since 2010 solar electric panel costs have

¹⁴⁷ Scott L. Montgomery, conversation with Kaia Boonzaier and Matt Hegyes, February 2, 2017.

¹⁴⁸ "Solar Energy in the United States," United States Department of Energy, accessed January 20, 2017. <https://energy.gov/eere/solarpoweringamerica/solar-energy-united-states>.

¹⁴⁹ "Medium-Term Renewable Energy Market Report," www.iea.org, October 25, 2016, accessed January 13, 2017.

decreased by 50%. By 2025, solar panels could produce electricity for less than \$100.¹⁵⁰ In recent years the US has seen somewhat of a solar power transformation, increasing solar power production from 1.2 gigawatts (GW) in 2008 to 30 GW in 2016. In addition, 209,000 solar energy jobs have been added since 2010. While only a small portion of US energy is currently provided by solar energy, these recent developments show that solar transformation is possible and realistic. The US Department of energy estimates that seven southwest states have the technological potential and land area to supply 4 times the US electrical demand from solar power usage¹. Potentially the biggest issue facing solar energy today is its inability to provide baseload power. This means that solar energy is unable to supply a region's continuous energy demand, and produce energy at a constant rate. When discussing renewable energies, Gregg Maryniak, chairman of the Energy and Environmental Systems Track of Singularity University, commented "What we urgently need is a means of storing energy at a large scale that and low cost that can be adapted anywhere."¹⁵¹ Thus, the US must conduct more research with the goal of achieving baseload power to make solar and other renewable a viable long-term energy source.

The benefits of wind power are numerous due to its abundance and accessibility. Wind power accounted for 5% of US electrical energy production in 2015. This number

¹⁵⁰ Tara Patel, "Fossil Fuels Losing Cost Advantage Over Solar, Wind, IEA Says," *Bloomberg*, August 31, 2015, accessed January 22, 2017.

<https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-08-31/solar-wind-power-costs-drop-as-fossil-fuels-increase-iea-says>

¹⁵¹ Gregg Maryniak, "Storage, Not Generation, is the Challenge to Renewable Energy," *Forbes*, August 07, 2012, accessed February 02, 2017.

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/singularity/2012/07/20/storage-not-generation-is-the-challenge-to-renewable-energy/#146daofd37cc>

has increased dramatically since the 1970's due to improvements in technology and lower operating costs. Wind generated electricity is a viable alternative to fossil fuels because of its low environmental impact, cost-effectiveness, versatility, and positive economic impact. Wind turbines can be situated anywhere where there is significant wind production. Often they are located on plains, rolling hills, or offshore. There are currently 29 wind power projects located 39 states across the US. The five states that produce the most wind-generated electricity are Oklahoma, Texas, California, Iowa, and Kansas. Over the past 10 years, wind power capability has enlarged by 30% largely driven by increased investment.¹⁵² The cost efficiency of wind power makes it attractive relative to fossil fuels. Wind generated electricity costs a mere 4-6 cents per kilowatt/hour.

Additionally, wind farms can be built on existing farms or ranches – providing economic benefits to the rural areas where wind farms are most commonly found. In this manner, wind farm owners can make rent payments to farm owners increasing their income. The wind energy sector injected \$8 billion of private capital into the US economy in 2014 –employing more than 73,000 workers. By 2050, the wind energy sector has the potential to create 600,000 jobs in installation, manufacturing, and supporting services.¹⁵³ Between 2008 and 2013, wind energy investment averaged \$13 billion each year. This investment was driven by an elevated manufacturing capacity, as

¹⁵² Wind, Energy, and the Environment," Energy Information Administration, accessed February 02, 2017.

http://www.eia.gov/energyexplained/index.cfm?page=wind_environment.

¹⁵³ "Advantages and Challenges of Wind Energy," United States Department of Energy, accessed February 02, 2017. <https://energy.gov/eere/wind/advantages-and-challenges-wind-energy>

well lower wind power costs which decreased by 1/3. In the Wind Vision Report, the US Department of Energy envisions a future in which 10% of the nation's electricity demand will be driven by wind power by 2020. This percentage will increase to 20% by 2030 and 35% by 2050. Under this scenario, the report estimates that \$149 billion could be saved relative to a future in which no additional wind production is added.¹⁵⁴ The increased use of wind energy will decrease the United States' dependence on fossil fuels, as well as diversify our energy portfolio. Thus, it is in the US' best interest to pursue the Wind Vision Report outlined above due to its viability and economic potential in the future. Additionally, much like solar power, wind power lacks the capacity for baseload power. Therefore, it is essential that the US conduct further research to make this a possibility.

The Economic Effects of Climate Change

Possible Scenarios

Climate change will almost certainly affect the environment. However, if climate change continues along its current trajectory, the United States will feel its effects economically as well. If climate change follows current trends, according to US Geological Survey and the national Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the entire coastline of the United States will be irrevocably altered. Currently, the probable sea rise in 100-300 years is five feet. While this may seem insignificant, under this scenario, 20% of Miami, 7% of New York, and 88% of New Orleans will be flooded. If only moderate

¹⁵⁴ "Wind Vision," United States Department of Energy, accessed February 02, 2017. <https://energy.gov/eere/wind/maps/wind-vision>

emission reductions are made, sea levels could rise by 12 feet by 2300. Under this scenario, 73% of Miami, 98% of New Orleans, 22% of New York City, and 34% of Boston will be submerged.¹⁵⁵ The total GDP of these metropolitan areas amounted to about \$2.023 trillion in 2015 –a significant number that will surely decline if climate change continues unhindered. In fact, scientists from Nature magazine predict that if a climate change continues along the current trend, total global GDP will decrease 23% below economic output otherwise.¹⁵⁶ This is a startling number, and one that threatens to throw the global economy into a tailspin and threaten the sanctity of the US nation as we know it. Under these scenarios, some places on earth will simply become too hot to live in. Along with rising sea levels, regions will experience salinization of agricultural land, food shortages, and desertification. The result of this will be mass forced migrations. The International Organization for Immigration states that by the most pessimistic estimates, up to 200 million people will be displaced by climate change by 2050.¹⁵⁷ A forced migration of this degree will strain infrastructure and economic growth, adding to the substantial financial duress already weighing down the American nation. The US cannot afford to proceed along its current path, and must transition to non-carbon energy sources to avoid this outcome.

¹⁵⁵ Baden Copeland, Josh Keller, and Bill Marsh, "What Could Disappear," *New York Times*, April 24, 2016.

¹⁵⁶ Marshall Burke, Solomon Hsiang, and Edward Miguel, "Global Non-Linear Effect of Temperature on Economic Production." *Nature* 527, no. 7577 (November 12, 2015), accessed February 2, 2017.

¹⁵⁷ "Migration and Climate Change." IISD, 2008. Accessed February 2, 2017. https://www.iisd.org/pdf/2008/migration_climate.pdf

Increase Government Spending on Renewables

According to the US' most recent budget release, the Obama Administration designated \$377 million to clean energy technology.¹⁵⁸ There were substantial increases in funding from previous years given to the Office of Energy Efficiency and Advanced Research Projects Energy Agency. Under the current administration, the US should continue this trend, and increasing funding to research labs and universities from current levels. These government research grants should be geared towards creating and instituting cheaper, more reliable, and more efficient alternatives to fossil fuels. Additionally, the US must increase the number of government contracts given to start-ups and other programs conducive to innovation in the non-carbon energy sector. The US government should supplement this by simultaneously investing and supporting infant non-carbon industries. Making non-carbon technologies a viable alternative to fossil fuels will not be possible without continued research and support from the US government.

The Nonpartisan Issue of Climate Change

The transition from fossil fuels to renewable energy in the United States will not be an easy one, though its benefits in the long run will be innumerable. The issue of climate change, and the steps that should be taken to address it, are not political. Rather, climate change is something that should be viewed as nonpartisan, due to the negative implications it has for the nation as a whole. All industries will be affected by

¹⁵⁸ Matt Hourihan and David Parkes, "Federal R&D in the FY 2016 Budget: An Overview," AAAS, March 18, 2015, accessed February 02, 2017.
<https://www.aaas.org/fy16budget/federal-rd-fy-2016-budget-overview>

climate change. Therefore, it is in the best interests of all citizens to work towards a solution to climate change. The petroleum based energy industry must eventually assume a smaller role in America's energy portfolio in order to combat climate change. This will almost certainly be met with widespread resistance from the industry and associated parties. In order to address this scenario, policies must be implemented to facilitate a smooth transition from fossil fuels to renewable energies. First, the US government should subsidize electricity generated from wind, solar, and nuclear energy sources below or equal to the market price of fossil fuels. The US government should commit a larger share of its budget towards decreasing the costs of renewable energies. Eventually, a small tax should be levied on all fossil fuels with the exception of natural gas, and gradually increased with time. Workers displaced by a shrinking fossil fuel industry should be offered the choice of free admission to their local community college, or training and job placement in the non-carbon energy sector. In addition, displaced workers should be given a payment equal to their most recent salary for up to a year after becoming unemployed. In regard to the fossil fuel industry and sectors that rely on it, the US government should encourage a greater emphasis on natural gas and non-carbon energies through subsidies and lucrative government contracts.

Foster Energy Cooperation with China, India, and the EU

Creating sustainable and lasting energy reform will not be possible without the cooperation of nations like China, India, and the European Union, who consume comparable amounts of fossil fuels to the US. It is in the US national interest to include China, India, and the EU in these reforms due to the substantial amount of carbon that these nations produce in addition the US. Thus, effective and substantial reform cannot

be made without the cooperation of these countries. To do this, the US should follow through on its agreement made at the Paris climate summit, and act as global leader in supporting the Paris Climate Agreement. China emits more CO₂ than the rest of the world by a wide margin annually, with 12,454,711 kilotons (kT), followed by the US with 6,343,841 kT, the EU with 4,704,011 kT, and India with 3,002,895 kT.¹⁵⁹ The EU, China, and India should be expected to maintain their sides of the agreement, encouraged by the US' own carbon reductions. The US, China, India, and the EU made pledges aimed at keeping the increase of global temperatures below two degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels.

The EU has pledged to cut 20% of greenhouse gases from 1990 levels, obtain 20% of its energy from renewable sources, and make a 20% improvement in energy efficiency.¹⁶⁰ China has pledged to peak carbon emissions by 2030, lower carbon dioxide intensity emissions by 60%, and increase forest stock volume by 4.5 million cubic meters from 2005.¹⁶¹ India pledged to reduce emissions intensity of GDP by 30-35% of 2005 levels, and obtain 40% of its electric power from non-fossil fuel energy sources by 2030.¹⁶² Finally, the US has pledged to cut CO₂ emissions by between 26-28% relative

¹⁵⁹ CO₂ emissions (metric tons per capita)," World Bank, accessed February 02, 2017.
<http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/EN.ATM.CO2E.PC>.

¹⁶⁰ "Paris Agreement," *European Commission*, November 23, 2016.
http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/international/negotiations/paris_en.

¹⁶¹ China's Contribution to the Paris Climate Agreement." *Center for Climate and Energy Solutions*. July 2015, accessed February 2, 2017.
<https://www.c2es.org/docUploads/chinas-contributions-paris-climate-agreement.pdf>

¹⁶² Han Chen, "The Road From Paris: India's Progress Towards its Climate Pledge," NRDC, November 2016, accessed February 2, 2017.
<https://www.nrdc.org/sites/default/files/paris-climate-conference-India-IB.pdf>

to 2005 levels by 2005.¹⁶³ Means of enforcement should include economic sanctions, and economic incentives. Countries that fail to uphold their pledges should be met with trade sanctions and withdrawn military and aid. Countries that uphold their pledges should receive economic aid, innovative and novel US technologies, and the promise of military protection and support. These pledges must be upheld if any lasting progress will be made against climate change, and the US should strive to be a global leader when completing these initiatives if it hopes to maintain any sort of international credibility.

The Middle East and Energy Policy

Changing Priorities

For almost two decades, US foreign policy has been focused on the Middle East, largely due to the vast quantities of oil reserves that lies below the region. With a greater emphasis on non-carbon energy, the US could begin to pivot away and direct its assets towards other focuses. This change would also give the US greater political leverage in the region, freeing up resources and shifting the American focus away from the protection of US interests in the region. Turmoil in the Middle East threatens US economic prosperity through the impact that regional conflicts have on the production and extraction of Middle Eastern oil. The volatile price of oil caused by political unrest in the region poses a risk to the US economy. A sharp rise in oil prices caused by conflict or other unforeseen events in the region could cripple the US economy and cause serious problems nationwide. The oil embargo of 1979 caused oil prices to quadruple in the United States and contributed to rampant inflation. Another event of this magnitude

¹⁶³ Jean Chemnick, "US. and China Formally Commit to Paris Climate Accord," *Scientific American*, September 06, 2016, accessed February 02, 2017. <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/u-s-and-china-formally-commit-to-paris-climate-accord/>

would prove disastrous for US economic prosperity. Per day, the US imports 2.89 million barrels of oil from the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries. This accounts for 31% of petroleum that the US imports.¹⁶⁴ The US must pivot away from this reliance if it hopes to avoid another crisis of the magnitude of the 1979 oil crisis or worse.

Fossil Fuels and What It Means to be an American

A transition to non-carbon energies will not only change the American economy, but will also change what it means to be an American. America has traditionally been a global leader in the production of coal and other fossil fuels, and this legacy is undoubtedly embedded in the history of our nation. Despite this, consider a different America, one that is a leader in the production of non-carbon energies. Cars would be charged using electricity derived from non-carbon sources. The working class Americans of the Midwest and Northeast, who have for generations labored in coal mines, would return home from the wind farm or solar field instead of a coal mine. The gas stations that line our streets would be replaced by charging stations. Smog, which is a common sight in many of our urban areas, would disappear. The oil spills that contaminate our oceans and rivers would no longer be a reality. Nearly every aspect of American life would be touched by a transition from fossil fuels to non-carbon energies, rebranding the identity of America as one marked by sustainability and cutting-edge ethical innovation to its citizens and the world.

¹⁶⁴ How much petroleum does the United States import and export?" United States Energy Information Administration, accessed February 02, 2017.
<http://www.eia.gov/tools/faqs/faq.cfm?id=727&t=6>

Natural Gas

A Temporary Solution

An abrupt transition to non-carbon energies would not be feasible nor beneficial for US economic prosperity. That is why the US should continue to extract natural gas, for use domestically and for export. Natural gas emits 50-60% less CO₂ when combusted than coal, and 15-20% less than gasoline. It also produces insignificant quantities of sulfur, mercury, and other harmful particulates unlike coal. The United States has 324.3 trillion cubic feet of natural gas reserves.¹⁶⁵ These reserves should be utilized and exploited until non-carbon technologies are advanced enough to compete with fossil fuels. The US must also take advantage of the natural gas export market in Europe. Currently, Europe imports 37.5% of natural gas from Russia and 21.3% from N. Africa and the Middle East.¹⁶⁶ By increasing natural gas exports to Europe, the US could boost revenues while simultaneously decreasing Europe's reliance on Russian and Middle Eastern oil. Liquid Natural Gas (LNG) allows for safe storage and easy transport of natural gas. The gas is cooled to -262 degrees Celsius, which shrinks its volume by 600 times making it preferable for shipping. The gas does not ignite in its liquid state and is converted back into gas upon arrival at its destination.¹⁶⁷ Using this technology,

¹⁶⁵ Environmental Impacts of Natural Gas," UCSUSA, accessed February 02, 2017.
<http://www.ucsusa.org/clean-energy/coal-and-other-fossil-fuels/environmental-impacts-of-natural-gas#.WJLaMrYrJp8>

¹⁶⁶ EDGAR - GHG (CO₂, CH₄, N₂O, F-Gases) Emission Time Series 1990-2012 per Region/Country," *European Commission*, accessed February 20, 2017.
<http://edgar.jrc.ec.europa.eu/overview.php?v=CO2ts1990-2014&sort=des9>

¹⁶⁷ "Liquefied natural gas (LNG)," Shell, accessed February 02, 2017.
<http://www.shell.com/energy-and-innovation/natural-gas/liquefied-natural-gas-lng.html>

the US could increase revenues while promoting a less harmful alternative to coal and other fossil fuels. While natural gas is not a perfect solution to carbon reduction, its use in the short-term would be beneficial in the transition to non-carbon energy sources.

Conclusion

Climate change is not a partisan issue, but is rather an issue that affects the globe. It will have numerous disastrous implications for current and future generations if bold action is not undertaken. This is why energy reform is necessary and vital to the long-term interests of the US and the world. To enact this energy reform, the US must begin the transformation of its energy portfolio from one heavily based upon fossil fuels, to one leaning on non-carbon energies and natural gas. Wind, solar, and nuclear energy sources must encompass a larger part of US electrical energy production relative to fossil fuels. For the time being, nuclear energy has the capacity to serve as a base-load power source unlike solar and wind energy. Therefore, further research must be conducted in order to achieve base-load power for solar and wind energies. These changes should be facilitated with the joint cooperation of China, India, and the EU. Additionally, widespread bipartisan compromise must be made in the US in order to make these changes. A transition to non-carbon energies will reduce US reliance on Middle Eastern oil and prevent any oil shocks that could shake US economic growth. These changes are necessary, as they will ensure economic growth and prosperity both presently and in the years to come.

Policy Recommendations

- Transition from fossil fuel dependence to the use of non-carbon energies. This should be facilitated through economic subsidies, carbon taxes, worker training, and global cooperation and compromise
- Increase federal funding geared towards non-carbon energy research to universities, start-ups, and infant non-carbon industries
- Act as a global leader in the fight against climate change by enforcing the Paris Climate Accord. Seek the cooperation of China, India, and the EU
- Continue the extraction of US natural gas for export to Europe and elsewhere
- Increase investment in natural gas extraction technologies and build up short-term infrastructure for extraction and LNG transportation

C. Ensuring American Innovation Supremacy

The United States is among the world's wealthiest nations and enjoys some of the international community's highest incomes. This has much to do with its status as the most innovative country. Innovation is the process by which new ideas, methods, and devices are introduced. These ideas can improve a quantifiable metric like productivity or a social good like transportation times. To put this in perspective, the average American makes 40 times more than the average citizen of the Democratic Republic of the Congo because her or his labor is 40 times more productive. However, innovation in the US, and therefore its standards of living, are under threat as ascendant competitors are now increasingly outperforming the once imperturbable superpower. Innovation, as well as the wealth innovation creates, is quickly moving to foreign locations. Without aggressive reform, the American Dream will continue to wither in both imagination and in practice. This section presents simple, effective, and actionable solutions in the critical areas of education, intellectual property, innovation infrastructure, and R&D funding, which will have profound impacts for generations to come.

A Mandatory Internship

A recent survey of high school graduates from The College Board found less than half of respondents felt they had been prepared for the working world, after accounting for the globally notorious confidence of American students, the picture becomes even more dire.¹⁶⁸ In 2015, 88% of adults had a high school diploma or General Education Diploma (GED) while only 42% held an Associate's Degree or more and only 12% had an

¹⁶⁸ Hart Research Associates, *One Year Out: Findings From a National Survey among Members of the High School Graduating Class of 2010*. College Board, August 18, 2011.

advanced degree.¹⁶⁹ As things stand now a high school degree is the only shot of more than half the population. We have to make it count.

The Most Valuable Year of an American Education

The United States has, as a percentage of its economy, one of the most powerful private sectors of highly developed nations, yet it is woefully underutilized. America's many failings in compulsory education are well publicized, and solving them will require a battery of strategies longer than this entire report. That being said, one that has a profound possibility for successfully effecting change follows; a mandatory internship in their junior year of high school. Students will be able to select between a wide variety of yearlong primarily private company internships based upon their personal tastes and preferences. Students will be compensated by the companies and organizations at a determined rate, potentially below minimum wage, providing students with work experience and modest post-graduation savings. Companies will be incentivized to participate in the program by having low cost labor in the form of on the job training, as well as being able to hire freshly trained graduates, improving their bottom line. These incentives will ensure that companies not only offer these programs, but also constantly improve them, as they benefit just as the students do. Schools should continuously expand their program offerings, so there are always more program spots than there are students, further stimulating the competitive effect. Savings from implementing this system, in place of the traditional junior year, can be re-directed towards helping to fund an expansion of professional degree opportunities or be put back into state budgets.

¹⁶⁹ Camille Ryan and Kurt Bauman. *Educational Attainment in the United States: 2015*. United States Census Bureau, 2016.

In addition to the private sector, high value internships in the public sector can also be created. Students can gain valuable experience working for operations like the local transit agency, or in public administration for their respective city. That being said private internships must always make up a sizeable majority of offerings, as companies will be more able to effectively utilize labor. It would be heartbreakingly inefficient to watch students waste a year manually picking up garbage on the side of the road because their poorly run school district didn't provide enough quality options.

Lastly, modified one year programs for things like the Peace Corps and AmeriCorps should be made available. In addition to enriching students' lives and the beneficiaries of these programs, they also improve America's soft power. This link is expanded upon in the report's section, "Fostering and Securing American Identity." As students can apply to any internship available to them, there will be strong competition for the most attractive opportunities. This application experience will not only expose students to the reality of the job market they are about to enter, but also incentivize them to make the most of their internship, as well as the years leading up to it, in the hopes of making themselves a more attractive applicant.

Energizing Higher Education

US universities' domination of international rankings masks an ugly truth. While top schools are doing well, the rest of the system has not caught up. Main street students face few in-state options, mounting costs, and classes that are increasingly irrelevant to the demands of the modern economy. If the US is to improve its higher education on both paper and in practice, aggressive reform must be made.

Reforming Geography-based Tuition

Students should be able to use their educational dollars where they best see fit, rather than having to choose between a narrow range of in-state options and out-of-state and private universities that are cost-prohibitive. By eliminating the state lines that hold the leaders of tomorrow financially hostage, innovation and competition will be fostered and students can select the programs that best fit their educational needs. Universities will compete more intensely for students and the best universities will see strong demand while poor quality universities will be forced to improve or close. Students will be able to move to the cities that are the centers of the industries they are interested in working in, and public universities will be able to create a critical mass of intellectual capital in their preferred fields, as they are able to draw upon the best and brightest from around the country. Increased performance will not only lead to a better education for individual students, but also vastly improved research, development, and collaboration.

This increased performance will lead to American universities cementing their currently fragile dominance of the international rankings, which they have been steadily losing to ascendant international competitors since the turn of the century. High rankings will attract even more international students who pay above cost, subsidizing American students, as well as providing scholarship funds for other international students who are more intellectually gifted and less financially able. These societally and intellectually elite students are also more likely to take their financial and brain capital to the United States after graduating as opposed to other top immigration destinations. Rural universities that offer far fewer job, internship, cultural, and leisure opportunities, and are less accessible to low income students compared to their urban counterparts are

likely among the first that will be affected by this policy change. Many of these universities were founded a long time ago by political accident or compromise or by flawed population projections and yet, in lingering on, still make up a sizeable portion of states' university seats. For example, even though Washington State University is located 80 miles from the nearest economic center of any size, it is one of only two public research universities available to students in Washington State. In a freer system, urban universities will see their applications increase and states and cities will work together to rapidly increasing capacity and quality in order to compete for students.

While this plan would be a break from the status quo, never before in American history has the timing been better. Recent state cuts have made a vast majority of public institutions tuition driven, and federal funding as a percentage has never been higher. The federal government can spearhead a program to modify the system so that students can use their tuition subsidy in any participating state. With an opt-in model, reluctant states could stay out of the new system but intense student and parental pressure on lawmakers would likely lead many to soon join.

An End to Community Colleges

Few of the students who begin community college with the intention of acquiring an associate's degree, let alone a bachelor's degree, will achieve that goal. A nationwide report following 2008 cohorts found only 39% of students who entered community college would graduate by the time the study closed six years later. A quarter of those who enrolled in the fall wouldn't even come back in the spring.¹⁷⁰ A California study

¹⁷⁰ National Student Clearinghouse Research Center, *Completing College: A National View of Student Attainment Rates – Fall 2008 Cohort*, National Student Clearinghouse Research Center, November 17, 2014.

found 70% of its community college students failed to graduate or transfer within six years and only 40% of students achieved sufficient credit hours in school to even marginally boost their potential in the workforce.¹⁷¹

Community colleges, a nearly uniquely American concept, were established with the hope of making higher education more accessible, while still retaining its quality. This hope has not been realized. Too many students will drop out while not having learned any meaningful skills, after having wasted their time and both their own and the taxpayers' money. If the promise of community college is to be achieved, states must make long-term planning decisions to fundamentally change a broken system. First, the way in which state resources are allocated in the higher education system needs to be fundamentally altered. Community colleges that are built on university campuses need to have their capacity dynamically expanded, and their integration with the university deepened, so that students can benefit from the resources of both institutions.

Meanwhile, the first and second year program capacities of bachelor's degree granting institutions must be radically expanded over time, to meet student demand in inverse proportion to declining community college demand. During this expansion, separate credit tuition rates should be established for 100/200 and 300/400 level classes so that lower division education at universities remains similarly affordable as it was at community colleges. Next, large and successful community colleges with significant physical capital should be aggressively transformed into bachelor's degree granting institutions and have their offerings expanded. By getting disengaged students out of failure factories and onto existing university campuses, in universities themselves,

¹⁷¹ Carla Rivera, "Community Colleges Not Preparing California's Future Workforce, Study Says." *Los Angeles Times*, October 20, 2010.

or in brand new universities, they will be inspired and invigorated. With access to upper classmen, upper division classes, vastly superior student organizations and learning facilities, as well as more numerous degree options with a clear path to success they will take greater value and utility from their education.

Enter: The Professional Degree

Dental hygienists have starting median annual earnings of \$70,210. Web developers make \$62,500. Electrical line workers net \$70,000 to start. What do all these careers have in common? They're two year degrees.¹⁷² Many students who enter community college take simple classes to satisfy the general education requirements of universities; for the majority of those who will never graduate or transfer, these classes are a waste. The American higher education message to new users must become bluntly simple: be committed to achieving a bachelor's degree or get a professional degree, and if you're wondering which path you should take, then it's the latter. The status and visibility of professional degrees must be raised at all levels of society, but particularly with high school's guidance counselors and higher administration. High schools need to begin operating on a new pragmatic assumption: that most of their graduates will not pursue meaningful higher education initially, that many of those remaining will pursue a professional degree, and that the remainder will achieve a bachelor's degree or higher. So stop teaching state history, and start teaching career exploration classes. The gig is up.

