



U.S. in the World

TALKING GLOBAL ISSUES WITH AMERICANS:
A PRACTICAL GUIDE

CONTENTS

	1. Introduction: Why a Guide?	3
	2. Acknowledgments/Task Force Members	5
TAB 1 Getting Started	3. Key Background for First-Time Users	8
	4. Core Concepts and Terms	10
	5. Where the Public Is Coming From	14
TAB 2 Top 20 Recommendations	6. Top 20 Recommendations	32
	7. Wonk-Speak Translator	44
TAB 3 America's Role in the World	8. MESSAGING RECOMMENDATIONS, HELPFUL ARGUMENTS & FACTS	
	A. Why Our Foreign Policy Matters So Much	48
	B. What Our Foreign Policy Should Look Like	50
	9. COMMON CRITIQUES & EFFECTIVE RESPONSES	
	A. "We spend too much abroad. Domestic needs come first."	52
	B. "Soft issues are nice, but security/survival issues come first."	53
	C. "No country is perfect. America is a benign superpower."	54
	D. "There is no such thing as an 'international community.'"	55
	E. "Peace is best achieved through strength."	56
	F. "You see the world the way you want it to be, not how it really is."	57
	G. "We can't rely on the old strategies anymore."	58
TAB 4 International Cooperation	10. MESSAGING RECOMMENDATIONS, HELPFUL ARGUMENTS & FACTS	
	A. International Cooperation: Why We Need It	62
	B. International Cooperation: How to Improve It	64
	C. Why What the World Thinks of Us Matters	66
	11. COMMON CRITIQUES & EFFECTIVE RESPONSES	
	A. "America must not compromise its sovereignty/flexibility."	68
	B. "We can't entrust decisions about U.S. security to others."	69
	C. "We're not opposed to all treaties ... just the bad ones."	70
	D. "International organizations/bureaucracies are inefficient."	71
	E. "Being resented for being No. 1 goes with the territory."	72
	F. "Leadership is not a popularity contest."	73
TAB 5 Terrorism, Spread of Deadly Weapons, Use of Force	12. MESSAGING RECOMMENDATIONS, HELPFUL ARGUMENTS & FACTS	
	A. What to Do About Terrorism	78
	B. What to Do About the Spread of Deadly Weapons	80
	C. Improving Cooperation to Prevent the Spread of Deadly Weapons	82
	D. Special Topic: Talking about the Use of Force	84

TAB 5 (CONTINUED)

**Terrorism,
Spread of Deadly
Weapons,
Use of Force**

13. COMMON CRITIQUES & EFFECTIVE RESPONSES

A. “Why should we absorb the first blow?”	86
B. “We have no choice but to prevent through military preemption.”	87
C. “New threats require new means.”	88
D. “We should be able to develop any weapons we need.”	89
E. “Proliferation is inevitable.”	90
F. “Verification doesn’t work.”	91
G. “Only America can prevent proliferation. We must do it our way.”	92
H. “What do you propose we do when countries break international rules?”	93

TAB 6

**Poverty,
Development,
Trade**

14. MESSAGING RECOMMENDATIONS, HELPFUL ARGUMENTS & FACTS

A. Why it Matters How Other People Live	98
B. Helping People and Countries Lift Themselves Out of Poverty: What Works	100
C. “Nation Building”	102
D. Special Topic: Talking About Trade and the Global Economy	104

15. COMMON CRITIQUES & EFFECTIVE RESPONSES

A. “The poor will always be with us ... there’s only so much we can do.”	107
B. “Foreign aid just creates dependency.”	108
C. “Poverty has nothing to do with terrorism.”	109
D. “The problem is corruption.”	110
E. “We’re already so generous. The U.S. can’t do it all.”	111
F. “The market will solve these problems—trade, not aid.”	112
G. “We invest in good performers, not every basket case.”	113

TAB 7

**Energy,
Global Warming**

16. MESSAGING RECOMMENDATIONS, HELPFUL ARGUMENTS & FACTS

A. Why America’s Energy Choices Matter	118
B. Global Warming	120
C. A 21st-Century Energy Strategy	122

17. COMMON CRITIQUES & EFFECTIVE RESPONSES

A. “What you propose would harm our economy.”	124
B. “The market will take care of this; let the private sector lead.”	125
C. “The science isn’t conclusive on global warming. You use scare tactics.”	126
D. “The international approach on global warming is unfair.”	127
E. “What you propose would restrict our choices and compromise safety.”	128
F. “Face it, oil is going to be central for a very long time.”	129
G. “You’re unrealistic. ... Yours are pipedream technologies.”	130

TAB 8

**Engaging
Citizens**

18. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Yardsticks to Help Citizens Evaluate U.S. Policy and Actions	136
B. Talking About What Citizens Can Do	138

DETACHABLE SUMMARY CARDS

INTRODUCTION

WHY A GUIDE?

