



PEACEKEEPING



GIRLS' & WOMEN'S RIGHTS



TERRORISM



DEMOCRACY



HUMAN RIGHTS



IRAQ



NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION



POVERTY



CLIMATE CHANGE

DON'T GO IT ALONE

*America's Interest in International Cooperation*







The **Better World Campaign** works to strengthen the relationship between the United States and the United Nations through outreach, communications, and advocacy. We encourage U.S. leadership to enhance the UN's ability to carry out its invaluable international work on behalf of peace, progress, freedom, and justice. In these efforts, we engage policy makers, the media, and the American public to increase awareness of and support for the United Nations. To learn more, visit [www.betterworldcampaign.org](http://www.betterworldcampaign.org).

*This publication is a compilation of executive summaries from nine papers commissioned by the Better World Campaign to help inform the 2008 Presidential campaign in the United States and to provide recommendations for the next American administration. Taken together, the recommendations contained herein make clear that international cooperation is a smart strategy for addressing global challenges and advancing U.S. interests. The complete text of all nine papers can be found at [www.betterworldcampaign.org/issues/elections-2008](http://www.betterworldcampaign.org/issues/elections-2008).*





**EVERYONE  
HAS THE RIGHT TO  
FREEDOM OF THOUGHT,  
CONSCIENCE AND RELIGION;  
THIS RIGHT INCLUDES  
FREEDOM TO CHANGE HIS  
RELIGION OR BELIEF,  
AND FREEDOM, EITHER ALONE  
OR IN COMMUNITY WITH  
OTHERS AND IN PUBLIC OR  
PRIVATE, TO MANIFEST  
HIS RELIGION OR BELIEF  
IN TEACHING, PRACTICE,  
WORSHIP AND OBSERVANCE.**

# Table of Contents

<b>Peace and Stability Operations: Challenges and Opportunities for the Next U.S. Administration</b> <i>By William J. Durch</i>	<b>PEACEKEEPING</b> 4
<b>A New Agenda for Girls' and Women's Health &amp; Rights</b> <i>By Adrienne Germain</i>	<b>GIRLS' &amp; WOMEN'S RIGHTS</b> 6
<b>Building Global Alliances in the Fight against Terrorism</b> <i>By Alistair Millar and Eric Rosand</i>	<b>TERRORISM</b> 8
<b>New Directions for Democracy Promotion</b> <i>By Lorne W. Craner and Kenneth Wollack</i>	<b>DEMOCRACY</b> 10
<b>The Future of Human Rights: Restoring America's Leadership</b> <i>By William F. Schulz</i>	<b>HUMAN RIGHTS</b> 12
<b>The United Nations in Iraq</b> <i>By Carlos Pascual</i>	<b>IRAQ</b> 14
<b>Reducing the Global Nuclear Danger: International Cooperation, the Indispensable Security Imperative</b> <i>By Charles B. Curtis</i>	<b>NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION</b> 16
<b>Poverty: Combating the Global Crisis</b> <i>By John W. Sewell</i>	<b>POVERTY</b> 18
<b>U.S. Global Leadership to Safeguard our Climate, Security, and Economy</b> <i>By Nigel Purvis</i>	<b>CLIMATE CHANGE</b> 20

## Peace and Stability Operations: Challenges and Opportunities for the Next U.S. Administration

*By William J. Durch*

# PEACEKEEPING

The next U.S. Administration will face serious questions of resource allocation regarding peace and stability operations, whose responsibilities range from cease-fire observation to temporary governance, where political authorities have collapsed or departed. They are often complex mixes of civilian and military action. The United States, despite its status as the world's greatest economic and military power, has found it not only useful but necessary to undertake these operations in the company of others—coalitions, alliances, regional groupings, and global institutions—in support of a stable peace.

But peace has a problem. When it breaks out in places like Bosnia or the Congo, the press and public turn their attention away, seeking more exciting news. But peace is rarely self-enforcing; it often needs outside help. NATO, for example, poured 60,000 troops into Bosnia in 1995 to cement the Dayton Accords. Twelve years later, 2,900 troops remain, now under European Union command. This makes Bosnia typical in one sense—peace takes years to rebuild—but unusual in another, as the continuous recipient of major security and economic aid for so long a time.