¹⁷² Liz Weston, "When a Two-Year College Degree Pays Off." *Time*, April 21, 2015.

An Adult Education Revolution

A rising tide only lifts everyone's boats if we make sure that no one drowns. Innovation improves everyone's lives generally by disrupting –or providing better goods and services than –incumbent industries. This is a cycle fundamental to human progress, but during this process, jobs are lost just as new ones are created. Historically, in less innovative, and therefore less prosperous, economies, many workers would stay in one job their entire life. This paradigm is dead. In the new economy, workers will lose their jobs and enter new careers multiple times in their lives, just as income inequality will increase as skill gaps widens. These economic inevitabilities are unavoidable, but smart government policy can ensure that workers aren't left behind, and that income disparity does not increase any more than it has to. For this to happen, America needs an adult education revolution.

Program Choice

When workers lose their jobs due to automation, outsourcing, or other future economic developments a variety of job-focused, affordable professional degrees must be available to them. Just as with university education, states must collaborate under federal direction to ensure student mobility, thereby eliminating cumbersome residency length requirements that prevent students from enrolling in professional degrees at subsidized rates until after a year has expired. For example, if a low wage water heater factory worker in Pittsburgh gets their job eliminated due to automation, and wants to get a Professional Degree in Houston so they can join the petrochemical industry in “The Energy Capital of the World” they should be able to begin immediately.

The US Department of Labor and Department of Education should collaborate to

improve awareness of, and social support for, adult education programs. This could come in the form of new training courses for unemployment offices and companies' human resources departments, or a nationwide media campaign with targeted TV, billboards, and print media ads. As consumer demand for adult education rises due to the increased awareness and an increasingly fast paced economy capacity will need to expand. A system for publicly subsidized but privately run professional degree programs should be introduced in addition to increasing seats at public institutions. Vouchers can be made available to applicants to partially or completely cover costs at their preferred private institution. Private programs competing with public ones will ensure an innovative environment where the latest job focused teaching methods are deployed. However, public programs will likely make up the majority of market capacity. High startup costs and the associated risk will generally ensure that private ventures begin only if investors are reasonably confident that the program on offer is competitive enough that student demand will noticeably outstrip seats, guaranteeing consistent revenue.

Immigration

Drain their Brains

It is a false and destructive myth that Americans alone are capable of providing all the innovation America needs to remain on top. Just as more than 95% of the world's population lives outside of the US, so too does a massive share of humanity's brightest minds. To illustrate, 74% of Silicon Valley employed computer and mathematical workers are immigrants and half of US startups valued at more than a billion dollars

were founded by immigrants.¹⁷³ The US has to proactively recruit and attract top talent from around the globe if it expects the wealth from their inventions to go to American companies and communities instead of foreign ones. Ideas on how to make America first in this vital area are presented in our report's section: "Immigration, a Necessity for America's Prosperity."

Fixing Patents

In 1790, life expectancy was 37 years and few people would journey more than 50 miles away from where they were born; it was also the same year the first Patent Act of the US Congress was passed. Since then, reform has been minimal as the aging system has failed to modernize itself along with the economy. While the patent system was originally designed to incentivize both innovation and research and development by protecting investment, today's system has become restrictive to the point of often stifling innovation.

Use It or Lose It

Patent trolls and blockers routinely exploit the system to sue companies and individuals supposedly infringing on their unutilized patents, or to hurt competitors by slowing their innovation, even if they have no intention of bringing any new product in that category to the market themselves. Various studies estimate that between 40-90%

¹⁷³ 2016 *Silicon Valley Index*, Joint Venture Silicon Valley Institute for Regional Studies, 2016.

of patents are never utilized or licensed.¹⁷⁴ Implement a “use it or lose it” standard that requires owners to show evidence they have productized their patent within 12 months of issuance. Additionally, the burden of proof necessary for overturning a patent in court should be reduced.

Fewer and Shorter Patents

First, far fewer patents need to be granted. The requirement for a patent to be “non-obvious” has to be radically strengthened to eliminate redundancy and prevent companies from patenting simple things as Twitter did with its pull-to-refresh feed, thereby stifling progress. Every accepted patent application must include a clear, and easily challengeable, statement from the Patent Examiner stating the reason for granting. Second, patent terms should be reduced from the current 20 years to only five years as the pace of innovation has increased exponentially since this arbitrary figure was first introduced. For patents in industries like the medical field that require separate regulatory approval, the allowed patent application will be published immediately, but the actual patent will only be issued when the regulatory approvals are obtained.¹⁷⁵ In the fast-moving fields of the new economy, like information technology, new ideas can be developed cheaply and quickly. Never again will long-lasting monopolies on technologies that can become the building blocks of an industry be allowed. These reforms will help energize American innovation by significantly reducing both the time and money necessary for invention.

¹⁷⁴ "Time to Fix Patents," *The Economist*. August 8, 2015.

¹⁷⁵ Scott Dietzen and Joe FitzGerald. "Fixing What Ails The US. Patent System: A Modest Proposal," *Forbes*. December 29, 2014.

Building the Internet Superhighway

America can't be 1st if its Internet ranks 17th.¹⁷⁶ The Internet is the most important invention of this generation, and has become indispensable to having a high quality of life. However, Internet speed, access, and cost in the US lags behind the highly developed world and is stifling progress. Though the Internet is just one aspect of America's embarrassingly sub-par infrastructure, it has the greatest dollar per dollar impact on innovation. Just as the US unleashed its economic might when it created the world's best highway system, if the US is going to continue to lead the world it must create an Internet super highway.

Smash the Oligarchy

Fixed broadband is dominated by three big cable companies: Comcast, Charter, and Verizon respectively.¹⁷⁷ Nearly one in three Americans have no choice for broadband service. If the power of a competitive market is to be unleashed with the American people as its beneficiaries, policy makers have to act decisively open up the market. Future mergers should not be permitted, and municipalities should not grant monopolies to individual companies in exchange for quickly outdated infrastructure promises. State laws that came about as a result of special interest lobbying restricting municipal broadband services or prohibiting the renting of pre-existing government fiber must be struck down.¹⁷⁸ Each viable separate step of the Internet delivery process should be siloed, reducing the influence of oligarchic companies. For example, Internet

¹⁷⁶ "Akamai's [state of the internet] Q3 2016 Report," Akamai 9, no. 3, (2016).

¹⁷⁷ *Speedtest Market Report: United States*, Speedtest, August 3, 2016.

¹⁷⁸ Adam Estes, "FCC Just Overruled State Laws That Were Blocking Municipal Broadband." *Gizmodo*, February 26, 2015.

service providers should not be able to install their own router, and instead consumers should purchase their own router off the market. Maintaining robust net neutrality is vital for preventing big cable from providing preferential speeds to paying companies, thereby eliminating the equal playing field of the Internet that made it so dynamic in the first place.

Go Fiber Optic

The last mile of Internet infrastructure is the largest problem today.¹⁷⁹ While connections between cities are formed of super-fast fiber optic cables, the connection to homes and apartment buildings is often ancient copper coaxial cables. Switching to fiber optic cables all the way until the port in your wall is of vital significance. There are numerous solutions. Among them, new and renovated buildings should be required to install fiber optic connections, and once healthy competition has been established, cable companies should be required to install fiber optic cables for their users.

Funding Science

In the 1970s, federal spending on R&D as a percentage share of the gross domestic product peaked at above 2%. 72% of recently surveyed adults in a major Pew report say that government investments in engineering and technology usually pay off in the long run but today, federal funding is less than .7% of GDP with the nominal dollar figure peaking in 2010 at \$160 billion.¹⁸⁰ While in an ideal world, the private sector would be solely responsible for funding innovation, many of the most important

¹⁷⁹ Adam Estes, "Why America's Internet Is So Shitty and Slow." *Gizmodo*, March 10, 2015.

¹⁸⁰ Cary Funk and Lee Rainie. "Public and Scientists' Views on Science and Society," *Pew Research Center*, January 29, 2015.

inventions of the last couple generations have been greatly assisted by government money. This is because in corporate research, 80 cents of every dollar spent on R&D goes to development, while only 20 cents goes to basic and applied research.¹⁸¹ This ratio is almost the complete opposite of that found in civilian science agencies and why public funding is so vital. Things that are incredibly beneficial now were not funded by private industry then because they often were not seen as having the possibility to positively affect the bottom line or have immediate commercial application.

How We Stack Up

Nine countries spend a greater share of their money on science than the United States. In 2013, the US spent \$433 billion cumulatively, both publically and privately, on R&D or 2.7% of GDP, while Japan spent 3.5% and South Korea spent 4.1%.¹⁸² This is unacceptable. In order to foster a climate of innovation and attract humanity's best and brightest, research funding must be expanded and celebrated. Secondly, if America's higher education system is to even be partially overhauled as elaborated above, new research capacity at resurgent universities will be immense, but cannot be properly realized without sufficient funding. Policy makers should fight for more local, state, and federal funding of R&D. A 150% increase from current levels could be easily positively utilized and should be established as a policy target. Currently, American companies outspend the government on research at about 70% of total funding.¹⁸³ An increase in

¹⁸¹ Art Jahnke, "Who Picks Up the Tab for Science?" *BU Today*, April 6, 2015.

¹⁸² Rebecca Harrington, "These 9 countries spend a greater share of money on science than the United States." *Business Insider*, March 1, 2016.

¹⁸³ Mark Boroush, "US R&D Increased in 2013, Well Ahead of the Pace of Gross Domestic Product," National Science Foundation, September 8, 2015.
<https://www.nsf.gov/statistics/2015/nsf15330/>

public funding can establish equilibrium between these two groups or even tip the scales in favor of government funding which will have massive, positive implications on the research side of the equation. The agencies that dole out this funding should also focus on a wider allocation, as well as innovative distribution strategies such as grants, prizes, interest free loans, and public investment in high-risk startups.

Conclusion

For the first time in living memory, some believe today's children will be worse off than their parents. Ignorantly clinging to the past and not embracing the future is a good way to guarantee that their fears will come to pass. However, by fostering and promoting innovation while working to ensure that no one is left behind in the new economy, today's children will undoubtedly live better lives than their parents could ever imagine.

Policy Recommendations

- Replace the junior year of high school with a mandatory internship for at least half the year
- Allow higher education students to receive full tuition subsidies outside of their home state
- Turn highly successful community colleges into universities, close unsuccessful ones, and increase underclassmen capacity at existing universities
- Dramatically increase the funding, visibility, and capability of adult education
- Fix the patent system with a “use it or lose it” rule and by decreasing the number of patents given and reducing their term length
- Build fiber optic connections and increase competition in the Internet Provider market
- Increase government funding for R&D and spend more in grants, prizes, interest free loans, and public investment in high-risk startups

Conclusion

The global economy is undergoing its most dramatic changes in human history. The changes in the United States that have and will continue to happen as a result of this are irreversible, inescapable, and inevitable. The jobs that have left aren't ever coming back and many of the jobs today won't exist in a couple decades. The currently, comparatively high paying jobs of America are threatened by a complacent education system that is evolving slower than its competitors and is failing to prepare Americans for the jobs of tomorrow. Innovation must continue to be unapologetically fostered and be allowed to disrupt ailing industries, while government backed programs work to make as many as possible benefit from these changes. Climate change will have a profound and measurable effect on the US economy and its standard of living, and every year that it is ignored the number of effects that can be mitigated decreases, while the cost of mitigation rises. Finally, the future preeminence of American global enterprise is at threat from burgeoning new centers of the global economy. If the United States is to remain on top of its ascendant competitors, and continue to reap the spoils of that privileged position, the government must be more proactive in reforming tax and regulatory systems while shrewdly working to enhance America's comparative advantages. With data-backed, pragmatic, and aggressive policy changes the United States can restructure its economic might to harness the new global dynamic to ensure the continued prosperity of its citizens.

This section has outlined powerful, cost-effective, and actionable policy solutions that address the most pressing issues facing the US in the modern economy. The

importance of these issues cannot be understated, for a strong economy is the foundation of any successful society and without it, nothing is possible.

The new economy presents many challenges, but far, far more opportunities. In the years ahead, political opportunists will see a coal miner and an unemployed factory worker and exploit their misinformed anger for personal gain; but visionaries will see a solar power technician and a robot designer who just haven't got their quite yet.

Policy Recommendations

- Re-engage with the global economy by pursuing trade agreements that raise standards and enhance America's comparative advantage
- Reform tax and regulatory systems at home to allow businesses to competitively expand and develop
- Enact major reforms to the American high school and higher education systems to provide American students with the skills they need to succeed in the future job market
- Dramatically upgrade America's physical and digital infrastructure to enhance communications and the transit of goods across the country
- Recognize the need to gradually transition from a fossil fuel economy and begin the transition through the increased adoption of nuclear power plant technology
- Increase government investment and awarding of contracts to renewable energy providers and innovators in order to encourage adoption
- Continue to dedicate federal grant money to finance further research into the potential economic effects of climate change

IV. Fostering and Securing American Identity

Introduction

In the 21st century, the United States has held its position as one of the world's leading powers in part through its promotion of American core values, including democracy, sovereignty, and transparency. These ideals have been maintained since our country's founding, and their cherishment can be seen in the protection, promotion, and integration of these values in all parts of American society. A series of strong national security policies protecting American democracy from terrorism and other significant threats resulted in the status we've achieved today. Moreover, the 'great American melting pot' would not be as economically strong were it not for the many immigrants that came before us that promoted our values as well as contributing their own, which today comprise what we consider uniquely 'American values.' The survival of these core values is only possible if America continues to promote them to our citizens, as well as the international community.

In the last few years, the US has been heavily criticized domestically and internationally for its hypocritical violation of the values we espouse. For example, to improve national security, greater surveillance was legalized through policies like the Patriot Act, resulting in heightened tensions between the government and the people who felt democracy was being threatened by the large expansion of government surveillance. The government is supposed to stand for its people, so it must strike a balance between democracy and security to resolve controversies over violations of civil liberties. A large factor in protecting our core values is making citizens aware of what these values are and how they relates to them, so that the government will be pressured

by citizens to reform surveillance and immigration policies to ensure more transparency of data collection and efficiency. We want to secure not only the land or the economy; we also desire to protect American culture.

The prominence of American culture is dependent on spreading these values through different types of media. Furthermore, the movement of people through international exchanges is a valuable way of displaying the full spectrum of American culture. With so many different ways to interact with the international community, using soft power to convey the benefits of democratic institutions and capitalistic possibilities helps teach the true essence of what it is like to be an American. Additionally, US humanitarian efforts must be continue; the provision of aid to other countries is a vital policy that, with reformation, can be an even greater asset to our country and those abroad.

Beyond simple international exchange, there is also a large number of people seeking to immigrate or take refuge in the US. Unfortunately, with an also increasing number of illegal immigrants, it is crucial to reform border control policy while also encouraging the foreign born to move here and incorporate their own values into US culture. On the other hand, we must give priority to potential immigrants who best serve US interests. We must therefore create immigration policies that prevent illegal immigration, while also giving equal opportunity to those who wish to come to the United States legally. Through more efficient immigration policy, the US will maintain its competitive edge with the knowledge the immigrant population can bring.

In order to retain our position as a global superpower, it is critical to maintain a steady flow of foreigners to the US to learn, to work, and to innovate. By making use of forms of American soft power such as the arts, humanitarian programs, and foreign aid,

the US reputation can be bolstered to ensure our country remains the top destination for the world's best and brightest. At the same time, we must find a balance by protecting our nation from all threats foreign and domestic. In the coming era, the US should strive to set an example for the international community on how to best foster a welcoming yet secure nation.

A. Liberty and Security: Striking a Balance

To maintain its position as a superpower, the United States should ensure its safety and security from terrorism and other potential disasters. According to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), the purpose of Homeland Security is to reduce the nation's vulnerability to terrorism and minimize damage from any kinds of terror attacks. As a result of the department's responsibilities in an increasingly globalized world, the balance between democracy and security has become controversial. In dealing with this controversy, the US government must cooperate with citizens to eliminate concerns about violations of civil rights; this is the only way to ensure that the DHS has the support and cooperation of the American people in their efforts to manage security threats. Moving forward, the US government, in conjunction with the DHS, should work to redefine a balance between prioritizing civil liberties and national security. Additionally, concerning new technologies that are now emerging in the 21st century, the government must improve technologies and programs intended to deal with new and existing risks of cyber security, therefore promoting the highest possible efficiency of American cyber warfare. The overall goal of Homeland Security is to respect the sovereignty of the state, while securing the land itself, individual rights, and protecting American core values.

Surveillance and Privacy Rights

It is controversial whether democracy or security should be the main priority of the United States. After the 9/11 terrorist attack, when Congress enacted the Patriot Act in 2001 and the Homeland Security Act in 2002 to protect the nation and people and prevent from any terrors, this controversy escalated. These laws have provoked

arguments in the US, due to concerns about the violation of democracy and civil liberties. The one sure thing that people and the government all agree on, is that both strong security and democracy are crucial for the nation and themselves. Therefore, the government must clearly redefine the balance between democracy and security so that the DHS may effectively ensure these rights. While many people struggle with the government's invasion of their privacy rights for the purpose of security, the government still must assure a reformed version of surveillance as a tool the DHS may use to maintain national security.

The Homeland Security Act has given authority to the DHS to control investigations that require access to information needed to protect against any forms of terrorism.¹⁸⁴ The issue with this act was that only the DHS was fully aware of what deemed an action as an act of terror. Because of this, many citizens of the US wondered whether any of their actions would be considered as terrorist acts. To relieve this concern, the government should clearly define and publicly announce the precise and understandable standard for what constitutes an act of terrorism.

Furthermore, the government was criticized for having excessive authority compared to its citizens and their Constitutional rights. The government's sole responsibility is to effectively represent the interests of its people; in the words of former President Abraham Lincoln, everyone in the United States is equal "under the Government of the people, for the people, by the people."¹⁸⁵ Namely, the nation stands for its people. That does not mean that people do not have to live under the laws of the

¹⁸⁴ United States Congress, *Compilation of the Homeland Security Act of 2002*, October 14, 2008.

¹⁸⁵ Abraham Lincoln, *Gettysburg Address*, United States Print Office, 1950.

government, but that the people decide the laws, themselves drawing the line between democracy and security. However, the recent information leaked by Edward Snowden regarding the massive surveillance and data collection breach conducted by the National Security Agency (NSA) has brought to light an infringement on the rights of the American public. The government acted undemocratically in their surveillance methods, taking power away from the American people, and going against American core values of sufficient representation. Many US citizens argue that continued surveillance under the Patriot Act is an invasion of their Constitutional rights. According to the Constitution, the Fourth Amendment still requires governmental searches and seizures to be conducted only upon issues of warrant, which means that people have the privacy rights against unreasonable searches.¹⁸⁶ Additionally, the Fifth Amendment protects against self-incrimination, which also ensures the privacy of personal information. These amendments demonstrate that Americans are granted privacy rights as basic civil liberties, and that they should be therefore protected under the Constitution.¹⁸⁷ Besides, the 14th Amendment clearly states that the government shall not make any legislations “which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States” or “deprive any person of life, liberty, property, without due process of law...within jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”¹⁸⁸

And yet, nonetheless, with the increasing possibility of domestic terrorist attacks, the American people require improved governmental actions for the assurance of our personal protection and security. Dissenting American voices argue that the Patriot Act is unconstitutional, because it allows the government to use the tools intended to

¹⁸⁶ “United States Constitution, Amendment IV,” *National Archives*.

¹⁸⁷ “United States Constitution, Amendment V,” *National Archives*.

¹⁸⁸ “United States Constitution, Amendment XIV,” *National Archives*.

combat terror to investigate organized crime and conduct unexpected and unwarned investigations.¹⁸⁹ The government has monitored internet networks, as well as telephone calls, both secretly and massively without any warrants. Citizens of the US have a right not only to security, but also to transparent surveillance policies by government agencies with clear information sharing about policy usage. Under Section 215 of the act, federal agencies including the DHS and the NSA could ask for a secret court order and obtain business records from “third parties, such as telephone companies...if deemed ‘relevant’ to an international terrorism... or foreign intelligence investigation.”¹⁹⁰ While this made it easier for agencies to communicate better by information sharing and cooperation among themselves, the agencies were not reporting how they had been collecting the information, or how the information was being used. Unless American citizens agree to provide their information with a clear understanding of how it will be used, therefore knowingly sacrificing their privacy for national security, it should not ever be acceptable for the government to violate individual privacy rights.

To resolve this concern, the government should announce and publicly distribute how they collect information, how much they collect, and more specifically how they use this data. That way, people have the ability to approve which information is being used, how it is being used, from where it is being gathered, to whom it is going, and why. The Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board report on mass surveillance, issued in January 2014, recommended that the government should provide a more specific

¹⁸⁹ United States Congress, *Public Law 107 - 56 - Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism (USA PATRIOT) Act of 2001*.

<https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-107publ56/content-detail.html>

¹⁹⁰ United States Congress, *USA PATRIOT Act of 2001*.

description explaining about surveillance, including how the government agencies collected, queried, and stored metadata.¹⁹¹ Besides, the government must define which cases or crimes have been aided by its surveillance techniques. If there is no positive outcome of surveillance, then it should be unnecessary for the NSA to continue with its current data collection policies, as they are then both unconstitutional and unproductive.

On the other side, the government argues that surveillance is hardly seen as invasion of constitutional rights. Right after the terrorist attack, when security concerns and fears of terrorism ran high, people in the US were willing to agree to extreme surveillance. Many citizens recognize the necessity of surveillance to fulfill security goals and acknowledge that the purpose of surveillance is to protect people and the nation before a terrorist attack can occur, by preventing any terrorist actions through policies of deterrence. However, these same citizens who are concerned about terrorism still argue that government surveillance policies intended as terror deterrents pose constitutional violations.

As time has passed, the government has worked to update the law to acknowledge the people's concerns and reflect new technologies and new threats. With surveillance, the government anticipates an ability to provide more enhanced security to the nation. This report agrees that surveillance is necessary for an open society. Ironically, the US requires this tool to protect itself, even if it has been uncomfortable for American citizens and the government, and its constitutionality is questionable.

Already in order to resolve the dispute between democracy and security, the USA

¹⁹¹ David Medine and Patricia Wald, "Is the Freedom Act More Effective than the Patriot Act?" *Newsweek*, May 10, 2016.

Freedom Act was enacted in 2015 as the reformed and updated version of the Patriot Act. It clearly represents that surveillance cannot be seen as the invasion of civil liberties, but seen as a tool for prevention of terrorism attacks and protections for physical land and civil rights or values given to people, reflecting unique realities of the 21st century. The government assures that the USA Freedom Act provides more transparency compared to the previous law, therefore satisfying most concerns regarding the invasion of privacy rights. Under the USA Freedom Act, the NSA lost its authority to collect the phone records of millions of Americans for any reason. The government is getting the bulk metadata collection program back up and running during a six-month transition period to the new data collection system. This act “is critical to keeping Americans safe from terrorism” while protecting civil liberties and values, according to House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio’s statement.¹⁹² Now, the NSA can ask companies for data only on a specific entity, such as a person, account, or device. Furthermore, the government must prove that the information collected is necessary because it is associated with a foreign power or terrorist group.

While the Freedom Act is a step in the right direction, it is important that the government continue to reform laws related to surveillance, in order to bring more transparency to data collection processes; hopefully this will persuade people to pay for the cost of their national security by sacrificing some of their individual privacy. The government must not ask for specific demographics to sacrifice their civil liberties. For example, since at least 2002, the NYPD has scanned mosques in New York City and

¹⁹² United States Congress, *Uniting and Strengthening America by Fulfilling Rights and Ensuring Effective Discipline Over Monitoring (FREEDOM) Act of 2015*.

beyond and put surveillance operations secretly on Muslim criminals.¹⁹³ This cannot be acceptable, as it discriminates against a particular group, and therefore breaks with American core values of equality. Surveillance must not be limited to a specific community, race, religion, or gender, but rather applied equally to everyone. With new and updated laws, these cases will be not incurred again, and transparency will simultaneously be improved.

Consequently, the DHS not only protects citizens themselves, but also protects American core values of democracy, such as life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. The government should impress an understanding of the imperative nature of the surviving version of reformed surveillance, especially regarding how it protects people's rights. If the majority of US citizens are continually unsatisfied with newly reformed laws on surveillance, the United States must listen to its citizens and provide other security plans by pursuing further reform. What is seen in most communities in the US is that people are willing to pay for security by letting go of some of their privacy, unless their sacrifice is useless and ineffective. In order to justify its continued use, the government must prove that without surveillance, specific terrorist attacks would have occurred.

In sum, surveillance is necessary and an indispensable component of the US national security strategy in the 21st century. However, we need more transparency in showing how effectively gathered data has been used to protect against terrorist attacks. Thus, the government should keep reforming security laws in a manner that reflects citizens' opinions, as the government stands for people. This report highly recommends that the US government provide a periodic public surveillance report, indicating how

¹⁹³ Colin Moynihan, "A New York City Settlement on Surveillance of Muslims," *The New Yorker*, January 7, 2016.

they have protected against events or criminals through their information collection efforts. This change will solidify popular support for governmental actions intended to prevent future terror attacks, both physical and cyber.

Cybersecurity

Despite its public acknowledgement of the necessity of cybersecurity, the US government has weaker cyber warfare and protection than any other leading power in the world, especially China and Russia.¹⁹⁴ Even though cyber-attacks have led to critically problematic issues in other countries, the US has not taken this threat seriously in the past. While both China and Russia have invested a lot of capital and labor into cybersecurity, the US has comparatively done very little. To alleviate and eliminate concerns towards cyber-attacks, the DHS is already required to provide procedures and manuals “to share cybersecurity threat information with private entities, nonfederal government agencies, state, tribal and local government, the public, and entities under threats,” under the Cybersecurity Act of 2015.¹⁹⁵ The DHS must more seriously deploy a system to detect cybersecurity risks in network traffic traveling to or from an agency information system, and prevent or modify such traffic in order to remove cybersecurity risks.