Stephen Heintz, President, Rockefeller Brothers Fund

Walter Isaacson, President and CEO, The Aspen Institute

This guide grows out of a deepening sense of urgency that the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and The Aspen Institute's Global Interdependence Initiative share with many other organizations and individuals in the United States. That urgency stems in part from the fact that U.S. and international responses to many global challenges—AIDS, terrorism and the spread of deadly weapons, poverty and inequality, climate change and biodiversity loss, and more—are still not commensurate with the scale of those problems or our capacity to make progress toward solving them. It arises, too, from the recognition that America now faces critical choices about who it is and wants to be in an increasingly interdependent world—choices that will have a profound impact on Americans, on other peoples and countries, and on future generations. And it comes from the belief that **only a broader, more engaged and more active constituency of Americans** can encourage policymakers to support the kind of sustained investment, involvement, and leadership needed from the United States to tackle global challenges effectively.

These concerns are not new, and addressing these challenges will require years of sustained effort. In fact, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and The Aspen Institute began the collaboration that led to the Global Interdependence Initiative in the mid-1990s. **Our basic principle was and remains simple:** America's open and democratic system is a source of strength for its foreign policy. The collective wisdom of the American public, accompanied by its informed consent and support, help to give our nation's global engagements their moral legitimacy and their sustaining power.

The sense of urgency we feel today has led us and others working on global issues to acknowledge that whatever we have been doing to reach out to the American public, and however successful we have been in engaging citizens in discrete policy debates, it is simply not enough. **At a time when our country faces fundamental questions of national identity and purpose, we still lack a broad, bipartisan public constituency for pragmatic, principled, effective, and cooperative U.S. global engagement.** Though polling tells us that many Americans care about global problems and support such an internationalist vision of America's role, non-expert citizens are often not confident enough of their knowledge and opinions—or of their ability to make a difference—to speak up actively on foreign policy issues. Highly specialized and jargon-filled debates among foreign policy specialists and advocates do little to invite citizens into the national dialogue on U.S. global engagement or to dissuade citizens from deciding they should leave foreign policy to “the experts.”

So increasingly, advocates and experts who speak to Americans about global issues and this country's role in addressing them have come together to ask themselves, **“What do we stand for, what do we want to say, and how could we be saying it more effectively?”** Some of these conversations have taken place within specific issue areas; a few of them have brought organizations together across issues. Inevitably, many such conversations are unfolding in relative isolation from one another. But common to all the discussions has been a new interest among groups in working together and in identifying shared values and outreach strategies around which to collaborate.

The idea behind *U.S. in the World* was to create a space in which leading participants in those conversations—and others interested in similar questions—might work together on a project that would potentially benefit them all and give concrete form to some of their deliberations about shared values and strategies. The **nearly two-year process that led to the publication of this guide** involved at its core a Task Force of about 50 individuals representing many different areas of foreign policy expertise; in addition, the process incorporated advice from hundreds of experts on U.S. foreign policy, public opinion, and communications, collected through meetings, surveys, interviews, literature reviews, and other means. Some of the Task Force members had never met before, and most of them—development

advocates, energy and environmental organizers, nonproliferation and arms control experts, foreign policy scholars, youth activists, faith-based leaders—had never rolled up their sleeves to collaborate on a common task. Together they worked to identify some of the **key elements of a shared, nonpartisan vision of how America should engage with the world—a vision that would combine the common sense and common decency that has characterized U.S. global leadership at its best and most effective.** They winnowed from their expertise the top-priority themes and arguments that they wished more Americans were hearing about a number of critical issues. And with extensive input from communications experts, their deliberations produced practical recommendations about how to articulate those key themes and arguments, and connect them to big ideas about what kind of global citizen America should be.