Most peace missions struggle to attract the manpower and the funds needed to make a real change. The United Nations tries to keep the peace in Congo-Kinshasa with one-third as many troops as NATO started with in Bosnia, spread over an area six times as large and teeming with well-armed and vicious militias. Overall, the UN has 109,000 troops and police in the field, so it has trouble finding more troops for new operations like the one in Darfur, Sudan.

Few of the troops in its toughest, African operations come from developed states. Delayed payments from these same states keep UN peacekeeping perennially underfunded. At the end of its last peacekeeping budget year, in June 2007, the UN was still owed \$2.1 billion—nearly 40 percent—for its peacekeeping work. In one of life's greater ironies, it may not borrow funds to cover that shortfall, a rule enforced by the most indebted government on the planet: our own.

The UN's problems are not unique. In Afghanistan, maintaining adequate force-strength and building adequate fighting capacity has become a real issue for NATO, as too few NATO members bear these burdens amid flagging commitments and reluctance to risk troops on the part of most NATO countries.

Once it substantially disengages from Iraq, the U.S. will find it both cost-effective and politically expedient to lean on other states and organizations to help it advance shared strategic interests in international peace, security, justice, and prosperity. People around the globe understand, accept, and applaud UN actions. Compared to regional organizations and ad hoc alliances of nations, the UN has greater political reach and a deeper logistics network supporting humanitarian relief and development projects, as well as peace operations. U.S. support is critical to the success of UN peacekeeping operations, and well worth strengthening.



Early in the next administration, the president should:

- **Declare that the United States and the United Nations share common goals in expanding the writ of human rights and realizing human dignity**, which in turn requires international peace and individual human security.
- **Offer strong support—in cash and in kind—to every UN peace operation** for which it casts its vote in the Security Council, setting an example for others by promptly contributing the U.S. share of UN peacekeeping costs.
- **Support the continued restructuring and strengthening of UN headquarters offices that plan and support peace operations.**
- **Pledge strong and sustained U.S. diplomatic and political support to UN peacekeeping operations, especially in volatile states and regions.**
- **Promise temporary U.S. military support, in collaboration with its NATO allies, for UN operations that experience trouble from local spoilers or terrorist action.**
- **Continue to train foreign peacekeepers, contingent on their governments' willingness to discipline troops who violate international humanitarian law.**
- **Acknowledge that effective “transition and reconstruction” programs are peacekeepers' best exit strategy.**
- **Announce that the United States will rethink, restructure, and expand its own capacity** to contribute not only military advisors and police personnel but also political advisors and civilian substantive experts to UN peace operations.
- **Put in place a new interagency process and new centers of excellence to implement these objectives.**

---

**William J. Durch** is the Senior Associate at the **Henry L. Stimson Center**, a community of analysts devoted to offering practical, creative, non-partisan solutions to enduring and challenging problems of national and international security.

## **A New Agenda for Girls' & Women's Health & Rights**

*By Adrienne Germain*

# GIRLS' & WOMEN'S RIGHTS

In 2000, the United Nations (UN) agreed on targets to guide and focus international cooperation on behalf of enhanced quality of life and social justice in the coming decades. The resulting Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) constitute an action plan to halve poverty by 2015, in service of a more stable, secure, and prosperous world.

The MDGs were agreed to by President Bill Clinton in 2000 and reaffirmed by President George W. Bush in 2005. The MDGs implicitly and explicitly recognize that peace, security, and prosperity cannot be achieved unless women's health is secure and their inalienable human rights are fulfilled.

For years, the United States helped lead the struggle for women's health and rights, motivated by a commitment to a free, prosperous, and just world. To these moral and economic interests, today we add our interest in national security and peace.