Recently, the number of cyber threats has been dramatically increasing. The Government Accountability Office’s survey of 24 federal agencies showed that between 2006 and 2015, “the number of cyber-attacks climbed 1,300% —from 5,500 to over

¹⁹⁴ Cory Gardner and Chris Coons, "Senators: US. Cybersecurity Is Too Weak," *Time*, January 17, 2017.

¹⁹⁵ United States Congress, *Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015: report together with additional views*.

77,000 a year.”¹⁹⁶ Foreign hackers -mainly in Russia and China- with more advanced technologies and programs keep hacking US businesses and government institutions. In 2015, Russian hackers attacked the State Department email system, and the Office of Personnel Management reported that 5.6 million Americans’ fingerprints were stolen by this attack.¹⁹⁷ This is unacceptable in the United States, a nation which has been considered the world’s superpower since the emergence of the post-World War II era. Additionally, in November 2016, Russian hackers penetrated Democratic Party computers, and gained access to the personal emails of Democratic officials, which in turn were distributed to the global media by WikiLeaks.¹⁹⁸ Even in February of 2016, the DHS was hacked, and on twitter, the names and contact information of 29,000 DHS and FBI employees were released.¹⁹⁹ It is truly ridiculous that the department responsible for Homeland Security itself has now been hacked, demonstrating how weak American cyber security is.

Once the government’s agencies and organizations were attacked multiple times, the government hastily put more money into the development of new technologies intended to bolster American cybersecurity. The president’s 2017 Budget supports all federal civilian agencies in adopting these cyber capabilities. Former President Obama increased the budget on cybersecurity more and more to protect the nation from cyber-

¹⁹⁶ Gregory C. Wilshusen and Nabajyoti Barkakati, *Information security: agencies need to improve controls over selected high-impact systems: report to congressional requesters* (Washington, D.C.: United States Government Accountability Office, 2016).

¹⁹⁷ Andrea Peterson, "OPM says 5.6 million fingerprints stolen in biggest cyber attack in US history," *The Independent*, September 24, 2015.

¹⁹⁸ Robert Windrem, "Timeline: Ten years of Russian cyber attacks on other countries," *NBC News*, December 18, 2016.

¹⁹⁹ Brian Barrett, "Hack Brief: Hacker Leaks the Info of Thousands of FBI and DHS Employees," *Wired*, February 8, 2016.

attacks. According to the budget proposal for the 2017 fiscal year, the Obama administration sought \$19 billion for cyber security across the US government due to growing risk posed by other nation states in the digital world.²⁰⁰ The DHS plans to dramatically increase the number of cyber defense teams to a total of 48, by hiring highly talented people from across the federal government and private sector.²⁰¹ These newly formed teams are anticipated to protect networks, systems, and data across the government. The government eagerly looks forward to greater cybersecurity, while these teams will conduct penetration testing to enhance the network, proactively search for hackers and any undetected cyber-attacks, and analyze and provide incident response to the government.

The DHS should protect our nation against cybersecurity attacks from other foreign powers preventively. The government should not be satisfied with current technologies but continuously work to adapt prospective technology. The DHS must build and operate their own technologies for highest efficiency, and promote new protections against cyber-attacks.²⁰² With more effective and efficient technologies, the DHS will be able to help other governmental agencies defend against cyber threats.

In the 21st century, cybersecurity is a major threat to national security. Many cases of cyber-attacks are undetected; the government should keep monitoring the efficiency of the department. Research and development regarding the technology and

²⁰⁰ Reuters, "Obama Budget Proposal Includes \$19 Billion for Cybersecurity," *Fortune*, February 09, 2016.

²⁰¹ Office of the Press Secretary, "FACT SHEET: Cybersecurity National Action Plan," Obama Administration Archives, February 9, 2016.

<https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2016/02/09/fact-sheet-cybersecurity-national-action-plan>

²⁰² Office of the Press Secretary, "Cybersecurity National Action Plan"

system for protections against cyber-attacks must be maintained for long-term, because technology keeps developing, especially as other countries are continuously competing to have the best cybersecurity technology. To do so, the government must hire foreign technicians from other countries. Foreign technicians represent massive opportunities for American innovation, an idea that is expanded upon within the section of this report entitled 'Immigration, a Necessity for American Prosperity'. More importantly, the government should continue to encourage the public to report any information regarding potential or past threats posed by individuals, businesses, and the government. We should not be intimidated by the tactics of Russia and China, or by their advanced technologies. However, we must benchmark advanced technologies discovered by other countries, and develop them as our own technologies to protect our nation. With those solutions, the government can protect the American people not only against physical attacks, but also against new attacks in cyber world.

Border Security

Border security is another important aspect of ensuring the continued protection of the US. The role of the DHS when it comes to border security is not only to monitor and protect our borders from illegal movements of weapons, drugs, contraband, and people, but also to open the borders with enhanced security to promote the ability of foreigners to safely enter the country. By doing so, the DHS protects and promotes core values of America, generating civil liberties and equal rights to immigrants.

The acceptance of immigrants and refugees from specific countries has been a rising issue in the US. Considering that the US was initially founded through immigrant colonization of the Americas, it is not moral for that same country to not accept people

from specific countries, especially ones in the Middle East. Historically, as the United States has accepted and opened doors for immigrants, it has enjoyed numerous positive developments, whether economic, political, and international. Closing the borders for immigrants is not beneficial. For example, in Japan, a country with a reputation of a closed-door immigration policy, social and economic problems have been emerging. Because their society is rapidly aging and birth rates are low, the population is decreasing. With fewer and fewer people of working age and more people relying upon financial assistance in their old age, Japan is now facing an economic issue. By having more immigrants, the US can receive economic benefits, as it will experience growth in both labor force and human capital. According to the National Academy of Sciences, “immigration supplies workers, which increases GDP and has helped the US avoid the fate of stagnant economies created by purely demographic forces –in particular, an aging workforce.”²⁰³ Additionally, they reported, “Perhaps even more important than the contribution to labor supply is the infusion by high-skilled immigration of human capital that has boosted the nation’s capacity for innovation and technological change.”

²⁰⁴

Pro-immigration policies previously pursued by the US have historically brought many economic successes. Opening up the borders not only boosts the US economy, but also protects democracy and its supporting values. For example, in the early 20th century, the US welcomed immigrants by opening up borders. Especially, from 1890 to the 1920s, there was a massive immigration to the US. During this time, immigrants hugely benefited the American economy. Massive immigration was the driver of

²⁰³ Stuart Anderson, "3 Reasons Why Immigrants Are Key To Economic Growth," *Forbes*, October 2, 2016.

²⁰⁴ Anderson, “Immigrants Are Key.”

economic growth as indicated on many economic analyses of the nineteenth century.²⁰⁵ Additionally, this mass migration brought the rapid economic growth and 70% of the real-wage convergence observed in American economy of the late 19th century.²⁰⁶

Additionally, as the US occupies the position of the world's leading power, it is America's moral and ethical responsibility to accept more refugees from countries who cannot currently provide an adequate standard of living for their citizens. The most concerning issue regarding the acceptance of more refugees is currently the possible threat posed to security. Despite American citizens' fears of an infiltration of extremist terrorist organizations such as ISIL, it is imperative that the United States continue to emphasize that not all terrorists are Muslims and not all Muslims –even of the most devout– are terrorists and the United States vetting program for legal immigration or refugee programs from majority Muslim countries has so far effectively kept Americans safe from terrorist threats.

Nonetheless, as the border is opened to more immigrants and refugees, the security scanning standards and technologies, as well as human capital efficiency, should be enhanced. There must be stable plans and systems by the DHS to protect our borders. However, Homeland Security has received many questions regarding how their procedures can be monitored, and how the effectiveness of their border security policies can be measured. American budgets have increasingly poured money into national security efforts over the last decade, but the effectiveness of these efforts cannot be

²⁰⁵Kevin H. O'Rourke and Jeffrey G. Williamson. *Globalization and History: The Evolution of a Nineteenth-Century Atlantic Economy*, (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2001).

²⁰⁶Cecil E. Bohanon and T. Norman Van Cott. "Tariffs, Immigration, and Economic Insulation: A New View of the US Post–Civil War Era." *The Independent Review* 9, no. 4 (2005): 529-542.

measured correctly, and the plans provided by the department have not been fulfilled on time. According to the United States Government Accountability Office, in 2014, the US Customs and Border Protection (CBP) has identified one of its missions to be an improvement of the performance of surveillance technologies, but CBP has not fully applied itself to an assessment of the contributions of its new technologies.²⁰⁷ The limited ability of the CBP to collect, track, and analyze is not helpful to protect the nation, though it has advanced screening technologies. The DHS should gather the data within its database for easier tracking and recording and analyze this data to ensure greater efficiency, rather than ask for more financial support for increases in human capital.²⁰⁸

When this report recommends an opening of borders to foreigners, it does not mean a literal opening up of American borders to everyone; rather, it means that equal opportunities must be given to foreigners within the screening standards based on immigration law. This way the US can set an international example of how to correctly protect equality rights for all people, while simultaneously protecting the country from terrorist attacks. A physical wall along America's borders will not prevent illegal immigrants coming in, and is a waste of time for the DHS to pursue. Rather, giving equal opportunities to all attempted and planned immigrants based on lawful entries will help prevent illegal immigration in an ethical way. With advanced technologies for screening, and higher efficiency of border patrol workers, the US border will be best protected from terrorist threats.

²⁰⁷ Rebecca Gambler, "Border Security: DHS Surveillance Technology Unmanned Aerial Systems, Other Assets," Government Accountability Office (GAO), May 24, 2016.

²⁰⁸ Gambler, "Border Security."

Conclusion

In conclusion, the DHS should not only focus on protecting national security, but should also prioritize the protection of the American values and constitutional rights for which we have historically fought. As American citizens sacrifice their privacy for national security, the DHS must publish periodic reports on the efficiency and effectiveness of data collection and what cases or crimes are prevented by it. Moreover, the DHS should open up borders to other countries and immigrants, while maintaining the highest standards of security through investment in advanced technologies and human capital. Nowadays, many Americans are concerned that their liberties are being violated. The government can resolve this concern only when it works with its people.

Policy Recommendations

- Provide periodic public reports on the effectiveness and analysis of data collection and which cases or crimes have been prosecuted
- Adapt and benchmark technologies for cybersecurity and bring high-skilled technicians from other countries to ensure that America remains on the global frontline of cybersecurity technology
- Open our borders to any people satisfying our Immigration laws, and ensure their access to equal opportunities
- Analyze the effectiveness of border security technologies

B. American Values Abroad

American Influence

Democracy is the cornerstone of American society; it must be promoted and showcased around the world. A commitment to free and open markets is also a fundamental American value, and one that must be encouraged abroad. Furthermore, the US must nurture greater respect for universal norms and ideals internationally, as an American commitment to international agreements alone is ineffective. Throughout its history, the United States has employed various methods to project key American values in a manner that best serves national interest and secures its position as a global leader. As defined by Joseph Nye, soft power is a tool used by countries to obtain “the outcomes [the country] wants in world politics because other countries admire its values, emulates its example, and aspires to its level of prosperity and openness.”²⁰⁹ Essentially, it is the grouping of economic and cultural tactics a country may use to spread influence without resorting to military strength. It is vital for the United States to employ soft power as it navigates 21st century globalization. In order to do so, we must use educational exchanges, humanitarian programs, arts and media, and foreign aid as tools to project American values worldwide.

²⁰⁹ Joseph S. Nye Jr., "The Benefits of Soft Power," HBS Working Knowledge. August 2, 2004, Accessed February 10, 2017.
<http://hbswk.hbs.edu/archive/4290.html>

Educational Opportunities

Benefits of Education

International educational programs both showcase American values to the world and create opportunities for our own students to engage globally. In the 2014-15 school year, 974,926 international students were enrolled in American institutions and 313,415 American students studied abroad.²¹⁰ By welcoming foreign students, American institutions offer these students a truly American experience where they gain an appreciation for the quintessential American way of life. This appreciation thus makes them more likely to develop and support democratic institutions and ideals once they return home. Furthermore, the American students studying overseas act as cultural ambassadors, building positive relationships and fostering goodwill. Continued government support and funding for international programs and exchanges will make a widespread cultural impact by providing a more global perspective to students on either side of the exchange.²¹¹

International Students Experiencing the American Way of Life

Educational exchanges that immerse international students in American institutions create an opportunity for foreign students to learn American ideals, and also allow highly skilled students from both cultures to exchange ideas. China and India are

²¹⁰ "International Students in the United States 2015/16," Project Atlas, Accessed February 06, 2017.

<http://www.iie.org/Services/Project-Atlas/United-States/International-Students-In-US>

²¹¹ Karen P. Hughes, "Waging Peace": A New Paradigm for Public Diplomacy," *Mediterranean Quarterly* 18, no. 2 (2007): 30.

the top two countries with the largest amount of students coming to the US, with 31.2% of the total number of international students coming from China and 13.6% of total students coming from India in the 2014 school year.²¹² As more students travel domestically to the US, there will be an increase in employment of highly skilled individuals that want to learn more about American values. These highly skilled individuals are then become cultural ambassadors from the US once back at home, facilitating an exchange of their global knowledge with their community. The education of these foreign students can be used as a tool to spread US ideas and beliefs, as they will almost assuredly share what they acquired of the American way of life with their friends and families.

American Students Going Abroad

The global spread of educated people from the US allows Americans to be cultural ambassadors and improve the global community's perception of the United States.²¹³ American volunteers in programs purposed for international aid project that many Americans' lifestyles are such that they have the opportunity to live abroad because our democratic society grants them this economic privilege and liberty of choice. Educational foundations funded by the US in less-developed countries further develop a positive rapport, of which the United States' global image is in dire need.

Fulbright Program

With the participation of hundreds of thousands of American participants traveling abroad each year, programs like the Fulbright program and the Peace Corps

²¹² "International Students in the United States 2015/16," Project Atlas.

²¹³ Hughes, "Waging Peace," 30.

encourage another informal type of cultural diplomacy that can be used to spread American values.²¹⁴ While the Fulbright program is traditionally known as an educational exchange, it can also be viewed as a cultural exchange.²¹⁵ The Fulbright Program works by carefully selecting students with high academic standings who possess the ability to teach, study, and exchange diverse ideas that provide guidance for international issues.²¹⁶

Peace Corps

In our Peace Corps, as of September 30, 2016, there are currently 7,213 volunteers serving in 65 different countries and 40% of the volunteers work in education and 22% of the volunteers work in health.²¹⁷ Peace Corps volunteers are effective facilitators of foreign communities' firsthand experience working with Americans and learning about the US from the perspective of an American citizen, rather than through other, possibly negative contexts, such as international news or governments.

With many international students studying in the US and with US students studying abroad, international programs support US interests by engaging international students with American values, and strengthening bilateral relationships through exchanges. These exchanges are therefore tools that the US can use to promote the

²¹⁴ "Facts and Figures | Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs," United States Department of State, accessed January 21, 2017.

<https://eca.state.gov/impact/facts-and-figures>

²¹⁵ Lois W. Roth, "Public Diplomacy and the Past: The Search for an American Style of Propaganda (1952-1977)," *Fletcher Forum* 8, no. 2 (1984): 364.

²¹⁶ "About Fulbright | Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs," United States Department of State, accessed February 07, 2017.

<https://eca.state.gov/fulbright/about-fulbright>

²¹⁷ "Fast Facts," Peace Corps, accessed February 07, 2017.

<https://www.peacecorps.gov/news/fast-facts/>

advancement of democratic values in the world.

Funding Educational Opportunities

The US government must dedicate more funds to these programs, and to the marketing of these programs to make them popular. We must make sure that these exchange programs are fully staffed, and that they have the proper equipment to market to students.

Spreading American Media & the Arts

Global Capitalism in the 21st Century and Cultural Diplomacy

Cultural diplomacy comes in many forms; this is especially true when utilizing media, the arts, and propaganda. Having the liberty to express oneself freely paints a vivid picture of what the “American Dream” truly is. This picture is one of an America that is full of civil liberties which allow people to achieve that which they pursue, accompanied by the idea that the US capitalist system is what enables these endeavors to reap the highest economic reward possible. Cultural diplomacy through public media helps spread the projection of what the United States stands for through film, music, and the rest of the arts.

Public cultural diplomacy was critical during the Cold War because of the need to sway the world away from communism. The United States Information Agency (USIA) was in direct command of the utilization of various types of media and propaganda to spread the culture of America and to help foster a world that was not communist. Viewers from places like Russia watched American television shows and that exposure to a different way of life influenced their ideology. The US used public media to shape

the international community toward democracy and show the benefits of the way of life in a capitalist society.²¹⁸ Although the events of the Cold War are over, there are still prominent threats that still exist and it is important to spread the ideals of democracy and freedom so that the world may move towards more peace.

As previously noted in this report, today, the US no longer faces one major enemy as it did during the Cold War. Rather, a multitude of global issues such as Climate Change and nuclear proliferation pose the preeminent threats to the American way of life. Both internationally and domestically, the US could impress the imperative nature of these threats upon both Americans and citizens of other countries through funding rhetoric in popular (and globally far-reaching) American films and arts.

Hollywood

It is vital that our country utilizes as many forms of digital media as possible to maintain competent and relevant in a more digitally centered world.²¹⁹ The film industry and the internet both serve as tools to connect audiences all over the world with forms of American culture; therefore, a US government competency in utilizing the internet well would provide an advantage to the US. Online forums around the world have been increasing, so being able to use these forums helps America communicate effectively, discussing perceived American ideals abroad.²²⁰ Through media and the arts, the US should project images of capitalism by producing American goods and services that display American excellence. One facet of cultural arts – the American film industry –

²¹⁸ Filippos Proedrou and Christos Frangonikolopoulos, "Refocusing Public Diplomacy: The Need for Strategic Discursive Public Diplomacy," *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 23, no. 4 (2012): 731.

²¹⁹ Hughes, "Waging Peace," 26.

²²⁰ Hughes, "Waging Peace," 26.

possesses a great ability to reach audiences all over the world. Much of the world's countries have their box offices dominated by films coming out of the US, with 20 of the top movies in the year 2014 coming from the US and their partners.²²¹ Conveying messages of great entertainment and leisure to the world helps lure and fascinate people with the culture that is seen throughout the US. Popular films can lead foreign audiences to believe that under a capitalist system, people can live the types of lavish lifestyles so often portrayed on the big screen. Revealing to foreign audiences the way Americans live through film is an effective way to spread the culture that is fostered in the US.

United States Information Agency

The previous USIA's use of all types of media made the agency effective in promoting American values and giving the world a glimpse of what the US culture was like. The use of media like radio broadcast, newspapers, television, Hollywood, and distribution of American goods were some of the ways that the USIA utilized to spread their overall message of what it meant to be American. Although the hegemonic threats that were most prominent during the Cold War are gone, and agencies like the USIA are not in operation anymore, the media can still play a very important role in promoting American values. The possibility for a better life can be promoted through the advertisement of American ideals, so it is essential to project freedom, democracy, and opportunity through cultural diplomacy. With the closure of the USIA in the 1990s, the work that was previously managed by the USIA was dispersed into different branches, such as the State Department, Broadcast Board of Governors (BBG), and independent

²²¹ Michael Cieply, "Hollywood Works to Maintain Its World Dominance," *New York Times*, November 3, 2014.

federal agencies. However, the duties that these branches took over have since not been performed as effectively as they were in the past.²²² To make sure that cultural diplomacy occurs through the media and arts, it is necessary to structure a new centralized agency like the USIA to monitor all medias and products to be effectively distributed worldwide. It is important to spread positive change with culture because the interchanging of cultures through people, products, and ideas all enhance the knowledge and wellbeing of nations. The use of media and the arts to further spread the value of capitalism is important because as companies and brands from the US continue to get stronger, the US will have further influence as the world's economic hegemon. All forms of media coming from the US provide us with an opportunity to project a positive image of America, so it is important for the media to raise global awareness of issues that pose a possible threat to American way of life.

Foreign Aid

The US has held a prominent role in providing and assisting countries through foreign aid since the end of World War II. Currently, \$22.7 billion dollars of foreign aid are given out by the US; however, this amount accounts for less than 1% of the federal budget.²²³ By building a strong international structure that is reliant on the robust relations that the US forges, and by with strengthening US ties with less-developed countries that the US formally supports, new economic opportunities will arise. With an increase in US foreign aid, we will see an expansion in partnerships throughout the global system, as well as growth in trading opportunities for the US specifically.

²²² Hughes, ““Waging Peace,”” 25.

²²³ "Budget," United States Agency for International Development, accessed February 07, 2017. <https://www.usaid.gov/results-and-data/budget-spending>

Humanitarian Aid

It is in the best interest of the US interest to increase humanitarian aid, because the more assistance that the US provides to less-developed countries, the more our relationship with these countries is strengthened. Many forms of aid that the US gives to countries to help improve their domestic state of affairs are truly granted in part due to the US desire to improve its own strategic relationship with these countries.²²⁴ As more humanitarian aid is distributed, a better image of the US is created. Through strategic foreign aid, the US is able to both assist other countries while at the same time projecting American core values and improving the US' international image.

A program like the United States President's Emergency Plan For AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) exemplifies that the United States should take careful measures in helping develop countries in need. Introducing accessible drugs and counseling for protection against HIV/AIDS in underprivileged communities in the world effectively shows the US commitment to preserving the lives of those at risk. With the help of PEPFAR, the US currently is able to provide 11.5 million people with antiretroviral drugs that help combat HIV/AIDS and is one of the most effective humanitarian programs that the US utilizes.²²⁵ Programs like PEPFAR must continuously operate because these programs stabilize the American reputation and ensure that the US remains the leading hegemon to the global eye. China's recent initiative to pledge \$1 trillion dollars to construct infrastructure in low-income countries is challenging the US as the most influential

²²⁴ Henry S. Reuss, "The United States Foreign Aid Program: An Appraisal," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 336 (1961): 23.

²²⁵ Bill Frist, "The Case for Keeping America's AIDS Relief Plan," *New York Times*, February 9, 2017.

superpower.²²⁶ It will be necessary to increase the amount of aid that goes towards economic and humanitarian efforts in order to create a more balanced international system with countries that look to the US for support rather than other superpowers. The need to help in preventing the spread of epidemics, preventing the downfall of an economy, and making sure the political governments are monitored are all issues that the US has to consider. This is beneficial for the US because when countries become less concerned with issues that they experience now, they will be able to contribute to the international system as a whole when the need arises.

Direct Distribution of Aid

The majority of aid that the United States gives out is focused on military aid.²²⁷ This means that there is a lack funding given to areas like humanitarian efforts, which should be a main focus for US aid moving forward. Additionally, this report argues that it is in the best interest of the US to distribute aid directly, so that we can most effectively improve the regions where we are granting aid. International agencies that provide aid often do not help less-developed countries significantly and sometimes worsen their recipients' situations.²²⁸ Therefore, reliance of the US on international agencies when it comes to aid distribution should cease because assisting these countries ourselves would have better outcomes. Bypassing certain agencies such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank will help the US utilize its full potential when trying to help poor countries in need of assistance. The aid will thus be more transparent between the receiving country and the US, and will be more effectively

²²⁶ David Leonhardt, "America First, in Africa," *New York Times*, February 9, 2017.

²²⁷ Reuss, "The United States Foreign Aid Program," 23.

²²⁸ Reuss, "The United States Foreign Aid Program," 23.

monitored by us than it could be through an international body. The two aforementioned international agencies are particularly notorious for not allocating the correct funds, and for not fully monitoring the progress of projects. Rather than utilizing agencies to distribute the aid, it would be more effective to give out our own aid and to actually monitor our projects ourselves, to see if the aid that is being received is effective. Strengthening the delivery of aid that is being given to less-developed countries, and making sure that these programs are closely monitored will ensure that a clear path to a more developed and free world will be made.²²⁹

Conclusion

US soft power is a tool that will prove useful for preserving the prosperity of America as a nation. The exchange of ideas through international programs helps promote American culture and the integration of other cultures in the United States. Promotion of programs like the Fulbright program and the Peace Corps is vital to the sustained prosperity of the US as an educational hub for diversified learning and can be used as a means to build a positive reputation amongst the members of the international system. The use of all media sources will help inform people about the US and shed light onto what a democratic, capitalistic United States looks like and stands for. The increase in humanitarian foreign aid is a critical means to maintain US influence and good relations with other countries. Bypassing international organizations when distributing foreign aid will ensure that the programs that the funds' use is effective. Although all countries should have equal importance, some countries do require more attention and

²²⁹ Reuss, "The United States Foreign Aid Program," 29.

it is important to focus on the least developed nations. It is in the best interests of the US to support developing countries through both volunteer work and foreign aid because helping these countries may further improve relations among the international system and encourage these countries to embrace a more democratic society and capitalistic economy.

Policy Recommendations

- Promote international exchange programs for American students such as Fulbright and Peace Corps, and continue to encourage international students to study in the US as well
- Revive the USIA, or create a similarly centralized agency intended to utilize the internet and the media in order to spread American culture as a means to achieving national interests
- Bypass international agencies when distributing foreign aid by distributing foreign aid directly to countries in need through local governments and organizations
- Increase foreign aid spending to at least 2% of GDP, targeting humanitarian issues

C. Immigration: A Necessity for American Prosperity

Immigration is necessary for the United States if it wants to remain the global economic and political leader of the 21st century. It is crucial for the economy, as more than half of the recent growth in the US labor force has come from immigration, and nearly all future growth will come either from immigrants or from current workers delaying retirement.²³⁰

The Benefits of Immigration

There is a rising opinion in both the US and around the world that immigration has negative economic and social consequences for a country. Concerns over the costs of immigration inevitably rise either when the growth in the number of immigrants is large, or when the economy is experiencing a downturn. Many developed countries in the world are experiencing both. However, this sentiment must be corrected because both in history and in the modern day, immigration has had overall positive outcomes for countries. In other words, countries, especially the US, have benefited, and will continue to benefit from immigration.