The goal was to create **a practical guide that would enhance efforts to build constituencies on specific global issues, while also reinforcing for the public some core elements of a shared, positive vision of America's role in the world.** The creators of this guide hope it will help communicators to meet the short-term objectives of today's policy debates while also advancing the long-term objective of creating a broad-based, well informed, and active constituency for principled and constructive U.S. global engagement. To put it another way, we hope that communications informed by this guide will make a set of individual foreign policy issues clearer and more compelling to citizens, while also providing citizens with some overarching ideas and assumptions they can use to assess other global issues and policy options.

The project aims as well to create **a flexible framework within which experts and advocates might help one another across issue lines, talk with one another about the implications of their communications choices, and lay the foundation for future dialogue and learning.** The participants in this project have been inspired by a belief that public opinion is most likely to be crystallized and mobilized when a diverse and growing community of messengers begins to coalesce around shared themes and messages, even if they can't find common ground on every detail of their policy prescriptions.

What are the broad, cross-cutting themes on which this guide is based? They are principles that reflect convictions held by diverse experts and by the majority of non-expert American citizens, who consistently tell pollsters that they want the U.S. to do what works and what's right, and that they prefer to find peaceful solutions to global problems in cooperation with others. Principles such as building strength through teamwork and mutual respect; seeing the big picture; looking ahead and planning ahead; keeping our promises and practicing what we preach; using comprehensive strategies to address complex problems; and investing in the future. These are the kinds of big, nonpartisan ideas that are referenced throughout this guide, in the arguments and facts associated with each topic, in the messaging recommendations, in the suggested responses to tough questions, and in the quotes from thoughtful policymakers and policy analysts—of all ideological persuasions—that appear at the end of each section.

U.S. in the World offers a consistent, coherent vision. But it is **a scaffolding, not a script.** Few users will be comfortable with every single messaging recommendation or sample argument in these pages; none of the issue experts or communications experts who offered advice in this guide's creation will find it reflects all their recommendations. Because it is intended for use by those who are already knowledgeable about their particular issue focus, it is not an issue guide. It does not address every important global challenge that the United States confronts. And while the guide's techniques are meant to help users get a better hearing for their own insights and viewpoints, it does not seek to replace them. It does aim, however, to **encourage the emergence of a shared sense of purpose and broad unifying themes across issues and among diverse messengers.**

We invite you to become part of a growing network of communicators who are committed to inspiring more U.S. citizens to care about a broad range of global policy challenges and to educating Americans about the global issues that affect our own and future generations. The users of this guide constitute a network of communicators who are determined to **equip American citizens for reflection and debate on this country's foreign policy choices, and to encourage citizens to play a role in solving today's and tomorrow's global challenges.** These goals cannot be achieved on a meaningful scale overnight, or without patient and sustained effort. We hope this guide enables such an effort.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This guide is the fruit of the efforts and experience of scores of individuals who for two years pooled their expertise generously and enthusiastically under the aegis of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and the Aspen Institute's Global Interdependence Initiative (GII). The authors who compiled and edited the guide, Heather Hurlburt, Priscilla Lewis and P.J. Simmons, owe their first debt to the founding task force that was at the heart of the effort (see next page). Task force members brought their personal and institutional knowledge, communications wisdom and boundless energy to every aspect of this guide's content and format. While the authors take responsibility for final decisions and any errors in this document, all credit for its breadth of content, ease of use and pioneering spirit of community belong to the task force.

We also are deeply indebted to the following individuals who gave unstintingly of their time and expertise to guide us on communications and messaging questions: Robert Boorstin, Daniel Gotoff, Steven Kull, Celinda Lake, George Lakoff, Jeremy Rosner, and all the principals at the FrameWorks Institute. In addition, we wish to thank the entire team at Mindshare Interactive Campaigns for steering so brilliantly the creative and production process of the print version, Web site and CD-Rom; David Steuer and Adam Werbach of Act Now Productions for extraordinary video contributions for the Web site, CD-Rom, and video library of communications best practices for trainings; Laufer Green Isaac for helping to design a set of outstanding materials for communications trainings; Alfred Imhoff for providing superb editorial assistance; the staff members at the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and the Aspen Institute for their general support and collegiality; and the board of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, for its generous support of this effort from its inception.