Unfortunately, international progress on women's health and rights has stalled in recent years. Implementation of two of the great global agreements of the 20th century—the groundbreaking action plans agreed at the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) and the Fourth World Conference on Women (FWCW)—has been hampered by politics and ideology. The consequences are deadly:

- The global HIV/AIDS epidemic is disproportionately affecting women. In sub-Saharan Africa almost 61% of adults living with HIV are women and 76% of young people living with HIV/AIDS there are female.
- Each year, over a half a million women die as a result of pregnancy or childbirth, a reality that has changed very little over the last decade.
- Young girls continue to be exploited and dominated, whether in trafficking schemes or all-too-prevalent child marriage.
- One in every three women in the world is subjected to violence in her lifetime just because she is a woman.
- Essential legal rights—to own property, to inherit, to participate in politics—remain beyond the reach of hundreds of millions of women.

The new American President will have a fresh opportunity and profound responsibility to re-energize U.S. leadership on women's health and human rights.



Beginning on day one, the President should articulate a new agenda for international cooperation on women's health and rights that will:

- **Protect the Human Rights of Women** by submitting to the Senate for ratification internationally agreed human rights instruments, including the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CEDAW).
- **Strengthen Health Systems** by prioritizing reproductive health services (including: care during pregnancy, childbirth, and after; access to contraceptives; and diagnosis and treatment of sexually transmitted infections, including HIV/AIDS). The new Administration should make reproductive health the leading edge of new global health initiatives such as the International Health Partnership and Deliver Now for Women and Children.
- **Invest in Reproductive Health** by overturning unjustified (and counter-productive) restrictions on U.S. foreign assistance, including abstinence-only earmarks and the “global gag rule” on reproductive health service providers; releasing funds for the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA); and increasing U.S. funding for reproductive health services to more than \$1 billion, as agreed at the ICPD.
- **Prioritize Prevention and Women in International HIV/AIDS Efforts** by elevating prevention, especially reproductive health services as a primary strategy; supporting comprehensive sexuality education; and implementing gender equality guidelines and commitments made by the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria, and by the UN Joint Program on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS).

The world's women and girls—along with their families, communities, and nations—are counting on the United States to provide leadership again on universal protection of human rights, achievement of gender equality, and shared prosperity, peace, and equal opportunity. By implementing a clear and concrete agenda for women's and young people's health and human rights, the next Administration can foster a broad global coalition for a more secure, healthy, and prosperous world.

---

**Adrienne Germain** is the President of the **International Women's Health Coalition**, which envisions a world where women are free from discrimination, sexual coercion, and violence; where they make free and informed choices on sexuality and reproduction; and where health information and services are accessible to all.

## Building Global Alliances in the Fight against Terrorism

By Alistair Millar and Eric Rosand

# TERRORISM

Facing an evolving, global terrorist threat, the international community's ability to deal effectively with it will only be as strong as the international community's weakest link and the United States derives more benefit when it works with partners around the globe rather than alone in the international fight against terrorism.

Immediately after 9/11, the U.S. made a promising start by working with the international community. Since then, however, attention to this crucial element of counterterrorism policy has dwindled significantly.

To protect America from another major terrorist attack and repair its damaged reputation on the international stage, the new Administration will have to make strengthening international cooperation a top priority, including by spurring international cooperation to fight terrorism.

The next Administration will need to revitalize U.S. policy and practices in order to plug gaps in global capacities and improve relations with global partners and institutions to better protect America. It will need to cooperate more effectively with other nations, which can shoulder the burden of providing counterterrorism capacity-building and training assistance, especially in regions where the U.S. may lack access and leverage. More effort will also be needed to exchange information on terrorists with both allies and non-traditional allies and raise U.S. and global security standards for travel and border crossings through extensive international cooperation.

The next Administration can make important progress in both areas by working more closely with multilateral bodies, which have a critical role to play in global efforts to combat terrorism, by:

- **Setting international norms.** International organizations, particularly the UN, have a critical role to play in the establishing and monitoring the implementation of international legal frameworks, which provide the essential basis for the cooperation between states in combating terrorism and bringing terrorists to justice.
- **Enabling technical cooperation between countries.** Myriad different international functional bodies, such as those devoted to combating terrorism financing, aviation, and maritime security, facilitate the standard-setting and day-to-day technical cooperation essential to combating terrorism.
- **Assisting states to build their capacity to combat terrorism.** The UN plays a unique and invaluable role as an important facilitator and provider of those efforts among functional, regional, and sub-regional organizations. The United States cannot simply identify and fund its own priorities. Americans' security against terrorism is interwoven with that of other countries. The U.S. must work with these countries to identify and fund counterterrorism priorities in every corner of the world. An effective UN can help leverage the limited resources available and help raise the capacity of all states to combat terrorism.