Immigration has also brought a large share of the world's best talents to the US. The US has some of the most innovative companies in the world, and immigrants created many of them. In fact, a recent study shows that immigrants have started more than half, 44 of 87 exactly, of America's startup companies valued at \$1 billion dollars or

²³⁰ United States Senate Judiciary Committee, "The Role of Immigrants in the US Labor Market," March 16, 2016.

more, and that immigrants are also key members of management or product development teams in over 70% (i.e. 62 of 87) of these companies. The research finds that among the billion dollar startup companies, immigrant founders have created an average of approximately 760 jobs per company in the United States. Moreover, it is estimated that the collective value of the 44 immigrant-founded companies is \$168 billion, which is near to half the value of the stock markets of Russia or Mexico.²³¹ Immigrants that enter the country bring diversity: different ways of thinking, different ventures, different entrepreneurship values that benefit to company creations and jobs creation. Therefore, the US needs to keep this flow of immigrants, as it will be eventually translated into a huge brain gain for America. If the US drastically begins to reduce immigration, it will deprive the country of talented people, economic innovation, and competitiveness. In today's globalized economy the US needs a strong competitive advantage; high-skilled immigrants will help the country gain this advantage by making the nation both more competitive and innovative.

Moreover, the United States is facing an aging of its population; more and more people are retiring. Even though the US has a high birth rate, immigration is necessary to limit the decline in the working population. A more open immigration policy means that the US will face fewer economic and social pressures as many Americans retire in industry, service, and agricultural sectors, affecting both unskilled and skilled job markets. Immigration will keep the working age population steady, therefore helping the United States maintain economic growth.

²³¹ Stuart Anderson, "Immigrants and Billion Dollar Start-ups," *National Foundation for American Policy*, March, 2016.

If the US slows down its immigration, that will impact not only its economy, but also its image to the rest of the world. The US is no longer leading an ideological war as during the cold war, but American values such as democracy, capitalism, and freedom have not changed, and continue to define our nation. The US should promote and protect. Yet, our country cannot be the protector of the free world if it does not allow legal immigration to the country. That would have a negative impact on the US' world image, and will be detrimental for the prosperity of the United States throughout the 21st century and beyond. Therefore, the US needs to keep its border open for controlled legal immigration or its public image will be severely impacted.

Finally, many people in the world believe that the US is a country where anyone, no matter his or her origin, can succeed; the “American Dream” is what makes the US so coveted a destination by many people and states around the world. The American Dream is linked to the US history of high immigration, defines what it is to be American, and has allowed talented people to succeed in the country. Thus, immigration is a core value of the United States; the US needs immigration to demonstrate that the American dream is still possible, attract the best talented people of the world, and remain the global leader.

It is important that the US, in global competition, remains the first destination of choice for immigrants. The US should attract high-skilled immigrants to promote innovation, as well as low-skilled immigrants to respond to economic fluctuation. To achieve these goals, it is necessary that the US reform its immigration policy in order to promote legal immigration and better fit US national interests.

Understanding Immigrant Demographics

We believe that the US should not focus on the origin of legal immigrants that enter the country, but rather on what they will bring to the US, and how they will be beneficial to the US economy and society.

High-Skilled Immigrants

In today's globalized world, where barriers to free trade have been eliminated, and where low-wage countries compete directly with high-wage countries, innovation is essential to maintain a competitive advantage. Innovation requires a large pool of smart people with diverse knowledge, skills and experience. To maintain its position of global leadership, the US must constantly be replacing this pool of talents with new people from inside its borders, but also, from all around the world. The number of science and engineering PhDs earned by US citizens has fallen by more than 20% in the past decade. The US will face a growing shortage of highly skilled workers as the baby boom generation moves towards retirement. In 2006, there were more master's, doctoral, and professional degrees held by the American population age from 55 to 59, which is close to retirement, than among 30 to 34 year olds.²³² It is certain that most of future innovation, start-up creations, and job creations will come from immigrants in the years to come, especially as this is already the case. Therefore, immigration is necessary to the survival of the US as both a global leader, and as a primary economic power. Indeed, the survival of the United States, in today's highly interconnected and competitive world,

²³² Jeb Bush and Thomas F. McLarty III, "US Immigration Policy," Council on Foreign Relations, 2009.

depends on maintaining this flow of talent.²³³ This is why the US should encourage immigrants with university degrees to enter the country, and promote the ability of these young graduates to obtain working visas easily.

American universities are the biggest advantage the US has to attract these skilled immigrants. Many foreign students choose the US to pursue their university degrees. There are about 600 thousand foreign students that attend universities and colleges, which represent about 3% of the total students in the United States.²³⁴ These numbers could be expanded without displacing American students. Even if American universities remain a magnet for talented foreign students, government policies do too little to help them. In particular, the US makes it very difficult for international students to remain in the country after graduation. The US should make it easier for international graduates to stay in the country. The US invests money in them by offering them a degree that is recognized worldwide, and if these students go back to their home country, or to another country, the US will not gain anything by allowing them to study in the country. This is why this report proposes a reform of the H1-b visa, a policy recommendation that will be expanded upon later.

In Canada for example, most of immigration is work based and especially “talent based,” meaning that most of the immigrants accepted in Canada have a talent that the country needs. Most of the Canadian population is favorable to immigration because they know that immigrants are beneficial to the country’s economy and prosperity. The US population has a very skeptical opinion towards immigration, and if the government

²³³ Darrell M. West, *Brain Gain, Rethinking US Immigration Policy* (Washington: Brookings Institution Press, 2010).

²³⁴ Bush and McLarty, “US Immigration Policy.”

works harder to convince the media and the American population that immigration is critical to the competitiveness of the US economy, and to the ability of America to remain the world's leader in innovation, the public opinion would very likely change. The government should make more statistics about the benefits of immigration publicly accessible, the president should address the nation, and letters should be sent to the population. A combination of these informative techniques must be employed by the US government to effectively demonstrate that immigration represents economic gains for the US, making it beneficial to all Americans.

Low-skilled Immigrants

The US also needs a low-skilled immigration to satisfy its economic needs. Many companies rely on very cheap labor, and sometimes the American-born labor force does not satisfy the entire demand. The US needs a flexible labor force that responds quickly to economic trends. In times of economic growth, the US needs more cheap labor to produce more; especially during these times when the US faces a shortage in cheap labor supply. Therefore, legal low-skilled immigrants should help satisfy this demand. The United States, along with other developed countries, is producing many jobs in the service, retail, and leisure sectors that are not very attractive to native-born workers. These jobs represent a first step for unskilled immigrants on the economic ladder. The Bureau of Labor Statistics predicts that the majority of fastest-growing jobs over the next decade will be the ones that demand no education or little education, such as health, education, leisure, and hospitality services. Meanwhile, the pool of American-born workers has shrunk as many Americans now have higher education degrees. There has been debate over whether or not American-born individuals would accept these jobs

if they were paid more, with the consensus being “perhaps.”²³⁵ Efforts to restrict low-skilled immigrants and lure more educated American born people to do to unskilled tasks by raising wages for those jobs might be successful, but only at the cost of lowering the productivity and the overall size of the economy by allowing people to perform jobs far below their skill levels. There is in fact a long history in the US in which the influx of low-skilled immigrants has pushed the American-born population towards higher education; reversing this trend would push the country backward significantly.

Currently in the US, there is a very small quota for low-skilled immigrants. In practice, most of this demand is supplied with illegal immigrants. The US should also encourage low-skilled immigration in order to decrease illegal immigration. The advantage of illegal immigration for employers is that they do not need to pay taxes on the employees, and that the cost of labor is way cheaper. But, if the US promotes legal low-skilled immigrants with a labor cost that is also cheap, illegal immigration should decrease because companies will now rely on these legal low-skilled immigrants to respond to the lack of American-born cheap labor.

This is why the number of low-skilled immigrant visas should be readjusted regularly based on the needs of the economy, in an attempt to increase America’s competitiveness. There also should be a greater number of low-skilled immigrants permitted entry on work visas, with the option to seek for permanent residency.²³⁶ On the other hand, the temporary worker number should not be extended, as it has been proven that most temporary workers actually stay in the country, become illegal, have no jobs, and become excluded from the society. This phenomenon has been observed in

²³⁵ Bush and McLarty, “US Immigration Policy.”

²³⁶ Bush and McLarty, “US Immigration Policy.”

Europe, and has led to exclusion of immigrants, racism, and can be a cause of radicalism. The US should not extend the temporary working visa; temporary workers should only be for temporary jobs.

Refugees

The US has signed the 1951 convention of the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR), and therefore should accept all accompanying responsibilities tied to the convention. The US can either disagree with the definition of refugee as stated by this convention, or accept it. If the US refuses to accept the definition, this means that the US will not be member of the 1951 convention, and will therefore refuse to be part of the current international community in many ways. It is critical for the US to be an active member of the international community. The US should accept refugees as the convention mandates due to the moral values that the American nation is founded upon: the US, being the first power of the world, should not let people die in their countries by refusing to accept them into the US territory. This goes against US values of democracy, freedom, and freedom of movement. If the US does not accept refugees, this decision will have catastrophic consequences for the American image, and also for its status as global hegemon. It is inconceivable that the US could do the same today to refugees as it did on May 13, 1939, when the US turned away a Jewish refugee ship. More than 900 Jews fled Germany and boarded on the SS St Louis. They were hoping to reach Cuba and travel to the US, but the US government turned away the boat, and forced the Jewish refugees to go back to Europe, where more than 250 were exterminated in camps.²³⁷ The US should not be an indirect accomplice in genocide,

²³⁷Mike Lanchin, "SS St Louis: The ship of Jewish refugees nobody wanted," *BBC World*

mass murders, and massacres, nor should it be a passive actor and pretend these atrocities are not happening.²³⁸

Therefore, this report recommends that the US must accept refugees, after of course being subjected to screening. The US has one of the most effective and rigorous screening processes of world, and this system should not change. However, it should be the same for all refugees, because the US has no right to discriminate one nation over another one. In history, most of the refugees that left their countries to enter the United States were educated and became well integrated in society, therefore presenting no threats to our country. There is a current paranoia among the American population stemming from the thought that many refugees are terrorists or are Muslim radicals. Refugees are subject to the highest level of security checks of any category of visitor to the United States, and if there is any doubt about whether an applicant poses a security risk, they will not be admitted.²³⁹ The government should increase communication with the American people, and educate them about the reality that the screening process as a highly secure, effective, and meticulous screening system. If this is known by most of Americans, the population will become less skeptical about welcoming refugees.

Facilitating Integration

Over time, when American public opinion surrounding immigration may be more negative, it is important that the government reassures the American population that

Service, May 13, 2014.

²³⁸ Katharyne Mitchell, conversation with Audrey Peronnet, February 22, 2017.

²³⁹ Amy Pope, “Infographic: The Screening Process for Refugee Entry into the United States,” Obama Administration Archives, November 2, 2015.

immigrants do not represent a threat or a cost for the US, but rather are a benefit. We must remind the population that if immigrants are well integrated into American society, they will not be a threat to security. Therefore, it is in the interests of the United States to promote, facilitate, and encourage the integration of its immigrants into American society.

American Identity

There is not a real American identity, as most of the population of the US are of immigrant origin and come from different backgrounds. However, according to a study, Americans of all ethnic and racial groups express very high levels of patriotic attachment to their country.²⁴⁰ For immigrants, assimilation happens over time, and the level of attachment to the US increases as immigrants spend more time in the US and become culturally and socially integrated. The study shows that all ethnic groups primarily define a true American in terms of civic American creed, stressing the importance of treating people equally, working hard to get ahead, respecting American laws and institutions, and speaking English. Most of the American population thinks that all individuals should be united under one people and one nation i.e. 'E Pluribus Unum,' and that being American is sharing a set of values and a specific language, rather than a religion, skin color, or a race.

Most Americans, no matter their ethnicity, agree that the US should be a

²⁴⁰ Jack Critin and David O. Sears, *American Identity and the Politics of Multiculturalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

multicultural state, meaning that the government should not privilege one ethnic group over another, and instead promote difference, diversity, and among all, equality of all ethnic groups. Americans are in favor of what is called “soft multiculturalism” which is the acceptance of cultural pluralism and the value of ethnic minorities. The great majority in each ethnic group is willing to tolerate ethnic difference and supporting the right of ethnic and racial group to keep their own traditions. However, most of Americans disagree with what is called “hard multiculturalism,” indeed they prefer that the members of ethnic and racial minority think of themselves as individual Americans rather than members of a specific ethnic group, that the majority of immigrants should adapt better to the mainstream, and that racially based organizations may lead to dangerous levels of separatism. In that sense, the majority of Americans of all ethnicities agree that immigrants should integrate and acculturate rather than maintain separate racial and ethnic enclaves, but that Americans should accept cultural pluralism and tolerate differences. In other words, Americans agree that immigrants should keep their values, customs, traditions, and religion, but that they should also consider themselves as Americans before all.

Therefore, an ethnic balkanization of the US will not happen. The strong sense of national attachment among ethnic minorities should calm anxieties about America’s increasing diversity, and calm most of the skeptical sentiments Americans feel towards pro-immigration policies. Most Americans are in favor of the melting pot and cultural diversity given that immigrants respect American laws and values, and try their best to “melt” into American society.²⁴¹ Many Americans think that speaking English is a

²⁴¹ Critin and Sears, *American Identity*.

requirement for integration, and this feeling is shared with the majority of immigrants as well. Indeed, once immigrants speak English they can better understand the rule of law and their rights, as well as being more aware of the resources available to them to facilitate their integration.

Aiding the Process

Most new immigrants need help both with adapting to the United States and with integrating themselves into communities. Aid includes English instruction, civic education, social services, and community activities. The US Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services has set \$10 million for Immigration Integration Program, \$75 million for English literacy and civics education, and \$730 million for Language Acquisition State Grants, among other federal Programs.²⁴² These grants help local organizations develop in-person English classes and inform people about financial aid available for immigration integration.

Nevertheless, more money is needed in order to better integrate all immigrants. For instance, there are not enough English classes for all immigrants, long waiting lists, and high dropout rates. Furthermore, sometimes the quality of these classes is insufficient. US Census numbers show that 21.6 million adults in the US have limited English proficiency (including American-born people). For instance, in New York City alone it is estimated that there are 50,000 adult English classes available for roughly 1 million immigrants interested in learning English. A National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials survey in 2006 found that out of 176 courses, 57.4% had

²⁴² West, *Brain Gain*.

waiting list ranging from “few weeks to more than three years.”²⁴³ There is a huge gap between supply and demand, which creates problems in integrating and assimilating immigrants, leading to negative reactions from all. Many native residents are very skeptical when immigrants do not speak English, and immigrants are frustrated when they have to wait for months or years before being able to attend an English class.

The US government should provide more money for English classes for immigrants. By following our recommendations, if the US simplifies its visa application process and turns it into an all-electronic system, the money saved could be used for immigrant integrations. Also, by sanctioning companies that knowingly hire illegal immigrants with high penalties and fines, more money will be made available for English classes, at least until all companies comply with the law.

Streamlining Immigration Policy

The Visa Process

Many immigrants who wish to enter the US legally face numerous problems during their visa application, notably delays. Our task force recommends a reform of the visa application process to make it easier for people to enter the US legally. The legal system of entry is troubled by delays and uncompleted visa applications that lead many people who wish to enter the US legally to live in the US in a prolonged temporary status. This creates an uncertain situation for their families and for them.

The United States, as a major global power, should have the most efficient visa

²⁴³ Ibid.

application process, because these delays can drive some of the most talented people to other countries. Moreover, the US, being a democracy, should treat its potential immigrants as persons with human rights, and should therefore not tolerate the delays that put families into a painful and long separation. This is why the US should reform the immigration legal system to be more effective. More precisely, the US should enforce sensible and understandable visas, as well as immigration laws that welcome visitors, students, investors, and workers, therefore reflecting America's greatness and prosperity. The visa application process should be modernized. Right now, it is all paper based and requires repeated mailing of application and forms. It is time consuming as well as expensive. A better system would use digital technologies to allow electronic visa applications. The government should establish a high-level independent commission to undertake a precise examination of current US immigration laws and regulations, and to make recommendations for simplifying the system and create more transparent rules.

Moreover, this report also argues that more working visas should be allowed. High-skilled immigration should be the priority of US immigration, and therefore the United States should allow the international students who graduated from an American university to remain in the US after its graduation under a special visa, or an H1-b visa, to encourage these graduates to work in the US, innovate, and have brilliant ideas that may contribute to American prosperity. The US should also expand the number of EB-5 visas, which offer temporary visas to foreigners who invest at least \$500,000 in American locales officially designated as "distressed areas."²⁴⁴ If their investment leads to the creation of ten or more direct jobs, then they automatically obtain a green card. This is one of the most successful economic development initiatives in the federal

²⁴⁴ Bush and McLarty, *US Immigration Policy*.

government. Nevertheless, it does not receive a lot of media attention, and therefore the US should more greatly advertise this visa program, and extend it.

Disincentivizing Illegal Immigration

The US has many undocumented immigrants on its territory; it is estimated that 12 to 20 million illegal immigrants live here today. As a democracy, the US should not authorize illegal immigrants in its country, rather promoting legal immigration. Therefore, there should be strong immigration law enforcement. For instance, the prevention of illegal immigration should start by a greater protection of the US borders (see this report's section on homeland security, entitled "Liberty and Security: Striking a Balance"). The US should deny the entry of people who are not permitted, and also deny jobs to those who are not authorized to work here. Moreover, for the undocumented immigrants that succeed to enter the country illegally, there should also be greater employment law enforcement in order to deny employers ability to hire illegal immigrants. For example, we recommend that the US government should invest in a mandatory system for verifying those who are authorized to work in the US. This could take the shape of a biometric electronic verification system, or an e-verify system that would prevent undocumented immigrants from working for a US company. Under this system, prospective employers check an electronic database maintained by the US department of Homeland Security in cooperation with the Social Security Administration. This system compares the validity of social security numbers with existing databases and certifies whether someone has a legal employment status. If the system finds that a person does not have a legal employment status, then this person

will have two months to prove the opposite, or he or she will be fired.

Moreover, employers' sanctions for hiring illegal immigrants should also be strengthened. Under the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA), the first offence for an employer for knowingly hiring illegal immigrants is minimal administrative penalty. Only if there is a third offense is the employer subject to a misdemeanor criminal prosecution. The penalties must be higher. The first offense should be considered a misdemeanor. The second offense, or even the first offence if the employer has hired a significant number of undocumented immigrants, should be prosecuted as a felony. Given the greater visibility in immigrants' status via the e-verification system, and high penalties, most employers will comply with the law. It is known that many companies rely on undocumented cheap labor force for their competitiveness, however this should not be a valid excuse for employing illegal immigrants. By doing so, these companies are not paying taxes, and employing illegal immigrants with very low wages in a manner often close to slavery. This should not be allowed in the United States. Therefore, these companies should employ low-skilled workers, and low-skilled legal immigrants as well. If all companies are sanctioned while employing undocumented immigrants, the cost of labor will increase, benefitting the labor force; a labor force made of American citizens, and legal immigrants.

Nevertheless, there are about 12 million undocumented immigrants, posing the question, what should the US do with all these immigrants? Most of them are here to improve their living situation as well as their families'. Additionally, they have a strong sentiment as being American, or at least a strong desire to become one.²⁴⁵ The US

²⁴⁵ Critin and Sears, *American Identity*.

should legalize the status of these undocumented immigrants who have been in the United States for years. Most of them are already working (illegally) and therefore compete directly with the US citizens and legal immigrants for jobs. If the US legalizes their status, the competition will be more equitable, as the employers will have to pay them the same wage as citizens and legal immigrants receive. Legalizing their status would be beneficial for the United States and for its citizens.²⁴⁶ Moreover, once their status is legalized, immigrants feel more American and want to contribute further to American greatness, prosperity, and economy.

Conclusion

Immigration has long been crucial to America's success; it is the future of the United States if it wants to retain its position as economic and political leader of the world. The United States must generously welcome immigrants and refugees through an efficient system, enforce sensible and understandable visas, facilitate and promote the integration of immigrants into American society, effectively control its borders and immigration, and put a stop to illegal immigration and employment. To succeed, Congress should propose and pass a reform along the lines recommended in this report. Immigration policy should not only be discussed with the Domestic Policy Council in the White House, but also with the National Economic Council and the National Security Council. It is also very important that the government increase communication with the American people to let them know that immigration is beneficial to the country, and that the screening system for refugees is almost infallible. This will make Americans less skeptical about immigrants as well as refugees. How America handles its immigration

²⁴⁶ Bush and McLarty, *US Immigration Policy*.

policy is vital to its standing in the world, and if it fails to reform its immigration policy, there will be repercussions for many years to come.

Policy Recommendations

- Maintain a robust level of immigration, accepting both high- and low-skilled workers in order to respond to microeconomic fluctuations
- Authorize refugees to enter the US after sufficient screening, thereby making sure we accept our respective number of refugees agreed to by the UNHCR convention of 1951
- Facilitate the integration of immigrants into the US through a dedication of greater resources towards English and civics classes
- Establish a high-level independent commission to undertake a precise examination of current US immigration laws and regulations, and to make recommendations for simplifying and illuminating the Visa system
- Combat illegal immigration through an electronic verification system allowing employers to verify worker's legal status, and by increasing sanctions to employers that knowingly hire undocumented immigrants
- Raise public awareness of both the benefits of immigration for America and of the rigorous vetting standards already in place for all refugees and immigrants

Conclusion

The US is the primary economic and political power in the world, and it is important for the US to be stable during the 21st century if it is to retain its superpower status. This is why the US should be a safe place, where security as well as privacy rights are guaranteed to all American citizens and visitors. The power of the government should be limited so that it does not interfere with civil liberties. It is important for the US to promote American values globally in order to extend our influence and power all over the world, and maintain our position of global superpower. The US should share its culture and values worldwide to increase its influence and power in foreign countries.

By promoting American values such as democracy and respect for sovereignty, transparency, and education, the US will extend its influence throughout the world and will continue to attract highly educated people. Consequently, many people from all around the globe want to enter the US. Therefore, an effective and more humane immigration policy is needed. The US should encourage legal immigration of high-skilled and low-skilled immigrants in order to both respond to the economic situation and to make sure that the most talented people in the world immigrate to the US. By increasing its pool of talent, the US will remain the world leader in innovation. In sum, immigration is vital to the future of the United States, and a more effective immigration policy that modernizes the visa application system and ends illegal immigration will help the nation best satisfy its interests. The US should maintain a high level of immigrants and refugees, encourage rapid cultural integrations of immigrants, and reform the visa system.

Lastly, the coming globalized era, we must be more open to accepting ideas and people from all over the world, and we must protect these people, along with our own citizens, in a much more democratic manner.

Policy Recommendations

- Maintain a high level of immigration (both high-skilled and low-skilled immigration) to the US to ensure that the nation remains the world's primary economic power
- Provide periodic reports on how American values are protected and which crimes are prevented by the DHS's analysis of the data it has collected
- Promote cultural awareness through international exchange programs that invite highly skilled students to the US and allow American students to study abroad, allowing the spread of American values to foreigners both domestically and abroad
- Reform the immigration and border control policy of the US to make the system more efficient, cost effective, and humane

V. Stabilizing Regional Crises for a Future Global Order

Introduction

Three major areas of contention on the global stage today hold the potential to compromise the stability of the world, and therefore a timely and serious response is required immediately, halting further conflict or aggression, and brokering a longer-term solution that will enable US initiatives to succeed. In China and the South China Sea, the Middle East and North Africa, and Russia and Eastern Europe, delicate diplomatic relations and regional crises in these regions must be addressed for regional and global stability. We advocate these intentional and earnest US responses to these crisis zones in order to gradually construct a framework of an international system that accommodates the United States' aspirations for itself and for the world. Our ultimate goal is to develop stable and hopefully beneficial relationships with each of these countries or regions.

A. Maneuvering Towards a Peaceful and Prosperous Middle East

Unless the United States accelerates its efforts to support and broker peaceful solutions to longstanding regional conflicts between countries in the Middle East, increases aid in the region to better manage future crises, and fosters improved diplomatic relations with local powers, American involvement in the region will continue to reflect the heavy-handed and ineffective approach that the United States has exhibited in past decades. The United States began the 21st century by invading Afghanistan and Iraq. To the dismay of the Bush administration, these attempts to “plant the seeds of democracy” did not go as successfully as originally planned.²⁴⁷ To avoid the pitfalls of these failed nation-building projects, our goal is to create a system of support fostering strong civil institutions that can build up local populations through an emphasis on resource availability, education, healthcare, and other social services, ultimately promoting economic and political stability.

Future US Diplomatic Involvement with Regional Actors

As the demographics and power structures of various states in the Middle East continue to change, the United States would be wise to establish positive relations with states whose support would foster a more equal balance of power in the region, thus stabilizing the many diplomatic relationships on which the US relies. Therefore the United States should attempt to foster the following relations with major regional actors that will be specified in the section below; conversely, the United States could benefit

²⁴⁷ Bahram Maskanian, "Propagating Seeds of Democracy," Venus Project, February 15, 2004.

from distancing itself from certain regional relationships that will be addressed throughout the subsection.

Saudi Arabia

The United States should temper its longstanding policy unconditional support of Saudi Arabia, instead moving towards increased diplomatic and economic support to other states in the region (soon to be addressed). Saudi Arabia itself has been a major problem for the United States in terms of Islamic fundamentalism; much of the extremist ideology that the region has dealt with in recent years has been exported from Saudi Arabia through Wahhabism, which has fueled extremism and contributed to terrorism throughout the Islamic World.²⁴⁸ The United States currently provides Saudi Arabia immense monetary and military support, selling them over \$60 billion of arms in 2011 alone, all at the expense of stoking extremism in the region.²⁴⁹ In order to quell this rise in radicalism, the United States would be wise to distance itself from Saudi Arabia; limiting military arms deals to be a starting point, taking a pointed stand against a major state in the region that consistently has been found to finance fundamentalist groups.

The United States must be more judicious regarding our role of support in current religious proxy wars between Saudi Arabia and Iran, and it is best for regional stability

²⁴⁸ Scott Shane, "Saudis and Extremism: 'Both the Arsonists and the Firefighters'" *New York Times*, August 25, 2016.