Finally, we thank the many experts and communicators who have provided input since the project began—attending a meeting, responding to a survey, participating in a mock debate, being interviewed, helping to summarize research, or otherwise providing honest feedback: Martha Adams, Tundi Agardy, Suzy Antonian, Deana Arsenian, David Arnold, Benjamin Barber, Nancy Birdsall, Kennette Benedict, Michael Bernstein, Jared Blumenfeld, Carroll Bogert, Naila Bolus, Kathy Bonk, Heather Booth, Ruben Brigety, John Briscoe, Charlotte Brody, Martin Butcher, Charlie Cardillo, Kate Cell, Oscar Chacon, Christopher Chyba, Joseph Cirincione, Marcus Corbin, Kim Cranston, Barbara Crossette, Phyllis Cuttino, Jay Davis, Valerie DeFillipo, Brian Deese, Lew Diggs, Steve Del Rosso, Therese Delpech, Elliot Diringer, Chad Dobson, David Dougherty, Joan Dunlop, Andrea Durbin, Edith Eddy, Suzanne Ehlers, Jane Elder, Bob Engelman, Cynthia Farrar, Dan Feldman, Charles Ferguson, Brian Finlay, Jim Fishkin, Jessica Flag, Chris Flavin, Bill Fletcher, Ann Florini, Robert Fri, Alfred Friendly, Shepard Forman, Leon Fuerth, Meg Gage, Will Gartshore, Geoffrey Garrett, Ross Gelbspan, Michael Gelobter, Mimi Ghez, Charles Gibbs, Peter Gleick, David Gold, K.C. Golden, Sherri Goodman, Vartan Gregorian, Elise Groulx, Jason Gross, Jason Grumet, Hank Habicht, Mort Halperin, George Hamilton, Heather Hamilton, J. Drake Hamilton, Aleya Hammad, John Hamre, Rich Hayes, Lucas Haynes, Bud Heckman, Jacob Heilbrunn, Gordon Hein, Jacob Eric Heitz, Bracken Hendricks, Ned Helme, Michael Hirsh, John Holdren, Nicholas Hope, Robert Hunter, Ned Helme, John Isaacs, Shanto Iyengar, Mark Jacobs, Wayne Jaquith, Jean Johnson, Shanthi Kalathil, Anisa Kamadoli, Paul Kennedy, Drew Kodjak, Larry Kopald, Kevin Knobloch, Charlie Kupchan, Ellen Laipson, Jeffrey Laurenti, Les Leopold, Michael Levine, Nancy Lewis, Sally Lilienthal, Eugene Linden, Tom Lovejoy, Sarah Lucas, William Luers, Princeton Lyman, Bill Luers, Ken Luongo, Janet Maughan, Michael Maibach, Kamal Malhotra, David Malone, Susan West Marmagas, Faye Mandell, Jim Marzilli, Jessica T. Mathews, William Maynes, Mary McClymont, Bill McInturff, Charles MacCormack, Andrew Moravcsk, Bobby Muller, William Nash, Kevin Nealer, Pat Nicholas, Dane Nichols, Janne Nolan, Bill Novelli, Joseph Nye, Ray Offenheiser, Robert Oxnam, Thomas Palley, Amir Pasic, Stewart Patrick, Matthew Pawa, Charles Pena, George Perkovich, Karen Perry, Duane Peterson, James Pinkerton, Kathy Pomroy, Carl Pope, Samantha Power, Chris Preble, Mitchell Reiss, Bud Ris, Mark Ritchie, Sergey Rogov, Pat Rosenfield, Rhys Roth, Chuck Savitt, Jeffrey Sachs, Lara Saxman, David Scheffer, Jacob Scherr, Marcus Schneider, Robert Schwartz, Stephen Schwartz, Liz Schroyer, Susan Sechler, John W. Sewell, Ritu Sharma, Jeff Shesol, Smita Singh, Anne-Marie Slaughter, Sandra Smithey, Daniel Sneider, David Speedie, Gene Sperling, David Steuer, Ron Steel, Kathleen Sullivan, Robert Sullivan, Linda Tarr-Whelan, Betsy Taylor, Peter Teague, Shibley Telhami, Greg Treverton, George Trone, Erin Tunney, Libby Turpen, Karsten Voigt, Jane Wales, Hal and Marilyn Weiner, Jeremy Weinstein, Adam Werbach, Mason Willrich, Chris Wing, Timothy Wirth, Marissa Vitagliano, Lowell Weiss, Josh Weissburg, Charles Wolf, Ruth Wooden, Robert Wright, David Yang, Daniel Yankelovich, Lawrence Yanovich, June Zeitlan, Carolina Zumaran-Jones, and Benjamin Zycher.