- **Engaging with non-traditional allies.** The UN offers a forum for engaging with traditional and non-traditional allies on a range of counterterrorism issues, including those related to countering the growing radicalization and extremism that fuels Islamist terrorism and for which there is currently no broad-based and effective forum.

## **Recommendations**

We suggest the following recommendations for the next Administration to implement in its first one hundred days:

- **Appoint a White House “czar” for international counterterrorism cooperation;**
- **Appoint a diplomat as the Department of State’s Counterterrorism Coordinator;**
- **Ensure ambassadorial-level leadership on counterterrorism at the UN; and**
- **Call for the establishment of a global anti-terrorism organization.**

---

**Alistair Millar** is director and **Eric Rosand** is a senior fellow at the **Center on Global Counterterrorism Cooperation**, a nonpartisan research and policy organization that works to improve internationally-coordinated responses to the continually evolving threat of terrorism.



## **New Directions for Democracy Promotion**

*By Lorne W. Craner and Kenneth Wollack*

# DEMOCRACY

Despite the confusion and skepticism about U.S. democracy promotion efforts generated largely by the Iraq war and the outcome of elections in the Palestinian Authority, the United States must remain engaged in this important effort.

In recent decades, scores of countries have chosen to become democratic and the majority of people in every region of the world now believe that democracy is the best form of government. While democratic systems may be the standard that nations seek, achieving that standard and sustaining support for democratic governance can be a difficult process.

A critical challenge for new democracies is to deliver better lives to their populations. To be successful and maintain popular support, a democracy cannot be just a set of concepts or processes; it must be connected to economic prosperity and produce visible improvements, which are key factors in preventing alternatives, such as autocratic regimes, from gaining ground.

Democracies also provide the best alternatives for fostering peace across borders by maintaining internal stability and achieving economic and social development. The September 11 attacks increased the focus on failed states and those in conflict as potential breeding grounds for extremists. Democracies, with their focus on accountability, transparency, and pluralism, can help reduce extremism by allowing avenues for dissent, alternation of power, and protections for the rights of minorities.

However, “regime change” is not a goal or objective of democracy promotion. Rather, democracy is about choice-incremental improvements and reforms adopted at a pace set by each body politic. Democracy is also about much more than elections. The health and extent of democracies are judged as much by events and changes between elections when the substantive work of building democratic structures takes place.

Support for democracy has been a priority of U.S. foreign policy since the earliest days of the republic and has been on the agenda of almost every president since World War II. The U.S. government has taken a pluralistic approach to support for democracy promotion, allowing for diverse and complementary programming through the core institutes of the National Endowment for Democracy (NED), executive branch agencies, and contributions to multilateral institutions such as the United Nations.

For both our national interests and our ideals, the United States should remain engaged in democracy promotion. The next U.S. President should rejuvenate this core concept by implementing in his first 100 days a number of recommendations that would recommit the nation to international democratic principles and the promotion of democratic governance abroad, including:

- **Re-energizing U.S. alliances among democratically minded nations inside and outside of the United Nations, including within the UN’s regional groupings;**

- **Committing diplomatic resources to fixing the UN's new Human Rights Council and/or expanding U.S. financial and political commitments to the UN's Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and its field-based operations;**
- **Enshrining democracy promotion as one of the key pillars of U.S. foreign policy in the National Security Doctrine;**
- **Announcing continued or expanded funding for democracy support programs within various agencies of the U.S. government;**
- **Announcing continued support for and funding of the Millennium Challenge Corporation and the Community of Democracies;**
- **Announcing continued support for congressionally initiated funding for democracy support programs in Iraq; and**
- **Ensuring that the value of democracy promotion efforts is understood by American diplomats through extensive programs by the Foreign Service Institute and other mechanisms.**

---

**Kenneth Wollack** is the President of the **National Democratic Institute**, a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization committed to advancing freedom and democracy worldwide.