²⁴⁹ Mohamad Bazzi, "Obama may be preaching 'tough love' to Saudi – but arms sales tell another story" *The Guardian*, April 22, 2016.

as well as the countering of extremism to not solely support one of these states as we traditionally have. As these proxy wars between major powers are waged in the region from Yemen, Syria, Lebanon, and Iraq, it is in our national interest to divvy support and resources out on a case-by-case basis, in a manner which the United States can be sure is not causing further humanitarian crises abroad. The United States must do what is best for our own security interests, and this means being on an equal footing with multiple allies in the Middle East, while making sure to respect foreign national sovereignty.

Iran

Having made great strides with the drafting and completion of the Iran Nuclear Deal Framework – which ensures that Iran will not have access or the means to produce a nuclear weapon for at least 15 years – the Obama administration’s manner of dealing with a traditional ideological adversary so as to insure the safety of all in the region is something that will need to be stressed in our overall grand strategy moving forward. The United States should continue to push for new methods to work with Iran (such as through other deals mimicking the successful methods of the nuclear agreement) in order to ensure that we have an equally beneficial relationship in the region and a strong actor that could increasingly be favorable towards the US and our mutual interests. The US should move forward on diplomatic missions guided by the example of the Iran Nuclear Deal Framework, where each side has granted concessions and compromises some strategic interests for the security concerns of both actors, as keeping a debate and dialogue with a rising power in the region ensures communication and a better chance

of cooperation. Future deals with Iran to ensure that they do not have the ability to obtain a nuclear weapon and cooperation in regional conflicts (Syria) and in other future beneficial agreements, in return for the lifting of sanctions and good will of the US, will be an important step in building trust with Iran and parity among the region's most powerful states.

Israel

The United States should increase economic support for Israel, through implementing mutually beneficial trade agreements as well as through supporting future desalination projects in the country (to be addressed below), while assuring concessions from the Israeli government to roll back plans for the building of future settlements in Palestinian territory (settlements that the UN and international community have deemed illegal). As Israel is, historically, a close ally of the United States, we can continue to benefit from its strategic location and partnership in the region, yet must respect international law and the sovereignty of Israel's neighbors. Therefore, eliciting Israel's agreement to cease settlement building in turn for the increased economic support from the United States would keep Israel-US relations solid while demonstrating to Palestine and its neighbors that we are aware of their concerns with past encroachments of their territory. Fully resolving this complex issue is beyond the scope of this document, but the basic framework outlined here would be an important step in ensuring a positive sum gain for both states involved, hopefully creating an atmosphere of trust that could one day lead to a two-state solution.

Turkey

Turkey is a key actor in ending the Syrian Civil War and the appalling refugee crisis (which has led to a surge of far-right populism in the West, putting US reputation and international relationships at risk), although its role is difficult to discern, due to the words and actions of the increasingly volatile government of President Erdogan. Still, Turkey remains one of the strongest states in the region militarily, vital to NATO interests in the region.²⁵⁰ Taking this into account the United States must approach Turkey in the coming decades with caution while keeping them as a strategic ally and increasing economic ties through mutually beneficial trade deals. US-Turkey trade remains modest compared to its potential, and a stronger economic relationship with Turkey would both entice them away from Russian influence as well as act as a launching pad for further cooperation in the region, such as with ramping up efforts on the fight against ISIL.²⁵¹

Nonmilitary Aid

Desalination Projects and Efforts

The many problems that are a direct result of the lack of water in the Middle East will only be worsening in the coming years due to climate change (and in many countries, overpopulation), as co-riparian states in the region will no doubt be fighting

²⁵⁰ Tracy Wilkinson and W.J. Hennigan, "Straddling East and West, Turkey is a critical U.S. ally in fight against Islamic State." *Los Angeles Times*, July 15, 2016.

²⁵¹ Helphinstine, Kurt, "The West Must Embrace Its Anatolian Ally or Russia Will," *Forbes*, November 1, 2016.

over rights and access to water resources for years to come.²⁵² This will inevitably lead to further conflict and set the conditions for religious extremism in the region to rise, directly affecting US strategic interests. Therefore, the US should support aid for increasing desalination efforts in this region where water is incredibly scarce, so as to prevent conflicts over riparian rights in the future. By providing aid and resources to Middle East actors for desalination projects to help lessen the burden of their increasingly scarce fresh water supplies, as well as providing educational support and resources in how to successfully implement these complicated desalination systems, the United States would be helping to mitigate the burden of a resource scarcity that will continue to hamper peace efforts between states and lessen the tensions that water scarcity will undoubtedly amplify in the coming decades.

Regional Resource Sharing Organizations

The United States should focus on supporting regional water (and other resource) sharing agreements in the Middle East, while providing support to facilitate current water sharing agreements such as the Nile Basin Initiative and other local water allocation agreements.²⁵³ Tensions over water rights between co-riparian states in the region will continue to be at the forefront of conflict in at least 3 regional river basins in the future. Conflicts between states on the basins of the Nile, Euphrates, and Jordan rivers will only worsen and prove more complicated to prevent in the future; therefore, the

²⁵² Kenneth D. Frederick, David C. Major, and Eugene Z. Stakhiv. *Climate Change and Water Resources Planning Criteria* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997).

²⁵³ Wondwosen Teshome, "Transboundary Water Cooperation in Africa: The Case of the Nile Basin Initiative." *Alternatives* 7, no. 4 (2008): 34-43.

United States must act now and provide as much logistical aid as we can to ensure fair and agreeable resource sharing agreements for the future safety of the region.²⁵⁴

The Jordan River Basin (Israel and Palestine)

One of the results of the Oslo II Accords was the creation of the Joint Water Committee (JWC), headed by the Israeli water authorities and the newly created Palestinian Water Authority (PWA), whose job was to jointly manage the fresh water projects and allocations within the Palestinian borders and increase cooperation from both sides on the pressing water issue.²⁵⁵ However, the motives and actions of the committee have come under harsh scrutiny from the side of the Palestinians, with some describing the entire system as simply “domination dressed up as cooperation.”²⁵⁶ The reason for this scrutiny is that although the structure appears to be based on equal representation of the two parties involved, Israel enjoys “de-facto” veto power of all project approvals.²⁵⁷ Additionally, because of the fact that Israeli settlers in the West Bank are supplied with more accessible means of attaining water than their Palestinian

²⁵⁴ Sandra L. Postel and Aaron T. Wolf, “Dehydrating Conflict,” *Foreign Policy*, September– October 2001, 60–62.

²⁵⁵ Mark Zeitoun, “The Conflict vs. Cooperation Paradox: Fighting Over or Sharing of Palestinian-Israeli Groundwater?” *Water International* 32, no. 1 (2007): 112.

Oslo Accords Fast Facts,” *CNN*, August 28, 2016.

Mark Zeitoun, Clemens Messerschmid, and Shaddad Attili, “Asymmetric Abstraction and Allocation: The Israeli-Palestinian Water Pumping Record,” *Ground Water* 47, no. 1 (2009): 152.

²⁵⁶ David J.H. Phillips et al., “The Jordan River Basin: 2. Potential Future Allocations to the Co-Riparians,” *Water International* 32, no. 1 (2007): 42.

²⁵⁷ Clemens Messerschmid, “What Price Cooperation? Hydro-Hegemony in Shared Israeli-Palestinian Groundwater Resources,” (Ph.D. diss., University of Göttingen, 2007) 12.

counterparts, projects are introduced to the JWC by the Palestinians at a 3:1 ratio.²⁵⁸ “Therefore the capacity for Israelis to obstruct desperately needed Palestinian water developments is much greater than vice versa.”²⁵⁹ This results in a constant situation of coercion towards the Palestinians to approve Israeli projects as well.²⁶⁰ The United States could play a major role in quelling these tensions through two separate channels. The United States should assist in restructuring the rules of the JWC in order to create a more fair and equitable system of water allocation. To get Israel to agree to this, the United States could invest and provide logistical assistance for adding new desalination plants in Israel. This deal would result in a mutually beneficial positive sum gain, as Israel would increase its overall water output while Palestine would gain more autonomy over its water allocation rights.

The Nile River Basin (Egypt and upper Nile states)

Tensions between Egypt and neighboring co-riparian states of the Nile have increased in recent decades, as upper Nile states such as Ethiopia have pursued new efforts to dam their section of the Nile and thus lessened Egypt’s autonomy over their total water allocation, negatively impacting their agricultural sector while also leading to droughts and uncertainty.²⁶¹ Egypt could mitigate this problem through an increase in its desalination industry, which is both expensive and logistically difficult to implement

²⁵⁸ Messerschmid, “What Price Cooperation?” 12.

²⁵⁹ Alice Gray, “Water Development in the Palestinian Territories Since the Oslo Interim Agreement in 1995,” *Water Policy* 11, no. 5 (2009): 530.

²⁶⁰ Messerschmid, “What Price Cooperation?” 12.

²⁶¹ Ayman F. Batisha, “Water Desalination Industry in Egypt” (paper presented at the Eleventh International Water Technology Conference, Sharm-el-Sheikh, Egypt, 2007).

without outside support. The possibilities for Egyptian desalination projects will largely depend on the rate of improvement in the technologies used for desalination and the cost of needed power.²⁶² Additional economic support from the United States for the production of large-scale desalination plants as well as technical support from American companies and businesses to help install and improve the technical capabilities of the Egyptian water sector would help to decrease Egypt's water deficit, as well as provide Egypt with an immense boost in its internal water independence.²⁶³ This would be mutually beneficial, as American businesses would profit from the assistance, and a previously suspicious Egyptian population would now look forward to American assistance and cooperation. Egypt is a powerful actor in the region, and is currently skeptical of American sincerity towards their political climate while being a key state in the fight against ISIL; therefore, the US should attempt to woo Egypt to closer ally-ship. Egypt has recently strayed from US support, and has looked for much of its funding in recent years from Saudi Arabia and other Sunni allies in the gulf.²⁶⁴ This use of non-military aid to help solve their freshwater crisis is a key opportunity for us to work through nonmilitary means in courting an important ally in the region.

²⁶² Alaa El-Sadek, "Water Desalination: An Imperative Measure for Water Security in Egypt." *Desalination* 250, no. 3 (2010): 876-84.

²⁶³ S. Luzi, "Driving Forces and Patterns of Water Policy Making in Egypt." *Water Policy* 12, no. 1 (2010): 92-113.

²⁶⁴ "SWRO Desalination Plant to be Built in Port Said, Egypt Using Kuwait Loan," *waterworld.com*, December 6, 2016.
<http://www.waterworld.com/articles/wwi/2016/12/swro-desalination-plant-to-be-built-in-port-said-egypt-using-kuwait-loan.html>

The Euphrates River Basin (Turkey and Syria)

The United States has limited leverage over Turkey in regards to its utilization of water, and as an upstream riparian state to Syria, Turkey's past construction on the Euphrates River headwaters have greatly diminished Syria's annual water allotment as the downstream neighbor, leading to tension among the two states.²⁶⁵ Current geopolitical relations make it unlikely that a diplomatic solution is a possibility in the short-term; therefore, the United States must provide alternatives to incentivize domestic change within Turkey to reduce its water usage. The dual-prong strategy of promoting alternative sources of energy to hydroelectric power and building sustainable water infrastructure can provide water stability for all the nations in the Euphrates Basin.²⁶⁶ Veering towards the side of neutrality, the US could also instead encourage co-riparian states to better communicate and negotiate under the guise of a Joint Technical Committee as a method to do so.

Fostering for Peaceful Solutions

The Syrian Civil War

In keeping with our commitment to uphold transparency and human rights, the United States must draw a line when basic human rights are being abused and when being presented with a vast humanitarian crisis that continues to ravage innocent lives, floods our allies in Europe with political refugees, and creates a hotbed for ISIL

²⁶⁵ Aysegul Kibaroglu, "Activities," Euphrates Tigris Initiative for Cooperation, July 7, 2015.

²⁶⁶ Lorenz and Erickson, *Strategic Water*.

development among disenfranchised youth. The case of the Syrian Civil war is an example in which the United States must forgo our “hardline” stance on Russia so that we can implement the most immediate and effective way to end the human cost to this crisis. As a show of good faith to our counterparts (and by acting from a sincere lack of practical options), the United States would be wise to work with the Russian government to ensure on both ends that civilian casualties from the war in Syria can come to an end, while addressing the political implications later on. This would mean that the US would have to make strong concessions and firm bilateral agreements with Russia and Turkey to be able to manage diverging national interests and to make sure that everyone is on board with these binding agreements. With this accomplishment, the basics of implementing safe zones in Syria could be met and would accelerate an end to the current humanitarian crisis.

Post-ISIL Middle East and North Africa (A ‘Marshall Plan’ for the Middle East?):

In a post-ISIL world, our grand strategy would be wise to heavily invest in what we hope to be a Middle East devoid of violent Islamic extremism, in a manner similar to the American investment made in Europe following its devastation in World War II (in the form of the Marshall Plan). While there are valid criticisms to such a large scale effort of US led funds (for example, we do not currently have as powerful a foothold in the Middle East as we had in Europe in the post-war climate), the Marshall Plan stands as one of the most successful foreign policy decisions made in the 20th century, and this alone could be mitigated by providing an increase of US military intelligence and training expertise to cooperating regional actors on the ground. By making a prudent

effort to address these shortcomings of the plan upfront while fully committing to the rebuilding of a free and modern Middle East society, the United States would guarantee its diplomatic goals in the region. This aid would be provided with the understanding that the United States' national interests would be protected through preventing terrorist hotbeds by improving these regional economies, and this large-scale project could not be implemented until there is full assurance that all parties are on board and willing to cooperate. Therefore, once these conditions of readiness and commitment are met, the United States should willingly provide aid for a 21st century approach to a "Marshall Plan" for the Middle East.

The Question of Kurdistan

There is currently robust support for the acknowledgment of an internationally recognized Iraqi Kurdish state, as they are a key force in the fight against ISIL and have relatively durable ties to the United States Military and USAID network. An internationally recognized autonomous Iraqi Kurdistan would create an additional ally in the Middle East that would be both strategically located and diplomatically strong with the United States.

Policy Recommendations

- Reduce and limit military arms deals with Saudi Arabia
- Seek further agreements and treaties with Iran that lessen US imposed sanctions in return for concessions on military activity in neighboring states (with the intention for future US-Iranian cooperation)
- Expand our economic relationship with Turkey through mutually beneficial trade deals, while pursuing closer diplomatic relations with Ankara in hopes of luring Turkey away from Moscow
- Increase non-military aid and provide logistical desalination support to co-riparian states on the Jordan River Basin, Nile River Basin, and Euphrates River Basin
- Coordinate with the Russian government in the Syrian conflict focusing on preventing civilian casualties and defeating ISIL
- With the support of all involved states, massively increase non-military aid to regional states and organizations to develop local and regional infrastructure and economies in a post-ISIL Middle East
- Advocate for an internationally recognized Iraqi Kurdistan

B. China and Its Neighbors: Regional Balancing and Economic Opportunity

Integral to the strategies recommended in this section is an understanding that intent and capability are the fundamental components of potential threats. Governed by the Communist Party, a population of over 1.3 billion, and the second largest GDP in the world, the People's Republic of China, with its economic might, expanding military posture, and soft colonial infiltration worldwide, is certainly capable. For perspective, while the formidable Soviet Union never reached half of the US GDP at its zenith, China's GDP today is equivalent to over 80% of that of the US. Nonetheless, China's economic might alone cannot be attributed as the sole grounds by which the United States could perceive China as a threat; comparably, Britain and France, despite their substantial nuclear stockpiles, offer little threat to the US because of the demonstrated benevolent *intent* of these European states toward the US. Therefore, China is a top policy and strategy concern because the nation has shown itself to be extremely hostile to the US and its allies.

Focusing on the Asia Pacific, where military hostilities might very well break out between China and the Asian states (and by extension their ally the United States) that feel threatened by China's aggression in the area. Despite obstacles in containing China and urging it to change its behavior, with firm and resolute American commitment, China can be contained and persuaded to follow a more accommodating and rational approach in international affairs.

Foreign policy as continuation of domestic politics by other means

Yet, Mearsheimer's offensive realism is not without flaws, as it regards power as an ends and not as a means, rendering the environment of international relations near helpless. In actuality, despite the aggressiveness which China has demonstrated in recent years, its conduct was mild and somewhat welcomed by the international community ten years ago, when President Hu proposed the idea of a harmonious world at UN and former deputy Secretary of State Robert Zoellick was confident in pushing China to play the role of responsible stakeholder in world order.²⁶⁷ The primary changes to this situation were domestic political concerns, including a split from within the Communist Party and a stagnating economy, which contributed to social instability. The rise of a hawkish faction, mostly from People's Liberation Army officers, has ideological roots: its Generals possess substantial confidence on China's military power and share the belief that China shall rise up against the world's hegemon, the United States. Nonetheless, their ideological construct could only transform into real actions by either explicit or implicit support from central leadership inside the Chinese Communist Party. For instance, the emerging military showdown in South China Sea combined with slogans that stir up nationalism both via state propaganda and Chinese social media at least partially aims to appeal to the domestic audience and to consolidate the power of current administration. Therefore, these factors in domestic politics must be considered, and the way domestic political situation evolves in China will have a profound impact on its foreign policy making, which in turn affects the world order.

²⁶⁷ Josh Rogin, "The End of the Concept of "Strategic Reassurance"?" *Foreign Policy*, November 6, 2009.

When it comes to criticizing reckless Chinese international behavior, most scholarly books, articles, and even official government documents fail to acknowledge a systematic understanding of who, precisely, is referenced when speaking of “China.” Those solely focused on foreign policy perspective generally assume a coherence of policy making inside Chinese government, operating under the assumption that whatever Chinese conduct is, it is formed by consensus reached within leadership. But this orthodox thinking contradicts complicated reality today. If we look through the pattern of Chinese behavior since the 2000s, we sense a clear fault line around 2011, when China broke away from its reasonable behavior within the existing international system and from that point forward began conducting international affairs in a provocative manner.

This pattern perfectly matches the leadership transition inside Communist Party, as Xi Jinping replaced his predecessor Hu Jintao, who was known for his moderate style and viewed as a rather peaceful figure. Xi’s approach contradicts that of his predecessors entirely, as he started anti-corruption campaign both within the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) and People’s Liberation Army (PLA) and proposed the idea of the “China Dream,” which pursues national rejuvenation of the Chinese people following over a century of humiliation from imperial powers. The purpose behind these campaigns is beyond superficial interpretation, as they both serve for Xi himself and the regime’s survival. The anti-corruption campaign was indeed a purge; starting from the highest level of leadership, it was designed to take out Xi’s political opponents, and the convictions of thousands of lower-level officials was to appeal to the masses. The China Dream campaign was a hot topic contributing to the publication of dozens of books and articles, not only creating a sense of an ideological movement, but more importantly,

stirring up nationalism among the Chinese public for a while. Cohesively, those measures partially ensured Xi's popularity among the Chinese people, and were intentionally put into place to divert public attention from rising problems such as economic stagnation, rising income equality, and other imminent social issues.

However, softening tone does not necessarily mean real benign intention from within; rather, China played this trick over a decade ago when President Jiang – who successfully managed the 1999 NATO bombing crisis, the EP-3 Incident, and assured America that China would not stand in its way in the 21st Century, wisely bringing China 10 years of rapid development without effective American interference – was in power. Even though Michael Pillsbury's concept on 100 years of Marathon for China to retake global hegemony is somehow exaggerated -as very few coherent policies could last for that huge span of time without switching paths- Deng Xiaoping's "hide your strength, bide your time" ideology is still alive today within the mindset of Chinese leadership, and indeed is revitalizing itself as Chinese leadership acknowledges from past failures that they are not ready to break away from this doctrine. Congressman Jim McDermott pointed out, echoing what Henry Kissinger, that as one of the oldest existing civilizations in the world, China has witnessed waves of hegemony rise and fall, and its ability to temporarily withstand the impact from outside forces while preserving itself for long term survival and triumph is well above our comprehension.²⁶⁸ Our efforts to check this giant must be persistent and cautious, and preemptive measures must be implemented in order to contain the rise of potentially hostile actions before they accumulate momentum.

²⁶⁸ Henry Kissinger, *On China* (New York: Penguin, 2011), 6-16.

The South China Sea

If the political vacuum from North Africa to the Middle East associated with violent Islamic fundamentalist resurgence is turning that vast region into a geopolitical hotspot in the contemporary world, the ascendance of China and its expansionary behavior are concurrently creating another place for ever increasing tension: the South China Sea, where various regional actors, including Brunei, China, Malaysia, Philippines, Taiwan and Vietnam, are directly involved with disputes and the entire international community is concerned because of the critical importance of this region. Even though the South China Sea has always been a place of contention, the level of disputes and number of incidents have risen to an unprecedented scale for past five years, especially among China, Vietnam and Philippines.²⁶⁹

To develop a strategy that effectively deals with the Chinese aggression in the South China Sea, we need to first understand the multifaceted rationale of China on this matter. The economic importance of this area is immense; as over half of the world's maritime trade passes through the South China Sea each year, it has become an area in which even distant states hold vested interests.²⁷⁰ The goods passing through the Strait of Malacca, including oil and gas, make the South China Sea even more important. The rise of any contingencies there would influence the whole economic world order upon which the US relies. Furthermore, aside from being one of the most essential trading

²⁶⁹ C.J. Jenner and Tran Truong Thuy, *The South China Sea, A Crucible of Regional Cooperation or Conflict Making Sovereignty Claims?* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016).

²⁷⁰ Thomas Hirst, "The World's Most Important Trade Route?" *World Economic Forum*, May 21, 2014.
<https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2014/05/world-most-important-trade-route/>

routes, the South China Sea also possesses tremendous resources yet to be extracted. The South China Sea's proven oil reserve holds above seven billion barrels and the natural gas scales over 900 trillion cubic feet; these stakes are so huge that even the most powerful country in the world cannot afford to ignore the issue.²⁷¹ Chinese energy companies have already been extracting natural resources in deep water around disputed areas since 2010, which has conflicted with other drilling parties. In actuality, contention in the South China Sea is not a newly emerging phenomenon, but rather has repeatedly occurred through history, such as during colonial control of the Strait of Malacca and other imperial actions involving resource competition in the region.²⁷² However, persistent confrontation in the region has transformed it into one of the most dangerous geopolitical rivalries between the United States and China: an existing hegemon within the world order it established pitted against a rising challenger holding the ambition to revise the current world order for itself and dominate the planet.

Our previous policies dealing with the situation in South China Sea were generally accommodating, emphasizing avoiding misperception and miscalculation from American side. However, the Chinese would only perceive these peaceful tones as American weakness and as a signal that they could advance their geopolitical interests to a further degree. In 2010, the official military doctrine of the People's Liberation Army expanded the PLA Navy's role to foreign intervention in times of crisis beyond the first and second island chain, labeled by the Pentagon as Anti-Access and Area Denial strategy. Correlating with this strategic shift, the PLA Navy went through a series of

²⁷¹ Jenner and Thuy, *The South China Sea*, 16-19.

²⁷² Jenner and Thuy, *The South China Sea*, 31-36.

modernization efforts, including enhancement of surface combatants, amphibious ships, submarines, and the development of aircraft carrier groups.²⁷³ More importantly, despite lagging behind the US Navy, the Chinese military goal at this stage is not purely about power projection, since it is not playing a role as guarantor of the stability within the existing system, the role that the United States holds and that the British Royal Navy once held. That different mindset guarantees the Chinese more places to maneuver, and more freedom to choose the strategy that best fits for dealing with the US. The Chinese approach in facing American Navy presence reflected focused on developing anti-ship ballistic missiles, IRBMs, and attack submarines, which all served to deter the American Navy and even military bases in nearby region such as Guam.

One of the cornerstones of America's leadership role is our ability to rapidly deploy military means to protect national interests, and the China is contesting this supremacy. For us to effectively counteract and contain hostile Chinese advances, we must take initiative. Our projection of forces along the first and second island chain must increase. Just recently, the Marine Corps' first F35 Joint Strike Fighter squadron was deployed successfully into a military base in Japan, with full operational capability implemented. The nuclear powered USS Carl Vinson Aircraft Carrier and its battle group were also en route to the Western Pacific, joining the USS Ronald Reagan, which is based in Japan. The considerable size of the US Naval presence correlated with the level of potential threat in the nearby region. In response, China's recent military drill around the Taiwan Strait involved its Aircraft Carrier Liaoning and J-15 fighters onboard.

²⁷³ Jenner and Thuy, *The South China Sea*, 223-228.

Our heavy naval presence in Atlantic Ocean and Persian Gulf region does not appropriately match the diminishing threats of those places. Instead, we have to shift our power to the Western Pacific, which the previous administration has already been doing. The force-rebalancing posture since 2012 deployed over a half of the US Nuclear Attack Submarines to the Western Pacific, and additional bomber and fighter squadrons were also put into place.²⁷⁴ We need to escalate these efforts without destabilizing the situation. Our deterrence power would enforce stability and order, since China has previously responded to force. Allying with other partners in the region is necessary, but our full commitment is also required, since we are the only nation powerful enough to check and balance Chinese aggression. Retreat or isolationism is not our option, because Chinese momentum is already in the place, and tension will not loosen if we retreat. Thus we need to hold firm in this matter.

Horizons for Sino-US relations

The 19th National Congress of the CCP will be held this year, and it will determine the next administration and its policy orientation. We should consider using diplomacy to cultivate relationships with those inside the CCP elite who are sympathetic toward the United States. Although such measures could not guarantee the lasting stability of the current world system, it does give us more response time to deal with long-term threats.

²⁷⁴ Jenner and Thuy, *The South China Sea*, 232-236.

Policy Recommendations

- Pursue diplomatic relations and establish ties with new leadership after the 19th National Congress of the CCP this year
- Maintain resolute naval presence in the South China Sea, drawing a red line that China must not cross
- Channel other naval military resources (that are under-utilized in the Atlantic and Persian Gulf) to the South China Sea
- Introduce "SEATO" treaty with an appetizing invitation for China and utilize economic boons and sanctions to elicit compliance

C. Russia: From Foreign Adversary to Friendly Competitor

Despite the chilly nature of current US-Russia relations (even to the point of meriting the label of a second Cold War II), it is in the best interest of both nations to restore a working relationship in order to pursue long-term mutual global interests.