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Priscilla Lewis and P. J. Simmons, Co-Chairs

Paul Bledsoe	Hewlett Energy Commission
Peter Blomquist	Better Safer World Campaign
Lael Brainard	Brookings Institution
Ben Brandzel	Consultant
Davis Bunn	Author
Isabella Bunn	University of Oxford
Deb Callahan	League of Conservation Voters
John Cavanagh	Institute for Policy Studies
Bill Clapp	The Seattle Initiative
Phil Clapp	National Environmental Trust
Steve Clemons	New America Foundation
David Cortright	Fourth Freedom Forum
Tanya Dawkins	Inter-American Forum
Nisha Desai	Interaction
Reid Detchon	Energy Future Coalition
David Devlin-Foltz	Global Interdependence Initiative
Mark Epstein	Physicians for Social Responsibility
Ashok Gupta	Natural Resources Defense Council
David Hamilton	National Religious Partnership for the Environment
William Hartung	World Policy Institute
Stephen Heintz	Rockefeller Brothers Fund
Sheila Herrling	Center for Global Development
Robert Hunter	RAND Corporation
Heather Hurlburt	Consultant
George Ingram	Basic Education Coalition / Campaign to Preserve U.S. Global Leadership
Bruce Jentleson	Duke University
Lorelei Kelly	The Stimson Center
Daryl Kimball	Arms Control Association
Lawrence Korb	Council on Foreign Relations / Center for American Progress
The Rev. Eileen Lindner	National Council of Churches
Michael Litz	OneWorld U.S.
Robert Musil	Physicians for Social Responsibility
Jennifer Potter	The Seattle Initiative / Global Partnerships
Clyde Prestowitz	Economic Strategy Institute
Kevin Quigley	National Peace Corps Association
Tarek Rizk	Global Interdependence Initiative
David Sandalow	Brookings Institution
Susan Shaer	Women's Action for New Directions
Sonal Shah	Center for American Progress
Michael Shellenberger	The Apollo Alliance
Gayle Smith	Center for American Progress
Amy Smithson	Center for Strategic and International Studies
Abby Spring	Consultant
Jim Steinberg	Brookings Institution
Adam Taylor	Global Justice
Sid Voorakara	The United Nations Foundation
Jon Wolfsthal	Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
Emira Woods	Foreign Policy in Focus

TAB 1
GETTING STARTED

CONTENTS

3.	KEY BACKGROUND FOR FIRST-TIME USERS	8
4.	CORE CONCEPTS AND TERMS	10
5.	WHERE THE PUBLIC IS COMING FROM	14



U.S. in the World
TALKING GLOBAL ISSUES WITH AMERICANS:
A PRACTICAL GUIDE

Note: Sources for facts and figures in this section, along with recommended sources for keeping facts and figures up to date, are available in the “Keeping Current” section of www.usintheworld.org.