**Lorne Craner** is President of the **International Republican Institute**, a nonprofit organization working to strengthen and expand democracy worldwide.

## The Future of Human Rights: Restoring America's Leadership

By William F. Schulz

# HUMAN RIGHTS

By definition, human rights only gain meaning if they can claim a global imprimatur. They are, after all, *universal* human rights, not particular to any one country alone. They “become” rights only because a significant number of countries have recognized them as such. This means that any nation that would understand itself to be a nation that respects and promotes human rights must ipso facto be a nation that recognizes the authority of the international community when it comes to human rights or else it faces a contradiction.

The United States has been living in contradiction for more than fifty years; the last seven have merely made that contradiction starker. On the one hand, the U.S. has with some good reason prided itself on being a champion of human rights around the world; on the other, it has regularly balked at the authority of the international community upon which those rights are based, especially when it comes to its own practices.

No nation, no matter how powerful, can successfully pursue improvements in human rights around the world independent of that international community. If it tries, for example, to impose unilateral sanctions upon a country to protest human rights abuses there, those sanctions will inevitably fail if they lack the support and cooperation of others.

What has been especially damaging to human rights over the past seven years is that policies inimical to human rights have been carried out *in the name* of human rights. This includes the Iraq War of course (since human rights were at least a latter-day rationale for that conflict), but also encompasses the larger war on terror that has been pursued in the name of defending freedom and the rule of law. The result has been an unfortunate identification of human rights with America's worldly ambitions—an identification that has only exacerbated the customary suspicion in which human rights have been held by some in the developing world who see them as a guise for imposition of Western values.

All of this has contributed markedly to the decline in the U.S.'s global reputation.

A new Administration, whether Republican or Democratic, has an opportunity to reverse that decline and, in the process, renew America's reputation for human rights leadership. How it addresses these issues cannot be considered independent of many of the other topics addressed in the “Don't Go It Alone” series: the Iraq War, for example, or the promotion of democracy, or the pursuit of women's health, or the fight against poverty. All of these have implications for human rights policy.

There are several distinct steps that a new President can take. Foremost among them will be to conform the U.S.'s own practices to international human rights norms. Only when no gap remains between domestic practices and international standards can the U.S. begin to reclaim the mantle of human rights leadership and disarm the arguments of human rights violators around the world who have cited the U.S. as a model for their own repressive policies. Therefore, the next Administration should close Guantanamo Bay and either release its occupants or transfer them to the American military or criminal justice system for prosecution. It should also renounce the use of torture unequivocally; discard the practice of extraordinary rendition; commit to close and never re-open so-called secret “black site” prisons; and restore habeas corpus rights to all detainees.



In addition to changing these detention policies, the U.S. must find ways to signal its intention to respect international regimens and institutions. The next administration can do this, for example, by taking the following steps:

- **Ratifying one or more significant human rights treaties**, including the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women;
- **Suspending the penalties leveraged against those countries that have refused to immunize U.S. troops from possible prosecution by the International Criminal Court (ICC);**
- **Sending observers to the 2009 Review Conference of the Rome Statutes of the ICC** in order to kick-start the process of considering eventual U.S. “re-signing” and ratifying of the Statutes;
- **Considering standing for election to the UN Human Rights Council**, despite its very real flaws;
- **Supporting appropriate candidates for membership in the Council** and, whether as a member or non-member, encouraging the Council to engage in productive work rather than political posturing;
- **Providing additional voluntary financial support to the office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights** to allow for increased human rights monitoring, capacity-building, and advising of country missions;
- **Demonstrating strong support for the doctrine of the “Responsibility to Protect,”** including establishing clear policy on U.S. obligations in the face of genocide and ethnic cleansing;
- **Welcoming one or more UN Special Rapporteurs who wish to investigate conditions in the U.S.,** thus modeling openness to others;
- **Issuing its own annual report on U.S. human rights standards** to complement the State Department’s excellent annual report on other countries’ records;
- **Supporting an international treaty on terrorism that both codifies countries’ responsibilities to combat terrorism and describes appropriate mechanisms for fulfilling them;** and
- **Initiating an international process for declaring “best practices” when it comes to the use of sanctions of various kinds.**

---

**William F. Schulz** is a Senior Fellow at the **Center for American Progress** and has also served as Executive Director of **Amnesty International USA**, which promotes human rights worldwide.