The United States recognizes that, even though we pursue this visionary ideal, the tumultuous nature of Russian relations will be difficult to overcome. Russia's opportunistic attitude toward Eastern Europe and its involvement in Syria run counter to US interests in the region. Therefore, though we aim to achieve more positive relations with Russia, the United States should be ready with a plan of immediate responsive action in the instance of further aggression from Russia in the Baltic States. This involves US maintenance of NATO and, subsequently, the continued protection of all member states. We must also dedicate ourselves firmly and unequivocally to the obstruction of any further Russian aggression in Eastern Europe, communicating to Russia that the US will not tolerate a world in which borders are easily redrawn and territory is occupied by a foreign power who has not pursued diplomatic channels or shows no regard for international law or for the sovereignty of NATO members. Actions such as those that have already been committed by the Russian military in Ukraine, for instance, undermine the international order and create unnecessary geopolitical conflict in a region where stability has existed since the fall of the Soviet Union. The United States believes that both objectives—firm resistance to further Russian aggression and the pursuit of positive US-Russian economic relations— are not mutually exclusive.

Areas of Mutual Interest:

Nonproliferation

Bilateral Nuclear arms agreements have been a cornerstone of US-Russia policy. Continuing in this vein, prior to the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty's (START) expiration, the US must extend it or put in place a new nonproliferation treaty, to start significantly reducing both of our nuclear arsenals. In the name of global safety and security, the United States plans to modernize its current arsenal to reduce the likelihood of a nuclear accident due to our aging nuclear infrastructure. This is important not only for the United States but also Russia, as aging stores of nuclear material and outdated technology pose a serious threat to the world. As the world's two greatest nuclear powers, we have a responsibility to set an example and lead the world by making a concerted effort to mutually reduce our nuclear stockpiles. This is in the interests of both Russia and the United States. We are both far more likely to fall victim to a careless accident or oversight ending in catastrophe than we are to actually be a victim of a nuclear attack perpetrated by a state or non-state actor. By reducing the number of warheads in our stockpiles, we can help mitigate this risk. Our nuclear weapons are in dire need of modernization, the technology for firing them is outdated, many nuclear launch facilities are insecure, and the sheer number in our possession has led to numerous close calls over the course of our history due to an inability to manage the large number of warheads.²⁷⁵ We believe that the most effective way to reduce this threat is to reduce the size of both of our nuclear arsenals and modernize them to reduce

²⁷⁵ John Oliver, "Nuclear Weapons," *Last Week Tonight*, HBO, July 27, 2014.

the likelihood of a catastrophe. It remains the official policy of the United States to work with all the world's nuclear powers to ensure nuclear weapons are never used again, and that nations that comply with nuclear safeguards can continue peaceful nuclear energy programs.

Therefore, with this considered, the United States and Russia need to come back to the negotiation table and discuss the renewal of the New START agreements. The 2011 treaty stipulates the following limits on aggregate deployed weapons:

Aggregate limits:

- 700 deployed intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs), deployed submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs), and deployed heavy bombers equipped for nuclear armaments;
- 1,550 nuclear warheads on deployed ICBMs, deployed SLBMs, and deployed heavy bombers equipped for nuclear armaments (each such heavy bomber is counted as one warhead toward this limit);
- 800 deployed and non-deployed ICBM launchers, SLBM launchers, and heavy bombers equipped for nuclear armaments.

We should negotiate a further reduction in the total number of deployed nuclear weapons allowed in both of our arsenals to 75% of the limits listed above over a period of 10 years. At that point, the treaty shall be renegotiated and a continued effort toward eventual disarmament made. Such a bold and progressive action would send a strong signal to the international community that both Russia and the United States are committed to global safety and security in regards to nuclear weapons.

Counter Terrorism/Syria

In the counter terrorism battle, information is our greatest weapon. Since both the United States and Russia consider ISIL a serious terrorist threat, our intelligence communities should share any and all information gathered that could help our mutual causes in the fight against the Islamic State. By providing US intelligence on ISIL to

Assad and Russia's forces, we can help the people who have boots on the ground better target ISIL wherever they hide. The United States should also stop funding moderate rebel groups.

While the United States stands in stark opposition to the brutality of the Assad regime, we must come to terms with the de facto situation on the ground and pursue policy accordingly. Russia controls the skies, and it is likely at this point that the Assad government will remain in power and maintain control of Damascus.²⁷⁶ The US should specifically prioritize working with Russia toward the defeat of ISIL, which, while not an existential threat, must be extinguished (in part due to its capacity to inspire homegrown terrorism within the US). It is with this understanding of the crucial nature of the ISIL threat to the US, the region of the Middle East, and the world at large that the United States and Russia should work with Assad in Syria to eliminate ISIL. We then avoid the impractical idealism of clinging to too many objectives in the Syrian conflict, which would lead to few if any tangible achievements.²⁷⁷ Furthermore, working with Russia on the issue of counter-terrorism will open a channel of cooperation and be an excellent step towards positive relations.

Economic Prosperity

Due to the Russian economy's dependence on natural resources, it is susceptible to regular booms and busts. Since 2007, the Russian government has made a concerted

²⁷⁶ Alissa J. Rubin, "For Bashar al-Assad, Winning the Syrian War May Lead to New Troubles," *New York Times*, November 28, 2016.

²⁷⁷ Stephen Collinson and Jeremy Diamond, "Good, Bad and Ugly of Closer US-Russia Ties." *CNN*, December 14, 2016.

effort to expand its technology sector to give their economy more stability. While Russia has seen little improvements in this sector, it is possibly here that the United States could play a major role in Russia's economy. The United States has the leading technological economy in the world. If the United States were to lift the economic sanctions imposed on Russia, we could open their economy and create strong economic ties between our two nations.²⁷⁸ By reducing Russian dependence on natural resources and increasing their economic dependence on the technological sector, it is likely the United States will have a greater influence on Russia both politically and diplomatically. The more we integrate our economy with Russia's, the more we increase our bargaining power and incentivize Putin to play by the rules set forth in the international community. The more two countries integrate economically, the less likely they are to engage in military conflict.

On top of this, opening Russia's economy to American companies could create a much more positive cultural exchange. We should incentivize Russian students to study in the United States and vice-versa. Through large exchange programs, we could help bridge the ideological and cultural divides between the two countries. Consequently, if Russia were to see the benefit of a technology driven economy, they would institute tech-friendly economic policies to incentivize technology companies to invest in the Russian economy, resulting in a possible loosening of strict anti-LGBTQ+ policies the Russian government has supported as of late.²⁷⁹ Many American and European technology companies won't do business in a country that oppresses members of the LGBTQ+ community because LGBTQ+ people have a strong presence in the technology

²⁷⁸ "Russia vs United States Economy Stats Compared," NationMaster.com. December 18, 2013.

²⁷⁹ "Russia," *Human Rights Watch*. January 27, 2016..

community.²⁸⁰ Perhaps if Russia could see the economic advantage of changing their anti-LGBTQ+ policies, they will be more likely to pursue less oppressive policies like their imprisonment of homosexuals for their sexual orientation. While it's no guarantee, it's certainly worth attempting, and is possibly a more effective strategy to sanctions in regards to achieving this policy goal. Russia must see for themselves the benefits of positive human rights policies. Rather than attempting to impose American ideas of liberal society abroad, the US should instead foster an organic emergence of appreciation of the benefits of a freer, more tolerant society from within Russia through the aforementioned exchange programs.²⁸¹

Areas of Contention:

Ukraine and the Annexation of Crimea

The situation in Ukraine and the annexation of Crimea remains an issue on which the United States cannot concede another inch to Russia. The precedent that would be set by allowing Russia free reign in eastern Ukraine and Crimea is incredibly dangerous. The United States cannot allow a democratic nation to have its territory illegally occupied and borders redrawn for them. While Crimea may have overwhelmingly voted to annex themselves and become a part of Russia, that was a decision that should have been left up to the Ukrainian government to facilitate. In no way was it justified for Russia to annex Crimea and sow seeds of separatism into eastern Ukraine. It is also antithetical to the interests of NATO that Russia be allowed to occupy any Ukrainian

²⁸⁰ Rakesh Sharma, "The Gays And The Tech Industry: An Inclusive Yet Complicated Relationship." *Forbes*, July 1, 2014.

²⁸¹ Steven L. Hall, "Intelligence Sharing With Russia: A Practitioner's Perspective," Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, February 9, 2017.

territory. Actions such as these chill any warming relations with the west and are an obstacle to international stability, and are in violation of international law. In order for any of the aforementioned mutual interests to be achieved, the United States must be assured that it is working in tandem with Russia as a partner for peace, stability, and the maintenance of the current global order. Any further escalation of the conflict in this region or any further aggression by the Russian military will be met with a severe penalty by the international community. If Russia elects not to disengage and withdraw militarily from Eastern Ukraine, the international community will be forced to apply strict and suffocating economic sanctions on Russia. It must be made explicitly clear to Russia that borders of neighboring countries must be respected, and that democratic institutions have a right to self-determination. If Russia does not withdraw its forces from Ukraine the United States will be forced to drastically lower the price of its oil and natural gas exports, and the EU will drastically reduce its procurement of Russian Oil. While “Europe gets one third of its energy from Russia in total, (though some individual countries get considerably more) Europe draws 80% of Russia’s energy exports.”²⁸² This shows the leverage that Europe holds over Russia economically.

We calculate the risk of Russia responding to these sanctions with military force highly unlikely. By crippling the Russian economy Putin would be left with no choice but to leave Ukraine, thus lifting all sanctions against his country. The benefit would enormously outweigh the costs of losing politically, and Putin will not risk an all-out war against the US and NATO over the occupation of Ukraine and Crimea, especially with a coinciding supply shock to the economy. The United States needs to show Putin that we

²⁸² G. K. Kasparov and Mig Greengard, *Winter Is Coming: Why Vladimir Putin and the Enemies of the Free World Must Be Stopped* (New York: PublicAffairs, 2015), 14.

are willing to use meaningful action when pressed. Throughout the last presidential administration, Russia has had its way with the world. Putin will only respond if it truly hurts him. Giving “a dictator what he wants will never stop him from wanting more; it convinces him you aren’t strong enough to stop him from taking what he wants,”²⁸³ in other words, symbolic political gestures will have little influence on Putin. To defeat a bully, you have to stand up to them. We must match strength with strength, and be willing to use a bit of brinksmanship to get him to back down.

Once it is apparent that it will benefit Russia immensely to cease their aggressive behavior in the region, Putin will be willing to come to the negotiation table. We must stand firm against any further aggression, not officially acknowledging – and yet internally maintaining an awareness of – the new status quo of Crimea's annexation. In order for the US to welcome a partnership with Russia in Syria, Putin must also in turn withdraw all Russian troops from Ukraine and allow the free movement of any Crimean people who may seek refuge in Ukraine. This act of good faith by both the United States and Russia shall facilitate the pursuance of positive US–Russia relations and usher in a new beginning of cooperation. If Putin refuses to comply, the United States will be unable to change its policies in regards to economic sanctions and condemnation, and by maintaining robust deterrent capabilities in the Baltic States and in Eastern Europe.

Human Rights Abuses

Until Russia undergoes a change in leadership and no longer occupies Ukrainian territory, Russia should remain excluded from G7 membership. Under the Putin

²⁸³ Kasparov and Greengard, *Winter Is Coming*, 9.

administration, journalists have been killed, media and speech have been censored, anti-government assembly squashed, and violent atrocities have been committed against Russia's LGBTQ+ communities.²⁸⁴ While the United States may face scrutiny from the international community because of its vision toward a pursuance of more positive relations with Russia, we believe it to be in the best interests of the United States and its NATO allies, as well as in the best interests of the rest of the world. Moreover, while we hope to soon reach out a hand of friendship towards the Russians, we do so cautiously as we hold on ever tighter to the hand of NATO. The world is no longer a scale teetering on a bipolar balance, and the complexity of international relations puts Russia in a position with the United States in which we will someday stand more parallel in many areas than we stand juxtaposed.

NATO

There remains no alliance more essential to American security and global interests than NATO.²⁸⁵ In order to ensure the strength of NATO and guarantee its capability as a formidable alliance, all NATO members must contribute their promised 2% of GDP towards defense. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization will remain committed to “promoting democratic values and encouraging consultation and cooperation on defense and security issues to build trust and, in the long run, prevent conflict.”²⁸⁶ NATO is our unparalleled ally in regards to confronting Russia. The ability

²⁸⁴ "Russia," *Human Rights Watch*.

²⁸⁵ “Readout of the Vice President's Meeting with German Vice Chancellor and Minister of Foreign Affairs Sigmar Gabriel,” whitehouse.gov, February 2, 2017.

²⁸⁶ “What is NATO?” *NATO*.

<http://www.nato.int/nato-welcome/index.html>

to amass forces in Europe is an invaluable asset to curbing Russian aggression. We are and forever will be stronger as an internationally united defense. Most importantly, the United States must always affirm its unwavering commitment to NATO and its defense.

Conclusion

Both the United States and Russia stand to gain far more from cooperation than from contention. It shall be the policy of the United States to pursue a future of positive relations with Russia and to facilitate the integration of its economy with the rest of the world so that the nation becomes less of an adversary and more of a competitor. Through economic and cultural exchange, we can have a far greater influence on Russia politically than by solely imposing sanctions against them. We should show Russia that it is in their best interests to abide by the rules of the international system and that further aggression will not be tolerated. Having Russia as a potential ally opens diplomatic doors that can potentially greatly benefit US and international security.

If it so happens that Russia cannot meet the conditions required for the pursuance of positive relations, we maintain the necessity of negotiating the New START agreements. The United States reiterates its position towards eventual nuclear disarmament and hopes that our Russian counterparts will also reaffirm this bold mission. Finally, we hope that through the pursuance of more positive relations with Russia we can all live in a world that is both more peaceful and more prosperous for our great nations.

Policy Recommendations

- Provide military intelligence to Russia in regards to ISIL so that the Russians and Bashar al-Assad can eliminate ISIL quickly and entirely
- Along with our NATO allies, set a clear and official red line for Putin's Russia. If the Russian military crosses that physical boundary, not only will they confront NATO's defenses but Russia will also face severe and crippling political and economic sanctions.
- Reopen negotiations of the New START treaties and commit to the reduction and modernization of our nuclear arsenal.
- Maintain that we do not recognize Crimea as a part of Russia, even while simultaneously seeking cooperation with Russia on pressing global issues

Conclusion

Toward China, containment and accommodation shall be implemented simultaneously. We will maintain our military presence around the South China Sea and Western Pacific while reserving the place for diplomatic conciliation with the Chinese government and other regional players should they be willing to promote world stability. However, the long-term impact of China's rise is still difficult to assess, and we must focus upon examining this issue.

In regards to our approach towards the Middle East, we aim to respect the sovereignty of states abroad while at the same time pursuing our own national security interests. However, we also understand that the United States will no longer have a policy of nation building in a region where our help and presence is not wanted. The United States is more than willing to work with the Middle East and the international community, but primarily through aid and support to foreign states, as this supports US foreign and domestic interests. This allows their own governments to play a vital role in pursuing their best interests, which benefits our overall grand strategy.

Finally, in regards to Russia, our policy aim will be to pursue positive relations while remaining resolute in our defense of NATO and pledge to counteract any and all Russian aggression. Our aim is to integrate our two economies further with the hope that Russia will then become more politically malleable. Balancing policy toward a country that we want as our economic ally while they remain a political adversary will be difficult, but through cultural and economic exchange, non-proliferation treaties, and combating climate change, among other things, we believe that we can extend a hand of

friendship to Russia while furthering our economic and political objectives across the globe.

Policy Recommendations

- Implement both military and diplomatic sanctions to whatever extent necessary to check and balance Chinese aggression while cooperating with regional allies in Southeast Asia
- Design effective institutions and norms which enhance the stability in Southeast Asia
- Pursue more positive relations with Russia through economic, cultural, and diplomatic exchanges (as long as Putin ceases the expansion of Russia into Eastern Europe)
- Establish a clear and official red line for Putin's Russia at the Separatist Withdrawal Line. If Russia crosses that physical boundary, not only will Putin confront NATO's defenses, but the nation will also face severe and crippling political and economic sanctions
- Support Middle Eastern states willing to work with the US to rebuild diplomatic relations and fight terrorism
- Provide infrastructural and logistical support to Middle Eastern states willing to use American aid to rebuild their countries and boost their economies

VI. Conclusion

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, the world has been in a constant state of flux. Gone are the days where a unified ‘containment’ policy could structure US grand strategy. Today’s world is one of exponential evolution, where good policy lies not in keeping up with the pack but in defining the cutting edge of the global system. A single unified theory cannot be applied to the entire globe; a variety of policy initiatives are needed, tailored to each issue and region, united by an overarching vision.

Today, there is no Soviet Union, no single major threat to the free world that our foreign policy can rotate around. We face instead a variety of different threats, smaller in scope but no different in intensity. We face threats from “great powers” Russia and China, but we also face the ever-growing challenge posed by terrorist organizations. Non-state actors transcend national boundaries, making them that much more difficult to combat. Our traditional military arsenals are aging, and as the exponential growth of technology continues, the US must sustain its unparalleled capabilities. We thus emphasize the importance of not only adapting new technologies to prepare for 4th generation warfare, but adapting our old strategies as well.

A major battlefield of 4th generation warfare is cyberspace. The Panama Papers, Wikileaks, and the release of Democratic National Committee emails all have one major thing in common: the leaked information was obtained through hacking. Each of these events brought significant real-world consequences to the subjects targeted. The Panama Papers uncovered the corruption of hundreds of companies and politicians, including the Icelandic prime minister, in what some call the “biggest blow the offshore

world has ever taken.”²⁸⁷ Cyberwarfare threatens critical parts of infrastructure and power grid; a cyber-attack could in theory disable our satellites (blinding our defensive forces), cripple our electrical grid, or change pressures in pipelines, causing horrific explosions.

In the future, the world is going to be even more connected, which will be both a blessing and a curse. Increased connection will mean more ability to share information and more ways to interact with people from different cultures. However, companies, politicians, and governments who continue to be involved with this information superhighway, must be prepared for the accompanying risks. Insufficient online security makes us susceptible to new methods of hacking, and as more and more information stored is online or in “the Cloud,” hackers will have an easier time stealing personal information, shutting down websites, or taking control of private accounts. Greater defenses and preparation for cyber-attacks and hackings are essential if we are to thrive in this new normal.

Multipolarity is not simply a military issue; it is an economic one as well. China is currently one of the United States’ strongest economic competitors, with an economy that continues to expand at remarkable rates, while Russia remains an important economic player, particularly in the energy sector. Meanwhile, emerging markets have begun to come into their own: currently 11 countries in addition to Russia and China are considered to be powerful economies with which we must reckon.²⁸⁸ Trade reformation,

²⁸⁷ Richard Bilton, “Panama Papers: Mossack Fonseca Leak Reveals Elite’s Tax Havens,” *BBC News*, April 4, 2016.

²⁸⁸ Press Trust of India, “BRICS Is Passe, Time Now for ‘3G.’” *Business Standard*, February 23, 2011.

increased funding for research and development, and investment in non-carbon energies will let the US continue to play a major role in the global economic system.

The world is moving towards a new economic model, which will cause significant disruption in the US economy, not to mention in the lives of many Americans. Traditional blue-collar industries like coal-mining are slowly dying, and no matter how hard we try to hold on to them, they are not going to come back. This will continue to be a defining concern for nations of the developed world. Due to the increased profitability of outsourcing to countries with lower wages like Mexico and China, and advancements in Artificial Intelligence and automation, many industrial and manufacturing jobs are on the decline. The new American economy will be founded upon information technology, while international trade will be premised upon exporting ideas rather than physical products.

The world is facing another revolutionary period on par with the industrial revolution of the last time that the global economy was completely restructured. The growing technological boom is changing the face of many, if not all, industries. This “third industrial revolution” centers upon automation and the Internet, and has given rise to an economy in which people are at work more but paradoxically work less. Today’s 70-80 workweeks only make sense if the entirety of that time is being used. That is manifestly not the case; really, a fraction of that time is being used productively. This industrial-era time schedule is going to have to change in order for us to succeed. A perpetually exhausted population is not one that will remain competitive on a global scale. The idea of loyalty to a specific job is becoming a relic of the past. By reforming our economy and educational system now, we will prepare American citizens for a

changing economic future, thereby ensuring that we will retain our paramount economic position.

Of course, we also must consider the effect that our actions today will have on future generations. While we want what we perceive to be best for our children, our ideas of what a 'good' life consists of may not be applicable to them when they grow up. They are inheriting a world that may look completely different from the one in which they grew up, perhaps one in which they value information or technology over other material possessions. We have to be prepared for that. This is not necessarily a negative prognosis, however. The foreseeable future will likely witness dramatic decreases in global levels of poverty, world hunger, infant mortality, and more. Global quality of life will continue to improve, while our definitions of quality of life will evolve too.

Moving forward, it is absolutely necessary to communicate to the world a strong and clear message of both what the United States aspires to accomplish and how we intend to achieve it. It will be equally critical to explain to the American people what US foreign policy is, how it is being implemented, and why it is so important. It is, after all, their tax dollars and support that will undergird our grand strategy. Many of the topics covered above will affect Americans directly, such as our economic and domestic policies, which will likely engender interest amongst the citizenry. But we must also convey the critical impact of programs like foreign aid and support for international organizations, demonstrating to them the connections between these programs and their own lives.

We must work towards a more stable, secure, and prosperous world by encouraging international cooperation. We must strengthen supranational organizations and treaties, defend international norms respecting state sovereignty,

guard the United States from the many complex threats we face today, and cultivate liberal institutions. As the world grows closer through increasing globalization, the United States cannot lead without international cooperation, and the world will not prosper without American engagement.

VII. Appendix

Minority Perspective on the role of the UN in Human Rights

Presently, the UN's Human Rights Council still does not seem to work as an organization that promotes democratic values and even human rights. While it may be pragmatic to include countries from every region of the world on the Council, this requirement seems to guarantee the inclusion of countries that have a record of pronounced human rights violations. The current Human Rights Council is made up of human rights abusers and non-democratic states such as Egypt, Saudi Arabia, China, Venezuela, Cuba, the United Arab Emirates, and possibly the Philippines (depending on further investigation of President Rodrigo Duterte's treatment of criminals and drug users).²⁸⁹ This lends itself to the same credibility issue that led to the 2006 reformation of the Human Rights Commission into the Human Rights Council. Having countries that are ineffective in their own adherence to human rights dictating terms of human rights establishes a norm of human rights ineffectiveness within the UN. For example, the recent UN resolution on Israeli settlements in Palestinian territory "was sponsored by New Zealand, Malaysia, Senegal, and Venezuela," which are countries that include human rights abusers Malaysia and Venezuela.²⁹⁰

Furthermore, a continued lack of standards in membership in the UN detracts from the UN's efforts as a human rights upholder. How the UN conducts itself and the

²⁸⁹ "Current Membership of the Human Rights Council," United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner, accessed February 2, 2017.

<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/HRC/Pages/CurrentMembers.aspx>

²⁹⁰ CBS/AP, "UN Security Council votes 14-0 to condemn Israeli settlement construction," *CBS News*, December 23, 2016.

standards of its membership appear to need revision. A redrafting of the UN Human Rights Charter to better vet those who wish to be on the Human Rights Council, for example, will help lend more legitimacy to the organization.

Bibliography

- “5.6 Million Fingerprints Stolen in the Biggest Cyber Attack in US History.” *The Independent*, September 24, 2015.
<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/opm-says-56-million-fingerprints-stolen-in-biggest-cyber-attack-in-us-history-10515256.html>.
- “123 Agreements for Peaceful Cooperation.” *National Nuclear Security Administration*, March 28, 2010.
<https://nnsa.energy.gov/aboutus/ourprograms/nonproliferation/treatiesagreements/123agreementsforpeacefulcooperation>.
- “2014 Demographics: Profile of the Military Community.” US Department of Defense, 2014.
- “2016 Annual Report to Congress | U.S.-CHINA.” Accessed February 20, 2017.
https://www.uscc.gov/Annual_Reports/2016-annual-report-congress.
- “About.” Accessed February 20, 2017. <https://www.peacecorps.gov/about/>.
- “About Fulbright | Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs.” Accessed February 20, 2017.
<https://eca.state.gov/fulbright/about-fulbright>.
- Abraham Lincoln. *Gettysburg Address*. [Washington]: USGovtPrintOff, 1950.
- “Advanced Reactor Technologies | Department of Energy.” Accessed February 20, 2017.
<https://www.energy.gov/ne/nuclear-reactor-technologies/advanced-reactor-technologies>.
- “Advantages and Challenges of Wind Energy | Department of Energy.” Accessed February 20, 2017. <https://energy.gov/eere/wind/advantages-and-challenges-wind-energy>.
- Akamai. “Akamai’s [State of the Internet] Q3 2016 Report.” *Akamai* 9, no. 3 (n.d.).
- Alden, Edward, and Rebecca Strauss. *How America Stacks Up*. New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press, 2016. <http://www.cfr.org/competitiveness/america-stacks-up/p37438>.
- Allison, Graham. “Is Iran Still Israel’s Top Threat?” *The Atlantic*, March 8, 2016.
<https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2016/03/iran-nuclear-deal-israel/472767/>.
- “American Exceptionalism, American Decline: Research, the Knowledge Economy, and the 21st Century Challenge.” Task Force on American Innovation, December 2012.
- Anderson, Scott. “Fractured Lands: How the Arab World Came Apart.” *The New York Times*, August 10, 2016. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/08/11/magazine/isis-middle-east-arab-spring-fractured-lands.html>.
- Anderson, Stuart. “3 Reasons Why Immigrants Are Key To Economic Growth.” *Forbes*. Accessed February 20, 2017.
<http://www.forbes.com/sites/stuartanderson/2016/10/02/3-reasons-why-immigrants-key-to-economic-growth/>.
- . “Immigrants and Billion Dollar Startups.” National Foundation for American Policy, March 2016.
- Anonymous. “Paris Agreement.” Text. *Climate Action - European Commission*, November 23, 2016. https://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/international/negotiations/paris_en.
- “AR4 SYR Synthesis Report Annex II.” Accessed February 26, 2017.
https://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/ar4/syr/en/annexessannex-ii.html.