KEY BACKGROUND FOR FIRST-TIME USERS

- This guide pulls together facts and arguments and effective ways to put them across for advocates of positive, pragmatic, internationalist, collaborative global engagement. **In both form and content, the guide is designed to be a practical tool that supports efforts to advance single-issue causes *and* a shared vision for the U.S. in the world.**
- The guide was created for issue advocates, foreign policy experts, community activists, professional communicators, and any citizens who want to talk with other Americans directly or through the media about U.S. foreign policy. It is **meant to be used by individuals who already have a good understanding of an issue**; it is not a comprehensive guide to the issues or a primer for the public. It is designed to help those who are called upon frequently to speak about foreign policy and global issues, and who could benefit from having their core arguments summarized and framed in ways that research suggests are more likely to engage a large segment of the public. The guide is designed for speakers, but many of its suggestions also will help writers seeking to reach nonexpert citizen audiences. The print edition of the guide focuses on communications challenges involved in choosing *words*; the www.usintheworld.org Web site recommends supplementary resources that will help users with other important communications challenges, from how to write a press release to publicizing a local debate.
- The messaging recommendations draw on a large, varied body of research by communications and public opinion experts who use a range of techniques—polling, focus groups, cognitive analysis, media content analysis, and more—to understand what and *how* Americans think about foreign policy issues. Recommendations are meant to **help users make issues more understandable to a diverse cross-section of Americans** who pay attention to news, get involved in their communities, and vote—but **who do not track foreign policy issues closely and do not hold ideologically rigid views**. Recommendations are designed to help communicators reach individuals with moderate and ideologically flexible views, not those at the far left or extreme right of the ideological spectrum. The spirit of most recommendations should apply to most audiences of issue-attentive, moderate Americans—women, people of faith, people of color, students, business leaders, and more. However, speakers with detailed knowledge of particular communities will likely find more powerful words, anecdotes, metaphors, and the like to implement the guide’s recommendations, and are urged to explore specialized research to supplement this resource.
- **This guide offers highly vetted advice based on a wide-ranging consultative process** involving hundreds of foreign policy and global issue experts, advocates, and several leading communications and public opinion researchers (see the acknowledgments). The task force members who led this effort and the authors of this guide believe, however, that messaging choices—especially those that have the potential to be embraced by a diverse, knowledgeable community of users—are difficult to make and rarely involve cut-and-dried answers. They recognize that researchers with various perspectives—pollsters, cognitive linguists, psychologists, grassroots campaigners, public relations professionals, advertising executives—all bring valuable experience. This makes it highly challenging to try to agree on what “the messages” should be. However, they understand the value of mutually supportive messages that evoke the same “big story” about how America should act in the world, a story whose chapter headings unite them at a fundamental level.

- This resource is offered in that spirit. **It does not reflect any one body of communications research**, and is not intended to take the place of the research reports and recommendations that inform it; the authors strongly recommend that advocates avail themselves of these reports and challenge their own creativity to applying this learning. Indeed, none of our advisors—whether policy experts or communications experts—is likely to be comfortable with every messaging recommendation or sample argument in this guide. Nor will every user. But we hope that the guide will be a **strong point of departure that adds to the effectiveness of diverse public outreach efforts**. And we hope that it **can facilitate dialogue and debate among a growing community of users working on foreign-policy-related messaging, whose deliberations will help to refine this guide’s recommendations over time**.
- The founding task force members of the U.S. in the World network invite you to be part of a growing community of individuals and organizations who are in it for the long haul—who care passionately about getting more U.S. citizens to want to learn about the global challenges that will affect our children, arming them with questions that will enable them to evaluate America’s choices and inspiring them to play a role in solutions. **We hope that you will connect with others** who share similar interests and goals. We hope you’ll continue to track research, question your own communications choices, and talk about them with others. We offer some resources that may help you in the “Keeping Current” and “Community Resources” sections of www.usintheworld.org.

10-Minute Orientation: How to Find What You Need Fast

1. Take time at least to skim three key sections before you dive into using the guide: (1) **Core Concepts and Terms**, Tab 1, pages 10–13; (2) **Where the Public Is Coming From**, Tab 1, pages 14–30; and (3) **Top 20 Recommendations**, Tab 2.
2. Get a feel for the organization of **MESSAGING ADVICE, HELPFUL ARGUMENTS & FACTS**:
 - For example, open to Tab 4 (International Cooperation). Note that each tab has its own contents list. Find the page for “10A. International Cooperation,” go to that page, and find the “**Messaging Recommendations**” on the **insert** with “Do, Don’t, and Keep in Mind.”
 - Note the **blue “gateway” sentences**—examples of how a speaker might carry out Top 20 recommendation #10 (*Identify 3–4 important messages that can draw in listeners and serve as “gateways” for more complicated points*). Detailed bulleted arguments and facts follow.
 - Note the **red “big ideas” in the margins**: The blue “gateway” sentences and sample text below them are designed to evoke these.
3. Get a feel for the organization of **COMMON CRITIQUES & EFFECTIVE RESPONSES**:
 - Return to Tab 4’s contents list and find the page number for one of the “Common Critiques” that you frequently encounter. Flip to that page, where you will see a variety of suggested options for responding. **Key phrases are in bold red type**.
4. Find the **5 detachable pages** at the back of the book. They summarize—in shorthand and in no particular order—the Top 20 recommendations, blue “gateway” sentences, and key phrases to help you respond effectively to common critiques. We encourage you to use these selectively and to consult relevant sections of the book for elaboration and messaging recommendations.
5. Quickly tour the **Web site** at www.usintheworld.org, which features recommendations for “**Keeping Current**” on communications research and recommendations, facts, and arguments—as well as a variety of other free “**Community Resources**” that can connect you to peers with similar objectives and link you to helpful sites for engaging more Americans on foreign policy issues.