## The United Nations in Iraq

By Carlos Pascual

The next president of the United States will inherit 130,000 to 150,000 troops in Iraq amidst a fractured state of Iraqi politics that includes nascent stability in some provinces, militias armed to the gills, and little or no consensus on major national issues that are fundamental to a viable Iraqi state. A precipitous troop withdrawal could unleash an internal conflagration that could increase the threat of transnational terrorism, send oil prices soaring further, and add to the number and anguish of 4.7 million Iraqi refugees and internally displaced people. Yet keeping U.S. troops in Iraq is an unsustainable stopgap in the absence of a political agreement among Iraq's warring factions.

The next U.S. president should:

- **Seek the help of the United Nations to broker a political settlement in Iraq that breaks through this Gordian knot.** Military interventions can help shape the conditions for a political settlement, but without a consensus on peace, military force alone is unsustainable. That has been the case in Bosnia, Kosovo, Haiti, Northern Ireland, South Africa, Sudan, and Liberia, and it will be the case in Iraq. If Iraqis cannot get over their differences to negotiate a political settlement, then U.S. troops cannot resolve their differences for them and should be withdrawn.
- **Make it clear that the United States will coordinate military action to support the diplomatic process.** A political settlement, if reached, will require international troops, including troops from the United States, to implement it. A peace initiative must go beyond platitudes about commitments to diplomacy. A central UN role would provide an umbrella to engage Iraq's neighbors and to garner international support from Europe, China, India and Japan, all of which depend on Middle East energy.
- **Urge, support, and finance UN initiatives through OCHA and UNHCR to have a real regional strategy that ranges from humanitarian to personal security.** The president should also recognize that resettling tens of thousands at a time cannot be a solution.
- **Recognize the limits of unilateralism, even if cloaked in the mantle of a “coalition of the willing,” to help a nation rebuild the very social fabric of its existence.** The United Nations can play a role in providing legitimacy and mobilizing international partners.

There should be no illusions about simple success. The chances for brokering a political settlement are not high. Iraqi factions may still think they can fight and win. Provincial and parliamentary elections are scheduled, respectively, for the fall of 2008 and in 2009. Whether elections will exacerbate political competition among rival factions or inject public accountability remains to be seen. Still, a political settlement is worth pursuing to garner a truce around core issues that divide Iraqis so that a base for sustainable peace is created. The gains from success are huge; the fallout from failure is limited. The process of reviving an international diplomatic process on Iraq could help our friends and allies come to appreciate that they, too, have a stake in ending this war.

---

**Carlos Pascual** is Vice President and Director of the Foreign Policy Studies Program at the **Brookings Institution**, an independent research and policy institute.



## **Reducing the Global Nuclear Danger: International Cooperation, the Indispensable Security Imperative**

*By Charles B. Curtis*

# NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION

**T**he risk of a world-altering terrorist nuclear attack is growing. Keeping nuclear weapons out of terrorist hands should be the central organizing security principle of the 21st century, and international cooperation is the only realistic means of defeating that threat.

Four objectives are essential:

- Reducing the global supply of nuclear weapons through arms reduction and non-proliferation initiatives;
- Limiting the spread of nuclear weapons technology;
- Securing all nuclear weapons material globally to the highest possible standard; and
- Addressing the root causes of discontent underlying radical Islam.

The global security chain is only as strong as its weakest link. Powerful nations need the cooperation of poorer nations to safeguard global security. The U.S. must regain credibility as a nation that can act for common security and the common good, in order to obtain the international cooperation necessary to thwart nuclear proliferation and defeat terrorism. A renewed commitment to the Nuclear Proliferation Treaty (NPT) vows, as well as the United Nations and other international treaties and regimes, should be sought in order to restore the U.S.'s image as a global partner. Further, the United States should engage all nuclear weapons states in a joint enterprise to work toward a safer world free from the threat of nuclear weapons and toward the establishment of a more secure global political context that would make that goal possible.