- “Assessing America’s Ability to Provide for the Common Defense.” *2017 Index of U.S. Military Strength*. Accessed February 20, 2017.
<http://index.heritage.org/military/2017/>.
- Barnum, Miriam, and Bryan L. Fearey. “Sanctions as a Nonproliferation Tool: Lessons from Libya.” *Comparative Strategy* 35, no. 4 (August 7, 2016): 234–45.
 doi:10.1080/01495933.2016.1222830.
- Barrett, Brian. “Hack Brief: Hacker Leaks the Info of Thousands of FBI and DHS Employees.” *WIRED*. Accessed February 20, 2017.
<https://www.wired.com/2016/02/hack-brief-fbi-and-dhs-are-targets-in-employee-info-hack/>.
- Batisha, Ayman. “Water Desalination Industry in Egypt.” Sharm-el-Sheikh, Egypt: IWTC, 2007.
- Benhabib, Seyla. “The Morality of Migration.” *Opinionator*, 1343595633.
<https://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/07/29/stone-immigration/>.
- Bennet, James. “We Need an Energy Miracle.” *The Atlantic*, November 2015.
<https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2015/11/we-need-an-energy-miracle/407881/>.
- Bilton, Richard. “Panama Papers: Mossack Fonseca Leak Reveals Elite’s Tax Havens.” *BBC News*, April 4, 2016, sec. World. <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-35918844>.
- Blumenfeld, F. Yorick. “American Propaganda in Foreign Countries.” *Editorial Research Reports* 1961 I (1961): 301–319.
- Bohanon, Cecil E., and T. Norman Van Cott. “Tariffs, Immigration, and Economic Insulation: A New View of the U.S. Post–Civil War Era.” *The Independent Review* 9, no. 4 (2005): 529–542.
- Boutton, Andrew, and David B. Carter. “Fair-Weather Allies? Terrorism and the Allocation of US Foreign Aid.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 58, no. 7 (October 1, 2014): 1144–73.
 doi:10.1177/0022002713492649.
- “BP Energy Outlook | Energy Economics | BP Global.” *Bp.com*. Accessed February 20, 2017.
<http://www.bp.com/en/global/corporate/energy-economics/energy-outlook.html>.
- Brauch, H.G., ed. *Facing Global Environmental Change - Environmental, Human, Energy, Food, Health and Water Security Concepts*. Springer, 2009.
<http://www.springer.com/us/book/9783540684879>.
- Braun III, William G., and David Lai, eds. “U.S.-China Competition: Asia-Pacific Land Force Implications.” US Army War College Strategic Studies Institute, November 2016.
- Bremmer, Ian. *The End of the Free Market: Who Wins the War between States and Corporations?* New York: Portfolio, 2010.
- Brock, Gillian. *Debating Brain Drain: May Governments Restrict Emigration?* Debating Ethics. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Brynjolfsson, Erik. *The Second Machine Age: Work, Progrss, and Prosperity in a Time of Brilliant Technologies*. 1st ed. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2014.
- “Budget | U.S. Agency for International Development.” Accessed February 20, 2017.
<https://www.usaid.gov/results-and-data/budget-spending>.
- Bureau, US Census. “Educational Attainment in the United States: 2015.” Accessed February 27, 2017. <https://www.census.gov/library/publications/2016/demo/p20-578.html>.
- Burke, Marshall, Solomon M. Hsiang, and Edward Miguel. “Global Non-Linear Effect of Temperature on Economic Production.” *Nature* 527, no. 7577 (November 12, 2015): 235–39. doi:10.1038/nature15725.

- Burke, Ryan, and Sue McNeil. "Investigating the Benefits and Drawbacks of Realigning the National Guard Under the Department of Homeland Security." US Army War College Strategic Studies Institute, August 2016.
- Burst, James M., Joel N. Duenow, David S. Albin, Eric Colegrove, Matthew O. Reese, Jeffery A. Aguiar, Chun Sheng Jiang, et al. "CdTe Solar Cells with Open-Circuit Voltage Breaking the 1"oV Barrier." *Nature Energy* 1, no. 3 (2016). doi:10.1038/nenergy.2016.15.
- "Can You Keep a Secret?" *The Economist*. Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.economist.com/news/business/21573580-patent-idea-you-must-publish-it-many-firms-prefer-secrecy-can-you-keep-secret>.
- CBS/AP. "UN Security Council Votes 14-0 to Condemn Israeli Settlement Construction." *CBS News*, December 23, 2016. <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/u-n-security-council-votes-14-0-to-condemn-israeli-settlement-construction/>.
- Center. "Signature Report 8: Completing College: A National View of Student Attainment Rates – Fall 2008 Cohort." *National Student Clearinghouse Research Center*, November 17, 2014. <https://nscresearchcenter.org/signaturereport8/>.
- "Center for Economic and Policy Research." Accessed February 26, 2017. <http://cepr.net/>.
- Chemnick, Jean. "U.S. and China Formally Commit to Paris Climate Accord." *Scientific American*. Accessed February 20, 2017. <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/u-s-and-china-formally-commit-to-paris-climate-accord/>.
- Chen, Han. "The Road From Paris: India's Progress Toward Its Climate Pledge." National Defense Resource Council, November 2016.
- "China vs. U.S. Patent Trends. How Do the Giants Stack Up?" *Technology & Patent Research*, April 28, 2016. <http://www.tprinternational.com/china-vs-us-patent-trends-giants-stack/>.
- "China's Contribution to the Paris Climate Agreement | Center for Climate and Energy Solutions." Accessed February 20, 2017. <https://www.c2es.org/publications/chinas-contribution-paris-climate-agreement>.
- Christy, Donald P. "United States Policy on Weapons in Space." US Army War College, March 15, 2006.
- Cieply, Michael. "Hollywood Works to Maintain Its World Dominance." *The New York Times*, November 3, 2014. <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/04/business/media/hollywood-works-to-maintain-its-world-dominance.html>.
- Cimbala, Stephen J. "The Asian Attraction: Pivotal Priorities and Nuclear Dangers in U.S. Security Policy." *Comparative Strategy* 33, no. 2 (2014): 177–188. doi:10.1080/01495933.2014.897140.
- Citrin, Jack. *American Identity and the Politics of Multiculturalism*. Cambridge Studies in Public Opinion and Political Psychology. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Clemens, Michael A. "Economics and Emigration: Trillion-Dollar Bills on the Sidewalk?" *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 25, no. 3 (September 2011): 83–106. doi:10.1257/jep.25.3.83.
- CNN. "Oslo Accords Fast Facts - CNN.com." *CNN*. Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.cnn.com/2013/09/03/world/meast/oslo-accords-fast-facts/index.html>.
- CNN, Stephen Collinson and Jeremy Diamond. "Good, Bad and Ugly of Closer US-Russia Ties." *CNN*. Accessed February 20, 2017.

- <http://www.cnn.com/2016/12/14/politics/russia-us-trump-reset-pros-cons/index.html>.
- “CO2 Emissions (Metric Tons per Capita) | Data.” Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/EN.ATM.CO2E.PC>.
- “Common but Differentiated Responsibilities and Respective Capabilities (CBDR-RC).” *Climate Nexus*, July 30, 2015. <http://climatenexus.org/about-us/negotiation-issues/common-differentiated-responsibilities-and-respective-capabilities-cbdr>.
- “Comprehensive Plans to Address the National Debt.” Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.pgpf.org/finding-solutions/comprehensive-plans>.
- “Congress Passes the Cybersecurity Act of 2015.” *The National Law Review*. Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.natlawreview.com/article/congress-passes-cybersecurity-act-2015>.
- Copel, Baden, Josh Keller, and Bill Marsh. “What Could Disappear.” Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2012/11/24/opinion/sunday/what-could-disappear.html>.
- Council on Foreign Relations. Independent Task Force on U. S. Immigration Policy. *U.S. Immigration Policy*. Independent Task Force Report ; No. 63. New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 2009.
- Craig, Malcolm M. “‘Nuclear Sword of the Moslem World’?: The United States, Britain, Pakistan, and the ‘Islamic Bomb’, 1977–80.” *The International History Review* 38, no. 5 (October 19, 2016): 857–79. doi:10.1080/07075332.2016.1140670.
- Curiel, Katharine. “Education Abroad as a Catalyst for Impactful Global Development: The Global Impact of the Missing Focus on the Re-Entry Phase.” ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 2016. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1797593495/>.
- “Current Membership of the Human Rights Council by Regional Groups.” *United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner*. Accessed February 21, 2017. <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/HRC/Pages/MembersByGroup.aspx>.
- Curry, Robert L. “A Review of Contemporary U.S. Foreign Aid Policies.” *Journal of Economic Issues* 24, no. 3 (1990): 813–824. doi:10.1080/00213624.1990.11505072.
- “Cyberspace: Malevolent Actors, Criminal Opportunities, and Strategic Competition.” Accessed February 20, 2017. <https://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/display.cfm?pubID=1319>.
- Datta, Monti Narayan. “The Decline of America’s Soft Power in the United Nations 1.” *International Studies Perspectives* 10, no. 3 (2009): 265–284. doi:10.1111/j.1528-3585.2009.00376.x.
- “Dehydrating Conflict.” *Foreign Policy*. Accessed February 20, 2017. <https://foreignpolicy.com/2009/11/18/dehydrating-conflict/>.
- “Delivery of Navy’s Most Expensive Aircraft Carrier Delayed Again.” Text. *The Virginian-Pilot*. Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.military.com/daily-news/2016/10/07/delivery-navys-most-expensive-aircraft-carrier-delayed-again.html>.
- Difilippo, Anthony. “Steady State: The North Korean Nuclear Issue from Bush to Obama.” *Asian Affairs: An American Review* 41, no. 2 (2014): 56–82. doi:10.1080/00927678.2014.910423.
- “DMDC Web - HOME.” Accessed February 26, 2017. <https://www.dmdc.osd.mil/appj/dwp/index.jsp>.
- Dobbs, Richard. *No Ordinary Disruption: The Four Global Forces Breaking All the Trends*. First edition. New York, NY: PublicAffairs, 2015.

- “Document: China’s Military Strategy.” *USNI News*, May 26, 2015.
<https://news.usni.org/2015/05/26/document-chinas-military-strategy>.
- Dodds, Klaus, and Mark Nuttall. *The Scramble for the Poles: The Geopolitics of the Arctic and Antarctic*. Cambridge, UK ; Malden, MA: Polity Press, 2016.
- “Donald Trump’s 1950s Self-Help Foreign Policy.” *Foreign Policy*. Accessed February 26, 2017. <https://foreignpolicy.com/2017/02/10/donald-trumps-1950s-self-help-foreign-policy/>.
- Early, Gerald, Jeffrey B. Ferguson, Korina Jocson, and David A. Hillinger. “Race in the Age of Obama.” *American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 64, no. 4 (Summer 2011).
- “EDGAR - GHG (CO₂, CH₄, N₂O, F-Gases) Emission Time Series 1990-2012 per Region/Country - European Commission.” Accessed February 20, 2017.
<http://edgar.jrc.ec.europa.eu/overview.php?v=CO2ts1990-2014&sort=des9>.
- Eichengreen, Barry, and Ngaire Woods. “The IMF’s Unmet Challenges.” *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 30, no. 1 (2016): 29–52. doi:10.1257/jep.30.1.29.
- Elhefnawy, Nader. “Four Myths About Space Power.” *Parameters* 23, no. 1 (Spring 2003).
- El-Sadek, Alaa. “Water Desalination: An Imperative Measure for Water Security in Egypt.” *Desalination* 250, no. 3 (2010): 876–884. doi:10.1016/j.desal.2009.09.143.
- “Energy Production and Imports - Statistics Explained.” Accessed February 20, 2017.
http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Energy_production_and_imports.
- “Environmental Impacts of Natural Gas.” *Union of Concerned Scientists*. Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.ucsusa.org/clean-energy/coal-and-other-fossil-fuels/environmental-impacts-of-natural-gas>.
- Estes, Adam Clark. “FCC Just Overruled State Laws That Were Blocking Municipal Broadband.” *Gizmodo*. Accessed February 27, 2017. <http://gizmodo.com/fcc-just-overruled-the-state-laws-that-blocked-municipa-1688200941>.
- . “Why America’s Internet Is So Shitty and Slow.” *Gizmodo*, March 10, 2015.
<http://gizmodo.com/why-americas-internet-is-so-shitty-and-slow-1686173744>.
- Facing Global Environmental Change - Environmental*, | Hans Günter Brauch | Springer. Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.springer.com/us/book/9783540684879>.
- “FACT SHEET: Cybersecurity National Action Plan.” *Whitehouse.gov*, February 9, 2016.
<https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2016/02/09/fact-sheet-cybersecurity-national-action-plan>.
- Fallows, James. “The Tragedy of the American Military.” *The Atlantic*, February 2015.
<https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2015/01/the-tragedy-of-the-american-military/383516/>.
- “Fast Facts.” Accessed February 20, 2017. <https://www.peacecorps.gov/news/fast-facts/>.
- Fearon, James D., and David D. Laitin. “Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War.” *American Political Science Review* 97, no. 1 (2003): 75–90. doi:10.1017/S0003055403000534.
- Fiegerman, Seth. “Alibaba’s Jack Ma Met with Trump to Talk Jobs.” *CNNMoney*, January 9, 2017. <http://money.cnn.com/2017/01/09/technology/trump-alibaba-jack-ma/index.html>.
- “Fixing China Inc.” *The Economist*, August 30, 2014.
<http://www.economist.com/news/china/21614240-reform-state-companies-back-agenda-fixing-china-inc>.

- Flowers, Arija. "National Security in the 21st Century: How the National Security Council Can Solve the President's Climate Change problem.(Climate Law Reporter)." *Sustainable Development Law & Policy* 11, no. 2 (2011): 50.
- "Foreign Direct Investment Flows Into SC." *Business Climate*, January 27, 2015. <http://www.businessclimate.com/south-carolina-foreign-direct-investment-flows-state/>.
- "Fossil Fuels Losing Cost Advantage Over Solar, Wind, IEA Says." *Bloomberg.com*, August 31, 2015. <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-08-31/solar-wind-power-costs-drop-as-fossil-fuels-increase-iea-says>.
- Foster, Peter, and Matthew Holehouse. "Merkel 'Expects Cameron to Back EU Army' in Exchange for Renegotiation," September 12, 2015, sec. World. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/eu/11861247/Merkel-expects-Cameron-to-back-EU-army-in-exchange-for-renegotiation.html>.
- Frist, Bill. "Bill Frist: The Case for Keeping America's AIDS Relief Plan." *The New York Times*, February 9, 2017. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/09/opinion/bill-frist-the-case-for-keeping-americas-aids-relief-plan.html>.
- Funk, Cary, and Lee Rainie. "Public and Scientists' Views on Science and Society." *Pew Research Center: Internet, Science & Tech*, January 29, 2015. <http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/01/29/public-and-scientists-views-on-science-and-society/>.
- Gambler, Rebecca. "Border Security: DHS Surveillance Technology Unmanned Aerial Systems, Other Assets." Washington, D.C.: Government Accountability Office, May 24, 2016.
- Gardner, Cory, and Chris Coons. "Senators: U.S. Cybersecurity Is Too Weak." *Time*. Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://time.com/4636236/senators-cybersecurity-russia/>.
- Garlick, Jeremy. "Michael Pillsbury. The Hundred-Year Marathon: China's Secret Strategy to Replace America as the Global Superpower." *Asian Affairs* 46, no. 3 (2015): 543–544. doi:10.1080/03068374.2015.1082318.
- "GDP Ranking | Data." Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/GDP-ranking-table>.
- "Generation IV Nuclear Reactors: WNA - World Nuclear Association." Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.world-nuclear.org/information-library/nuclear-fuel-cycle/nuclear-power-reactors/generation-iv-nuclear-reactors.aspx>.
- Ghose, Arundhati, and Manpreet Sethi. "Can Pakistan's Nuclear Dangers Be 'Normalised'?" *Survival* 57, no. 1 (2015): 117–132. doi:10.1080/00396338.2015.1008305.
- Giles, Keir. "Prospects for the Rule of Law in Cyberspace." US Army War College Strategic Studies Institute, January 2017.
- "Global Climate Change Indicators: Introduction | Monitoring References | National Centers for Environmental Information (NCEI)." Accessed February 20, 2017. <https://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/monitoring-references/faq/indicators.php>.
- Goodman, Peter S. "In Era of Trump, China's President Champions Economic Globalization." *The New York Times*, January 17, 2017. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/17/business/dealbook/world-economic-forum-davos-china-xi-globalization.html>.
- Graham, Thomas E. "RUSSIA IS INDISPENSABLE TO OUR INTERESTS." *Perspectives on Peace and Security*, June 5, 2015. <http://perspectives.carnegie.org/us-russia/russia-indispensable-interests/>.

- Gray, Alice. "Water Development in the Palestinian Territories since the Oslo Interim Agreement in 1995." *Water Policy* 11, no. 5 (2009): 525–536. doi:10.2166/wp.2009.066.
- Hall, Steven L. "Intelligence Sharing With Russia: A Practitioner's Perspective." *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, February 9, 2017. <http://carnegieendowment.org/2017/02/09/intelligence-sharing-with-russia-practitioner-s-perspective-pub-67962>.
- Hart Research Associates. "One Year Out: Findings From a National Survey Among Members of the High School Graduating Class of 2010 to the College Board." College Board, August 18, 2011.
- Helphinstine, Kurt. "The West Must Embrace Its Anatolian Ally Or Russia Will." *Forbes*, November 1, 2016. <http://www.forbes.com/sites/realspin/2016/11/01/the-west-must-embrace-its-anatolian-ally-or-russia-will/>.
- Hille, Karl. "2016 Climate Trends Continue to Break Records." Text. NASA, July 19, 2016. <http://www.nasa.gov/feature/goddard/2016/climate-trends-continue-to-break-records>.
- Hirst, Thomas. "The World's Most Important Trade Route?" *World Economic Forum*. Accessed February 20, 2017. <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2014/05/world-most-important-trade-route/>.
- "Historic Timeline | National Counterterrorism Center." Accessed February 20, 2017. <https://www.nctc.gov/site/timeline.html>.
- "History and Future of Funding for Scientific Research | Research." Accessed February 26, 2017. <http://www.bu.edu/research/articles/funding-for-scientific-research/>.
- Hourihan, Matt Hourihan American Association for the Advancement of Science David Parkes American Association for the Advancement of, and David Parkes. "Federal R&D in the FY 2016 Budget: An Overview." *AAAS - The World's Largest General Scientific Society*, February 24, 2015. <https://www.aaas.org/fy16budget/federal-rd-fy-2016-budget-overview>.
- "How America Stacks Up." *Council on Foreign Relations*. Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.cfr.org/competitiveness/america-stacks-up/p37438>.
- "How Much Petroleum Does the United States Import and Export? - FAQ - U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA)." Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.eia.gov/tools/faqs/faq.cfm?id=727&t=6>.
- Hughes, Karen. "'Waging Peace': A New Paradigm for Public Diplomacy." *Mediterranean Quarterly* 18, no. 2 (2007): 18–36.
- Human Rights Watch. "World Report 2014: North Korea." *Human Rights Watch*, January 21, 2014. <https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2014/country-chapters/north-korea>.
- Human Rights Watch | 350 Fifth. "Russia." *Human Rights Watch*, January 4, 2016. <https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2016/country-chapters/russia>.
- "Impact Regulation Innovation." *ITIF | Information Technology and Innovation Foundation*. Accessed February 26, 2017. <https://itif.org/>.
- "In Syria, Trump Faces a Tough Balancing Act Between Turks and Kurds." *Foreign Policy*. Accessed February 20, 2017. <https://foreignpolicy.com/2017/02/06/in-syria-trump-faces-a-tough-balancing-act-between-turks-and-kurds/>.
- Inbar, Efraim. "U.S. Mideast Retreat a Boon for Moscow and Tehran." *Middle East Quarterly* 23, no. 3 (2016): 1A,2A,3A,4A,5A,6A,7A,8A,9A,10A,11A,12A,13A.

- Inc, Gallup. "After Nuclear Deal, U.S. Views of Iran Remain Dismal." *Gallup.com*. Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/189272/after-nuclear-deal-views-iran-remain-dismal.aspx>.
- . "In U.S., Half Still Say Gov't Regulates Business Too Much." *Gallup.com*. Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/185609/half-say-gov-regulates-business.aspx>.
- "Independent Review of the Department of Defense Nuclear Enterprise." US Department of Defense, June 2, 2014.
- India, Press Trust of. "BRICS Is Passe, Time Now for '3G': Citi." *Business Standard India*, February 23, 2011. http://www.business-standard.com/article/economy-policy/brics-is-passe-time-now-for-3g-citi-111022300246_1.html.
- "International Migration Outlook 2016 - En - OECD." Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.oecd.org/migration/international-migration-outlook-1999124x.htm>.
- "International Students in the United States." Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.iie.org/Services/Project-Atlas/United-States/International-Students-In-US#.WKpMtBIrKuU>.
- Jahnke, Art. "Who Picks Up the Tab for Science?" *BU Today*, April 6, 2015. <http://www.bu.edu/today/2015/funding-for-scientific-research/>.
- Jenner, C.J., and Truong Thuy Tran, eds. *The South China Sea: A Crucible of Regional Cooperation or Conflict-Making Sovereignty Claims?* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Jones, Brian. "One Chart Shows The Magnitude Of US Naval Dominance." *Business Insider*, November 13, 2013. <http://www.businessinsider.com/magnitude-of-us-naval-dominance-2013-11>.
- Kameri-Mbote, Patricia. "WATER, CONFLICT, AND COOPERATION: LESSONS FROM THE NILE RIVER BASIN." *Environmental Change and Security Program Report*, no. 13 (2008): 80–84.
- Kasparov, G.K. *Winter Is Coming: Why Vladimir Putin and the Enemies of the Free World Must Be Stopped*. First edition. New York: PublicAffairs, 2015.
- Kazmi, Zahir. "Normalising the Non-Proliferation Regime." *Survival* 57, no. 1 (2015): 133–150. doi:10.1080/00396338.2015.1008302.
- Kenneth D. Frederick, David C. Major, and Eugene Z. Stakhiv. *Climate Change and Water Resources Planning Criteria*. Dordrecht ; Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997.
- Kerr, William R. "U.S. High-Skilled Immigration, Innovation, and Entrepreneurship: Empirical Approaches and Evidence." Harvard Business School, August 2013.
- Kevin H. O'Rourke, Author. *Globalization and History: The Evolution of a Nineteenth-Century Atlantic Economy*. Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press, 2001.
- Kibaroglu, Aysegul. "Activities." *Euphrates Tigris Initiative for Cooperation (ETIC)*, July 2, 2015. <https://euphratestigrisinitiativeforcooperation.wordpress.com/activities/>.
- Kissinger, Henry. *On China*. New York, New York: Penguin Books, 2011.
- . Opening Statement, Global Challenges and U.S. National Security Strategy, § Committe on Armed Services (2015).
- Klare, Michael T. *The Race for What's Left: The Global Scramble for the World's Last Resources*. 1st ed. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2012.
- Kochhar, Rakesh. "How Americans Compare with the Global Middle Class." *Pew Research Center*, July 9, 2015. <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/07/09/how-americans-compare-with-the-global-middle-class/>.

- Kottasova, Ivana. "Which NATO Members Are Falling Short on Military Spending?" *CNNMoney*, April 15, 2016. <http://money.cnn.com/2016/04/15/news/nato-spending-countries/index.html>.
- Lanchin, Mike. "SS St Louis: The Ship of Jewish Refugees Nobody Wanted." *BBC News*, May 13, 2014, sec. Magazine. <http://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-27373131>.
- Leonhardt, David. "America First, in Africa." *The New York Times*, February 9, 2017. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/09/opinion/america-first-in-africa.html>.
- Lieber, Robert J. "The Tragedy of Great Power Politics by John J. Mearsheimer." *Political Science Quarterly* 117, no. 2 (2002): 321–322. doi:10.2307/798192.
- "Light Water Reactor Sustainability (LWRS) Program | Department of Energy." Accessed February 20, 2017. <https://www.energy.gov/ne/nuclear-reactor-technologies/light-water-reactor-sustainability-lwrs-program>.
- "Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG)." Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.shell.com/energy-and-innovation/natural-gas/liquefied-natural-gas-lng.html>.
- Lorenz, Frederick M. *Strategic Water: Iraq and Security Planning in the Euphrates-Tigris Basin*. Quantico, Virginia, S.I: Marine Corps University Press, sn, 2014.
- Luzi, S. "Driving Forces and Patterns of Water Policy Making in Egypt." *Water Policy* 12, no. 1 (2010): 92–113. doi:10.2166/wp.2009.052.
- "Macgregor Transformation Model (MTM: 19 November Briefing With Backup Slides | United States Army." *General Billy Mitchell Institute for Aerospace Studies*. Accessed February 20, 2017. <https://www.scribd.com/doc/186022364/Macgregor-Transformation-Model-MTM-19-November-Briefing-With-Backup-Slides>.
- Machi, Ethel. "Improving U.S. Competitiveness with K-12 STEM Education and Training." *The Heritage Foundation*. Accessed February 26, 2017. /education/report/improving-us-competitiveness-k-12-stem-education-and-training.
- "Making NAFTA Work for U.S. Small- and Medium-Sized Business." Accessed February 20, 2017. /about-us/policy-offices/press-office/fact-sheets/2011/making-nafta-work-us-small-and-medium-sized-business.
- Manning, Matthew J. "Peeking into the Abyss: What Pakistan and the A.Q. Khan Network Tell Us about the Future of Nuclear Nonproliferation." *Texas Review of Law & Politics* 19, no. 2 (2015): 336.
- "Marine Le Pen Takes the Lead in First Round French Election Poll." *The Independent*, January 12, 2017. <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/marine-le-pen-far-right-leader-front-national-french-election-poll-fran-ois-fillon-a7524056.html>.
- Maryniak, Gregg. "Storage, Not Generation, Is the Challenge to Renewable Energy." *Forbes*. Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.forbes.com/sites/singularity/2012/07/20/storage-not-generation-is-the-challenge-to-renewable-energy/>.
- Maskanian, Bahram. "Propagating Seeds of Democracy." The Venus Project Foundation, February 15, 2004. <http://venusproject.org/>.
- "McKinsey Global Institute | McKinsey & Company." Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.mckinsey.com/mgi/overview>.
- Mearns, Robin, and Andrew Norton. *Social Dimensions of Climate Change: Equity and Vulnerability in a Warming World*. New Frontiers of Social Policy. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2010.

- Medine, David, and Patricia Wald. "Is the Freedom Act More Effective Than the Patriot Act?" *Newsweek*, December 27, 2015. <http://www.newsweek.com/freedom-act-more-effective-patriot-act-409127>.
- "Medium-Term Reports." Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.iea.org/publications/medium-termreports/>.
- Meierding, Emily. "Climate Change and Conflict: Avoiding Small Talk about the Weather." *International Studies Review* 15, no. 2 (2013): 185–203. doi:10.1111/misr.12030.
- Menon, Rajan. "Newsflash, America: Ukraine Cannot Afford a War with Russia." *Perspectives on Peace and Security*, June 18, 2015. <http://perspectives.carnegie.org/us-russia/newsflash-america-ukraine-afford-war-russia/>.
- Messerschmid, Clemens. "What Price Cooperation? Hydro-Hegemony in Shared Israeli-Palestinian Groundwater Resources," 6.
- Meyer, Robinson. "How Should the U.S. Fund Research and Development?" *The Atlantic*, April 8, 2016. <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2016/04/us-research-and-development/477435/>.
- "Migration and Climate Change | IISD." Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.iisd.org/library/migration-and-climate-change>.
- Mitchell, Katharyne. Conversation with Professor Katharyne Mitchell, University of Washington. Interview by Audrey Peronnet. In Person, February 2, 2017.
- Mockaitis, Thomas. "The COIN Conundrum: The Future of Counterinsurgency and U.S. Land Power." US Army War College Strategic Studies Institute, December 2016.
- Montgomery, Scott. Conversation with Professor Scott Montgomery, Jackson School of International Studies, University of Washington. Interview by Kaia Boonzaier and Matthew Hegyes. In Person, February 2, 2017.
- "Monthly Energy Review - Energy Information Administration." Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.eia.gov/totalenergy/data/monthly/>.
- Moynihan, Colin. "A New York City Settlement on Surveillance of Muslims." *The New Yorker*, January 7, 2016. <http://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/a-new-york-city-settlement-on-surveillance-of-muslims>.
- "NAFTA Trilateral > Home > Legal Texts > North American Free Trade Agreement." Accessed February 20, 2017. <https://www.nafta-sec-alena.org/Home/Legal-Texts/North-American-Free-Trade-Agreement?mvid=1&secid=b5b817ee-c48a-4dda-b8d9-c4564e34ac4b>.
- "NAFTA's Economic Impact." *Council on Foreign Relations*. Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.cfr.org/trade/naftas-economic-impact/p15790>.
- "National Intelligence Council - Global Trends." Accessed February 20, 2017. <https://www.dni.gov/index.php/about/organization/national-intelligence-council-global-trends>.
- NATO. "The North Atlantic Treaty." *NATO*. Accessed February 20, 2017. http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_17120.htm.
- Navarro, Peter, and Greg Autry. *Death by China: Confronting the Dragon - A Global Call to Action*. Upper Saddle River: Pearson FT Press, 2011. <https://www.pearsonhighered.com/program/Navarro-Death-by-China-Confronting-the-Dragon-A-Global-Call-to-Action-paperback/PGM121776.html>.
- Nelson, Jenny, and Christopher J. M. Emmott. "Can Solar Power Deliver?" *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and*

- Engineering Sciences* 371, no. 1996 (August 13, 2013): 20120372.
doi:10.1098/rsta.2012.0372.
- “Newscontent.” Accessed February 20, 2017.
<http://newscontent.cctv.com/NewJsp/news.jsp?fileId=383349>.
- Nguyen, Viet Phuong, and Man-Sung Yim. “Post-Cold War Civilian Nuclear Cooperation and Implications for Nuclear Nonproliferation.” *Progress in Nuclear Energy* 93 (2016): 246–259. doi:10.1016/j.pnucene.2016.08.019.
- Noah, Timothy. “Obama Pushing Thousands of New Regulations in Year 8.” *The Agenda*. Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://politi.co/1OFsW6h>.
- Nowrasteh, Alex. “Boost Highly Skilled Immigration.” *Cato Institute*, November 17, 2014. <https://www.cato.org/publications/cato-online-forum/boost-highly-skilled-immigration>.
- “Nsf.gov - U.S. R&D Increased in 2013, Well Ahead of the Pace of Gross Domestic Product - NCSES - US National Science Foundation (NSF).” Accessed February 27, 2017.
<https://www.nsf.gov/statistics/2015/nsf15330/>.
- “Nuclear Power in the USA - World Nuclear Association.” Accessed February 20, 2017.
<http://www.world-nuclear.org/information-library/country-profiles/countries-t-z/usa-nuclear-power.aspx>.
- Nye, Jr., Joseph S. “The Benefits of Soft Power.” *HBS Working Knowledge*. Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://hbswk.hbs.edu/archive/4290.html>.
- “Obama Budget Proposal Includes \$19 Billion for Cybersecurity.” *Fortune*. Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://fortune.com/2016/02/09/obama-budget-cybersecurity/>.
- “Obama May Be Preaching ‘Tough Love’ to Saudi – but Arms Sales Tell Another Story.” *The Guardian*, April 22, 2016, sec. Opinion.
<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/apr/22/us-saudi-arabia-weapons-arms-deals-foreign-policy>.
- “OEC - Nigeria (NGA) Exports, Imports, and Trade Partners.” Accessed February 20, 2017.
<http://atlas.media.mit.edu/en/profile/country/nga/>.
- “OEC - Saudi Arabia (SAU) Exports, Imports, and Trade Partners.” Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://atlas.media.mit.edu/en/profile/country/sau/>.
- Office, U. S. Government Accountability. “Border Security: DHS’s Progress and Challenges in Securing U.S. Borders,” no. GAO-13-414T (March 14, 2013).
<http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-13-414T>.
- . “Information Security: Agencies Need to Improve Controls over Selected High-Impact Systems,” no. GAO-16-501 (June 21, 2016). <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-16-501>.
- Oliver, John. “Nuclear Weapons.” *Last Week Tonight*. HBO, July 27, 2014.
- “Overview of BLS Statistics by Industry : U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.” Accessed February 21, 2017. <https://www.bls.gov/bls/industry.htm>.
- Pathe, Simone. “Stop Pretending You Know What the Export-Import Bank Is.” *PBS NewsHour*. Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.pbs.org/newshour/making-sense/stop-pretending-know-export-import-bank/>.
- Phillips, David J. H., Shaddad Attali, Stephen Mccaffrey, and John S. Murray. “The Jordan River Basin: 2. Potential Future Allocations to the Co-Riparians.” *Water International* 32, no. 1 (2007): 39–62. doi:10.1080/02508060708691964.
- Pomeranz, William. Conversation with William Pomeranz, Deputy Director of Woodrow Wilson Center. Interview by Josiah Jones, January 14, 2017.

- Pope, Amy. "Infographic: The Screening Process for Refugee Entry into the United States." *Whitehouse.gov*, November 20, 2015. <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/blog/2015/11/20/infographic-screening-process-refugee-entry-united-states>.
- Proedrou, Filippou, and Christos Frangonikolopoulos. "Refocusing Public Diplomacy: The Need for Strategic Discursive Public Diplomacy." *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 23, no. 4 (2012): 728–745. doi:10.1080/09592296.2012.736339.
- "Public Law 107 - 56 - Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism (USA PATRIOT ACT) Act of 2001." Accessed February 20, 2017. <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-107publ56/content-detail.html>.
- Rapkin, David P., and William R. Thompson. *Transition Scenarios: China and the United States in the Twenty-First Century*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013.
- Ravallion, Martin. "The World Bank: Why It Is Still Needed and Why It Still Disappoints †." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 30, no. 1 (2016): 77–94. doi:10.1257/jep.30.1.77.
- "Readout of the Vice President's Meeting with German Vice Chancellor and Minister of Foreign Affairs Sigmar Gabriel." *Whitehouse.gov*, February 2, 2017. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/02/02/readout-vice-presidents-meeting-german-vice-chancellor-and-minister>.
- "Recent Developments Surrounding the South China Sea." Text.Article. *Associated Press*, January 22, 2017. <http://www.foxnews.com/world/2017/01/22/recent-developments-surrounding-south-china-sea.html>.
- "Reliable & Affordable Energy - Nuclear Energy Institute." Accessed February 20, 2017. <https://www.nei.org/Why-Nuclear-Energy/Reliable-Affordable-Energy>.
- "Report of the Commission of Inquiry on HR in the Democratic People S Republic of Korea." Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/HRC/CoIDPRK/Pages/ReportoftheCommissionofInquiryDPRK.aspx>.
- Reuss, H. S. "The United States Foreign Aid Program: An Appraisal." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 336, no. 1 (1961): 23–29. doi:10.1177/000271626133600104.
- Rivera, Carla. "Community Colleges Not Preparing California's Future Workforce, Study Says." *Los Angeles Times*, October 20, 2010. <http://articles.latimes.com/2010/oct/20/local/la-me-1020-community-colleges-20101020>.
- Rocha, Nadia, and Robert Teh. "Preferential Trade Agreements and the WTO." *VoxEU.org*, July 21, 2011. <http://voxeu.org/article/preferential-trade-agreements-and-wto>.
- Rogin, Josh. "The End of the Concept of 'Strategic Reassurance'?" *Foreign Policy*, November 6, 2009. <https://foreignpolicy.com/2009/11/06/the-end-of-the-concept-of-strategic-reassurance/>.
- Rosecrance, Richard N. *The Resurgence of the West: How a Transatlantic Union Can Prevent War and Restore the United States and Europe*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013.
- Rosenthal, Shane, and Pradeep Kurukulasuriya. "Climate Change and Agriculture : A Review of Impacts and Adaptations." The World Bank, June 1, 2013. <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/757601468332407727/Climate-change-and-agriculture-a-review-of-impacts-and-adaptations>.

- Ross, Michael L. "The Political Economy of the Resource Curse." *World Politics* 51, no. 2 (1999): 297–322. doi:10.1017/S0043887100008200.
- Roth, Lois. "Public Diplomacy and the Past: The Search for an American Style of Propaganda (1952-1977)." *Fletcher Forum* 8, no. 2 (1984): 353–353.
- Rubin, Alissa J. "For Bashar Al-Assad, Winning the Syrian War May Lead to New Troubles." *The New York Times*, November 28, 2016.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/28/world/middleeast/syria-civil-war-assad.html>.
- Rudloff, Peter, James M. Scott, and Tyra Blew. "Countering Adversaries and Cultivating Friends ; Indirect Rivalry Factors and the Allocation of US Foreign Aid." *Cooperation and Conflict* 48 (2013): 401–423.
- "Russia and the West: Russia's Recent Assertiveness, Western Response, and What the Future May Hold." *Harvard International Review*, January 3, 2017.
<http://hir.harvard.edu/russia-and-west-assertiveness-response-what-the-future-may-hold/>.
- "Russia vs United States: Economy Facts and Stats." Accessed February 27, 2017.
<http://www.nationmaster.com/country-info/compare/Russia/United-States/Economy>.
- "Russia's Anti-American Fever Goes beyond the Soviet Era's." *Washington Post*. Accessed February 20, 2017. https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/europe/russias-anti-us-sentiment-now-is-even-worse-than-it-was-in-soviet-union/2015/03/08/b7d534c4-c357-11e4-a188-8e4971d37a8d_story.html.
- Sadjadpour, Karim. "How America Could Stumble Into War With Iran." *The Atlantic*, February 9, 2017. <https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2017/02/iran-trump-nuclear-deal/515979/>.
- Saha, Devashree, Kenan Fikri, and Nick Marchio. "FDI in U.S. Metro Areas: The Geography of Jobs in Foreign-Owned Establishments | Brookings Institution." *Brookings*, November 30, 2001. <https://www.brookings.edu/research/fdi-in-u-s-metro-areas-the-geography-of-jobs-in-foreign-owned-establishments/>.
- Sanger, David E., and Eric Schmitt. "Yemen Withdraws Permission for U.S. Antiterror Ground Missions." *The New York Times*, February 7, 2017.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/07/world/middleeast/yemen-special-operations-missions.html>.
- Schlesinger, James. "Report of the Secretary of Defense Task Force on DoD Nuclear Weapons Management," December 2008.
- Schwab, Klaus. "The Global Competitiveness Report 2016–2017." *World Economic Forum*. Accessed February 20, 2017. <https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-global-competitiveness-report-2016-2017-1>.
- "Senators: U.S. Cybersecurity Is Too Weak." *Time*. Accessed February 27, 2017.
<http://time.com/4636236/senators-cybersecurity-russia/>.
- Sensenbrenner, F. "Titles - H.R.2048 - 114th Congress (2015-2016): USA FREEDOM Act of 2015." Legislation, June 2, 2015. <https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/house-bill/2048/titles>.
- Shane, Scott. "Saudis and Extremism: 'Both the Arsonists and the Firefighters.'" *The New York Times*, August 25, 2016.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/26/world/middleeast/saudi-arabia-islam.html>.
- Sharma, Rakesh. "The Gays And The Tech Industry: An Inclusive Yet Complicated Relationship." *Forbes*. Accessed February 20, 2017.

- <http://www.forbes.com/sites/rakeshsharma/2014/06/30/the-gays-and-the-tech-industry-an-inclusive-and-complicated-relationship/>.
- “Silicon Valley Index.” Accessed February 27, 2017.
<http://www.jointventure.org/publications/silicon-valley-index>.
- Skillington, Tracey. “Cosmopolitan Justice and Global Climate Change: Toward Perpetual Peace or War in a Resource-Challenged World?” *Irish Journal of Sociology* 20, no. 2 (2012): 132–152. doi:10.7227/IJS.20.2.8.
- “Small Modular Reactors (SMRs) | Department of Energy.” Accessed February 20, 2017.
<https://www.energy.gov/ne/nuclear-reactor-technologies/small-modular-nuclear-reactors>.
- Smith, Rebecca. “Cyberattacks Raise Alarm for U.S. Power Grid.” *Wall Street Journal*, December 30, 2016, sec. US. <http://www.wsj.com/articles/cyberattacks-raise-alarms-for-u-s-power-grid-1483120708>.
- “Solar Energy in the United States | Department of Energy.” Accessed February 20, 2017.
<https://energy.gov/eere/solarpoweringamerica/solar-energy-united-states>.
- “Special Report: Quadrennial Defense Review.” Accessed February 20, 2017.
<https://www.defense.gov/News/Special-Reports/QDR>.
- Steinberg, James. *Strategic Reassurance and Resolve: U.S - China Relations in the Twenty-First Century*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2014.
- “Strategic Reassurance.” *The Economist*, December 2, 2010.
<http://www.economist.com/node/17601443>.
- Sun Tzu. *Sun Tzu's The Art of War*. Translated by Lionel Giles. First edition. Tuttle Classics. Tokyo ; Rutland, Vermont: Tuttle Publishing, 2008.
- “Surveillance Under the Patriot Act.” *American Civil Liberties Union*. Accessed February 20, 2017. <https://www.aclu.org/infographic/surveillance-under-patriot-act>.
- “Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC) - OECD.” Accessed February 26, 2017.
<http://www.oecd.org/skills/piaac/>.
- “SWRO Desalination Plant to Be Built in Port Said, Egypt Using Kuwait Loan.” Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.waterworld.com/articles/wwi/2016/12/swro-desalination-plant-to-be-built-in-port-said-egypt-using-kuwait-loan.html>.
- Szoldra, Paul. “19 Unforgettable Quotes from Legendary Marine Gen. James ‘Mad Dog’ Mattis.” *Business Insider*, December 1, 2016. <http://www.businessinsider.com/general-mattis-best-quotes-2016-11>.
- Task Force on the United Nations. *American Interests and UN Reform: Report of the Task Force on the United Nations*. Washington, D.C.: USInstitute of Peace, 2005.
<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS72375>.
- Teshome B, Wondwosen. “Transboundary Water Cooperation in Africa: The Case of the Nile Basin Initiative (NBI).” *Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations* 7, no. 4 (2008): 34–43.
- “The Constitution of the United States: A Transcription.” *National Archives*, November 4, 2015. <https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/constitution-transcript>.
- “The Final Axis: North Korea and Nonproliferation Negotiations.” *Kennedy School Review*, June 29, 2016. <http://harvardkennedyschoolreview.com/the-final-axis-north-korea-and-nonproliferation-negotiations/>.
- The Integration of Immigrants into American Society*. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press, 2015.

- “The Navy’s Zumwalt Problem.” *The Washington Times*. Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2016/nov/28/the-navys-zumwalt-problem/>.
- “The Road to a Paris Climate Deal - Environment.” *The New York Times*, December 18, 2015. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/projects/cp/climate/2015-paris-climate-talks>.
- “The World Factbook — Central Intelligence Agency.” Accessed February 20, 2017. <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/pk.html>.
- “These 9 Countries Spend a Greater Share of Money on Science than the United States.” *Business Insider*. Accessed February 27, 2017. <http://www.businessinsider.com/american-science-funding-statistics-vs-world-2016-2>.
- “These Are the Jobs Most at Risk of Being Replaced By Robots.” *Fortune*. Accessed February 20, 2017. <https://uncubed.com/daily/meet-smart-robots-taking-traditional-jobs/>.
- “Thousands of Iraqi Soldiers Surrender.” Text.Article. *Fox News*, March 22, 2003. <http://www.foxnews.com/story/2003/03/22/thousands-iraqi-soldiers-surrender.html>.
- “Time to Fix Patents.” *The Economist*, August 8, 2015. <http://www.economist.com/news/leaders/21660522-ideas-fuel-economy-todays-patent-systems-are-rotten-way-rewarding-them-time-fix>.
- Tol, Richard S. J. “The Economic Effects of Climate Change.” *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 23, no. 2 (2009): 29–51. doi:10.1257/jep.23.2.29.
- Triadafilopoulos, Triadafilos. *Becoming Multicultural: Immigration and the Politics of Membership in Canada and Germany*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2012.
- Tunc, Tanfer Emin. “Less Sugar, More Warships: Food as American Propaganda in the First World War.” *War in History* 19, no. 2 (2012): 193–216. doi:10.1177/0968344511433158.
- “UCS Satellite Database.” *Union of Concerned Scientists*. Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.ucsusa.org/nuclear-weapons/space-weapons/satellite-database>.
- “Ukraine Crisis in Maps.” *BBC News*, February 18, 2015, sec. Europe. <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-27308526>.
- “United States - Share of Global Gross Domestic Product (GDP) 2020 | Statista.” *Statista*. Accessed February 20, 2017. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/270267/united-states-share-of-global-gross-domestic-product-gdp/>.
- United States. Congress. House. Committee on Homeland Security. *Compilation of the Homeland Security Act of 2002: (Updated with Amendments Made through P.L. 110-417 (October 14, 2008)) : Prepared for the Use of the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, Second Session*. Washington: USGPO: Suptof Docs, USGPO, distributor, 2008.
- United States. Congress. Senate. Select Committee on Intelligence. *Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015: Report Together with Additional Views (to Accompany S. 754)*. United States. Congress. Senate. Report ; 114-32. Washington, D.C.]: USGovernment Publishing Office, 2015. <http://purl.fdlp.gov/GPO/gpo56892>.
- United States Department of State. “Facts and Figures | Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs.” Accessed February 20, 2017. <https://eca.state.gov/impact/facts-and-figures>.
- . “New START.” Accessed February 20, 2017. <https://www.state.gov/t/avc/newstart/>.
- United States. Joint Chiefs of Staff. “Joint Vision 2020.” *United States Government Printing Office, June 2000*, 2000.
- United States Senate Judiciary Committee. “The Role of Immigrants in the US Labor Market.” United States Senate, March 16, 2016.

- “United States Speedtest Market Report.” Accessed February 27, 2017.
<http://www.speedtest.net/reports/united-states/>.
- “Uphold International Law | United Nations.” Accessed February 20, 2017.
<http://www.un.org/en/sections/what-we-do/uphold-international-law/index.html>.
- “U.S. Energy Facts - Energy Explained, Your Guide To Understanding Energy - Energy Information Administration.” Accessed February 20, 2017.
http://www.eia.gov/energyexplained/?page=us_energy_home.
- US Trade Representative. “TPP Chapter Summary: State Owned Enterprises.” Office of the United States Trade Representative, November 5, 2015.
- “USGS Fact Sheet 2009-3057: California’s Central Valley Groundwater Study: A Powerful New Tool to Assess Water Resources in California’s Central Valley.” Accessed February 20, 2017. <https://pubs.usgs.gov/fs/2009/3057/>.
- “U.S.-Russia Relations: Critical and Unstable.” *Perspectives on Peace and Security*, July 6, 2015. <http://perspectives.carnegie.org/us-russia/u-s-russia-relations-critical-unstable/>.
- “U.S.-Saudi Relations.” *Council on Foreign Relations*. Accessed February 20, 2017.
<http://www.cfr.org/saudi-arabia/us-saudi-relations/p36524>.
- Voices, Valley. “Fixing What Ails The U.S. Patent System: A Modest Proposal.” *Forbes*. Accessed February 27, 2017.
<http://www.forbes.com/sites/valleyvoices/2014/12/29/fixing-what-ails-the-u-s-patent-system-a-modest-proposal/>.
- “Volha Charnysh, Author at Nuclear Age Peace Foundation.” *Nuclear Age Peace Foundation*. Accessed February 26, 2017. <https://www.wagingpeace.org/author/volha-charnysh/>.
- Wagner, Viki, ed. *Russia*. Detroit: Greenhaven Press, 2009.
<http://trove.nla.gov.au/version/30543830>.
- Walker, Kristen. “Trump to Sign Executive Order to Renegotiate NAFTA and Intent to Leave TPP.” *CNBC*, January 23, 2017. <http://www.cnbc.com/2017/01/23/trump-to-sign-executive-order-to-renegotiate-nafta-and-intent-to-leave-tpp.html>.
- “Warfighting.” US Marine Corps, 1997.
- “Water Conflict.” *The World’s Water*, July 1, 2013. <http://worldwater.org/water-conflict/>.
- West, Darrell M. *Brain Gain - Rethinking U.S. Immigration Policy*. Brookings Institution Press, 01.
- Weston, Liz. “When a Two-Year College Degree Pays Off.” *Time*, April 21, 2015.
<http://time.com/money/collection-post/3829131/two-year-college-degrees-payoff/>.
- “What Is NATO?” *What Is NATO?* Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://www.nato.int/nato-welcome/index.html>.
- “What Is the Patriot Act?” US Department of Justice, n.d.
- “Who Actually Creates Jobs: Start-Ups, Small Businesses or Big Corporations?” *Washington Post*. Accessed February 20, 2017. https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/on-small-business/who-actually-creates-jobs-start-ups-small-businesses-or-big-corporations/2013/04/24/d373ef08-ac2b-11e2-a8b9-2a63d75b5459_story.html.
- “Who Is the Bigger Threat to U.S.: China or Russia?” MovingImage. *Fox Business*, December 19, 2016. <http://video.foxbusiness.com/v/5253848514001/>.
- Wike, Richard. “What the World Thinks about Climate Change in 7 Charts.” *Pew Research Center*, April 18, 2016. <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/04/18/what-the-world-thinks-about-climate-change-in-7-charts/>.
- Wikinson, Tracy, and W. J. Hennigan. “Straddling East and West, Turkey Is a Critical U.S. Ally in Fight against Islamic State.” *Los Angeles Times*, July 15, 2016.

- <http://www.latimes.com/world/europe/la-fg-turkey-us-importance-20160715-snap-story.html>.
- Williams, Phil, and Dighton Fiddner, eds. "Cyberspace: Malevolent Actors, Criminal Opportunities, and Strategic Competition." US Army War College Strategic Studies Institute, August 2016.
- Willis, Henry, Joel B. Predd, Paul K. Davis, and Wayne P. Brown. *Measuring the Effectiveness of Border Security between Ports-of-Entry*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, 2010. http://www.rand.org/pubs/technical_reports/TR837/.
- "Wind Energy and the Environment - Energy Explained, Your Guide To Understanding Energy - Energy Information Administration." Accessed February 20, 2017. http://www.eia.gov/energyexplained/index.cfm?page=wind_environment.
- "Wind Vision." *Energy.gov*. Accessed February 20, 2017. <https://energy.gov/eere/wind/maps/wind-vision>.
- Windrem, Robert. "Timeline: Ten Years of Russian Cyber Attacks on Other Countries." *NBC News*, December 18, 2016. <http://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/timeline-ten-years-russian-cyber-attacks-other-nations-n697111>.
- Wood, Dakota L., ed. "2017 Index of U.S. Military Strength: Assessing America's Ability to Provide for the Common Defense." The Heritage Foundation, n.d.
- World Bank. "Military Expenditure (% of GDP) | Data." Accessed February 20, 2017. <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/MS.MIL.XPND.GD.ZS>.
- Wright, Robin. *Diplomacy By Tweet*. The New Yorker Radio Hour, n.d.
- "WTO | Understanding the WTO - Principles of the Trading System." Accessed February 20, 2017. https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/tif_e/fact2_e.htm.
- "You Can't Always Get the World Order That You Want." *War on the Rocks*, January 26, 2017. <https://warontherocks.com/2017/01/you-cant-always-get-the-world-order-that-you-want/>.
- Yuhas, Alan, and Mazin Sidahmed. "Is This a Muslim Ban? Trump's Executive Order Explained." *The Guardian*, January 31, 2017, sec. US news. <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/jan/28/trump-immigration-ban-syria-muslims-reaction-lawsuits>.
- Zeitoun, Mark. "The Conflict vs. Cooperation Paradox: Fighting Over or Sharing of Palestinian-Israeli Groundwater?" *Water International* 32, no. 1 (2007): 105–120. doi:10.1080/02508060708691968.
- Zeitoun, Mark, Clemens Messerschmid, and Shaddad Attali. "Asymmetric Abstraction and Allocation: The Israeli- Palestinian Water Pumping Record." *Ground Water* 47, no. 1 (2009): 146–160. doi:10.1111/j.1745-6584.2008.00487.x.

**THE HENRY M. JACKSON
SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES**

UNIVERSITY *of* WASHINGTON

The Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies
jsis.washington.edu
Phone: (206) 543-6001 Email: jsis@uw.edu