We invented the United Nations for our collective security. We need to fund it and strengthen it to gain leverage in addressing the world's problems. The IAEA and other existing mechanism within the UN systems must be shored up and supported in order to function effectively. This also includes being a good global partner by reducing and eventually eliminating U.S. debt to the UN.

International cooperation is critical to redressing the economic and political conditions that create a breeding ground for potential unrest, especially in the case of radical Islamic jihad. To develop common purpose with moderate Islamic states and Muslim leaders, we need to develop a sweeping plan, on the scale of the Marshall Plan, to address their most pressing economic and social needs. One need only recognize that countries are not going to join with us in fighting terrorism unless we support them in addressing the root causes of social unrest.

The inescapable truth is that we must learn how to reduce grievances and defuse hatred before these emotions are expressed explosively and catastrophically.

To reduce the global nuclear danger, the next President should announce his intent to:

- **Renew commitment to NPT vows**, and reinvigorate our partnerships with the United Nations and other international treaties and regimes in order to restore the U.S.'s image and credibility as a global partner;
- **Shore up existing infrastructure within the IAEA and other relevant agencies**;
- **Achieve the arms reductions agreed to in the Moscow Treaty on Strategic Offensive Reductions by 2009**—three years in advance of the Treaty's time schedule;
- **Abide by the low end of the Treaty permissible range of deployed weapons**;
- **Direct military officials to work with their Russian counterparts to change alert postures of U.S. and Russia strategic forces** to enhance decision time and dramatically reduce the risk of an accidental or unauthorized launch of a ballistic missile;
- **Make clear that the Treaty of Moscow was not the end of arms control**, and emphasize that it is America's intention to engage the Russian Federation to achieve reductions below those set forth in the Moscow accord;
- **Develop a sweeping plan, on the scale of the Marshall Plan, to address the most pressing economic and social needs in moderate Islamic states**;
- **Limit the spread of nuclear weapons technology** by putting in place a system of reliable fuel assurances to support peaceful use of nuclear power;
- **Secure all nuclear weapons material such as plutonium and highly enriched uranium** to the highest standards by promoting best practices and giving technical assistance to any and all states with nuclear capacity; and
- **Reduce the worldwide supply of nuclear weapons** by preventing the emergence of new weapons states and by taking concrete, verifiable actions to reduce the inventories of already-existing nuclear powers.

---

**Charles B. Curtis** is President and Chief Operating Officer of the **Nuclear Threat Initiative**, which works to reduce the global threats from nuclear, biological and chemical weapons.

## Poverty: Combating the Global Crisis

*By John W. Sewell*

# POVERTY

Promoting international economic growth and improving people's quality of life have long stood as pillars of American foreign policy. Unfortunately, nearly half of the world's population does not share the benefits of growing global prosperity, as almost 3 billion people are living in poverty and earning less than \$2 a day.

The existence of global poverty is morally wrong. Moreover, if global poverty continues to persist, the costs to American economic, political, and security interests will grow exponentially, as will its impacts on individual Americans. Eliminating poverty is not just an issue of values and ethics; it is critical to our national security interests. The next U.S. Administration should make eliminating absolute poverty a top-line priority and should work with the rest of the world to combat it immediately and effectively.

Because poverty is a global problem, it will ultimately require a global solution. As the world's largest and most influential economy, the U.S. has a unique opportunity to join the international fight against poverty. Eliminating poverty not only is a moral imperative, but also advances American economic, political, and national security interests, and could significantly improve our international reputation.

To effectively combat global poverty, the next president should concentrate on certain key areas:

- **Investing in Open Political and Economic Systems.** Countries with market economies and democratic political systems consistently diminish poverty, enjoy greater freedom, and are less prone to violent conflict. By promoting democratic institutions and good governance, the U.S. will encourage the growth of the stable and prosperous market economies that limit poverty most efficiently.
- **Promoting Education for All.** Education has been proven to greatly improve individuals' economic productivity and social activity, thereby planting the seeds for development and democracy in poorer countries. The next Administration should take the lead in international efforts to enroll millions more children in schools and eventually achieve universal education.
- **Improving Health Systems and Disease Prevention.** The large number of rapidly emerging infectious diseases directly contributes to global poverty, harms economic productivity, and severely threatens American and international security. Fighting disease will require cooperation with the rest of the world and concerted investment in health care infrastructure and the provision of vaccines.
- **Opening Space in the Global Marketplace for Poor Countries and Poor People.** Equitable trade liberalization, when paired with investment in domestic development initiatives, can greatly reduce the crippling effects of poverty on the ability of developing countries to participate in the international trading system.

A framework for the U.S. to mount a coordinated attack on global poverty already exists in the form of the UN's Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), the eight development targets agreed upon by 152



governments in 2000 and endorsed by Presidents Clinton and Bush. To fully commit to the goal of ending global poverty, the next Administration should take the following steps:

- **Make ending poverty one of the top foreign policy priorities and reaffirm U.S. support for the MDGs;**
- **Name a new senior official as Coordinator for Ending Poverty;**
- **Establish a committee of deputies of all the agencies that have programs relevant to the goal of ending poverty;**
- **Replace USAID with an independent agency with a broad poverty mandate;**
- **Give this new agency the authority to appoint the Executive Director to the World Bank and represent the U.S. at the UN development agencies;**
- **Establish a “Poverty and Development Account” in the International Affairs budget; and**
- **Fully engage the private sector organizations that play a crucial role in promoting development.**

The fight against poverty has made significant progress in the past half century, but much still remains to be done. By applying the many important lessons learned over the past decades about development policies, the U.S. can take advantage of this historic opportunity to lead the fight to fully eliminate the scourge of global poverty.

---

**John W. Sewell** is a Senior Scholar at the **Woodrow Wilson International Center** and is the former President of the Overseas Development Council.

## U.S. Global Leadership to Safeguard our Climate, Security, and Economy

By Nigel Purvis

# CLIMATE CHANGE

Global climate change is a serious and growing threat to the United States and the world. The adverse impacts are already harming our economy and our communities, and those costs will rise significantly with time. Importantly, climate change also jeopardizes critical U.S. international affairs and security interests. By placing new stresses on vulnerable societies, weak governments, and degraded environments, climate change increases the risk of severe humanitarian crises, mass migration, and armed conflict over scarce natural resources, as well as contributing to the economic malaise that can breed despair, violence, and terrorism.

America faces the challenge of galvanizing international cooperation to both manage inevitable climate change and stabilize the Earth's climate in time to avert catastrophic impacts. We stand a good chance of success, by means that create economic opportunities, improve U.S. security, and advance other societal goals. But our success depends on urgent action at home and far-sighted U.S. leadership internationally. To safeguard our country and the world, we must act in concert with other nations to marshal an effective global response to the climate crisis. Meeting this challenge must become a defining objective of U.S. foreign policy.

Specifically, we must:

- **Set the right example by committing to substantially reduce U.S. greenhouse gas emissions without delay, and by backing that commitment with domestic emissions regulation;**
- **Negotiate international agreements pursuant to new 'Climate Protection Authority,'** which would authorize the President to conclude congressional-executive agreements (not treaties) and would create a credible path for U.S. participation in agreements that ensured equitable action by all major emitting nations;
- **Spur international cooperation to research, develop, and pilot advanced clean energy technologies;**
- **Work with the international community to offer economic incentives to developing nations to speed their adoption of climate-friendly technologies; and**
- **Minimize security threats, instability, and humanitarian crises by catalyzing international cooperation to help vulnerable developing nations adapt to the consequences of climate change.**

---

**Nigel Purvis** is President of **Climate Advisers, Inc.**, a strategic consulting firm specializing in U.S. and international climate change policy; he previously served as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans, Environment, and Science and as a senior U.S. negotiator on climate change.



Better World Campaign  
1800 Massachusetts Avenue, NW 4th Floor  
Washington, DC 20036  
Phone: (202) 462-4900 | Fax: (202) 462-2686  
[www.betterworldcampaign.org](http://www.betterworldcampaign.org)

*This publication was designed and printed by the Better World Campaign*