CORE CONCEPTS AND TERMS

The following three pages summarize the basic background for a handful of key concepts that have been central to the approach used in reviewing the research and developing the content for this guide. You can explore these concepts in more depth through the resources cited on the “Keeping Current” page of www.usintheworld.org.

This guide is built on the premise that effective communications requires understanding not only what people think, but WHY they think as they do.

- Research on human cognition, according to anthropologist Axel Aubrun and linguist Joe Grady of Cultural Logic, shows that **deeply held views of the world and assumptions about how the world works** guide people’s thinking and reasoning in largely unconscious and automatic ways. These mental constructs, which are derived from various sources—personal experience, cultural norms, mainstream news and entertainment, fables and popular sayings, religious beliefs, ethical values—function as “shortcuts,” familiar points of reference that enable people to process and assign meaning to new information by relating it to something they already know.
- In other words, when confronted with new information, people rely on their existing understandings to decide quickly “what this is about,” as Susan Bales of the FrameWorks Institute puts it. Then they interpret what they hear or read through the lens of that **big idea** or familiar concept (“fairness,” “teamwork,” “wise management,” “individual responsibility,” “the sky is falling,” “an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure,” and so on). Cognitive scientist George Lakoff of the Rockridge Institute tells us that humans naturally seek to assign meaning at this higher level of thought first, before getting to the details.
- In large measure, the assignment of meaning at this higher level guides a person’s thinking from that point on. Different big ideas can head people down very different **paths of reasoning**—and can ultimately lead them, quite logically, to very different choices, actions, preferences, and the like. For example, the widely shared idea that America already bears more than its share of the world’s humanitarian burdens sets up one train of thought about increasing development assistance. But an entirely different logical process is created by the idea that the world is an interconnected system in which we need others and they need us to solve common problems.
- The lesson for communicators is that “people are not blank slates,” an observation that the FrameWorks Institute has advanced. Your communications interact with the pictures, stories, and concepts that are already in people’s heads. Which of those preexisting ideas is activated and begins to guide your listener’s reasoning will determine whether he or she pays attention or tunes out, believes what you’re saying or rejects your facts, forms new opinions or confirms deeply held preconceptions, wants to get involved or feels powerless, and so on. **Facts and evidence are often not enough** to engage, persuade, or mobilize an audience, if the higher-level concept that prevails doesn’t admit those facts or prevents their correct interpretation. For example, because the notion that America does more than its share internationally is so firmly entrenched, simply presenting evidence to the contrary will do little to shake the public’s belief that the U.S. spends 15 to 20 times more than it really does on foreign affairs.

- Effective communication requires knowing which big ideas are likely to dominate most people's thinking on your issues. It also requires knowing **which big ideas will allow people to hear you and to follow your arguments**. The big ideas you evoke in your communications, the sequence in which you introduce those ideas, and the words and tone you use all play a critical role in determining how listeners understand and think about your issues—and potentially about other foreign policy issues they may encounter. The right choices can provide an opportunity for thoughtful and sustained conversation. They can help to open minds, encourage people to see an issue in new light, allow your arguments and facts to get a fair hearing, and inspire people to get involved. The wrong choices can get the door slammed in your face and trigger mindsets that make people tune out, disbelieve facts, or drift back to misinformed preconceptions.
- Recognizing this, the *U.S. in the World* Task Force paid particular attention to researchers' cautions regarding **certain instinctive choices that could have potentially negative, unintended consequences**—how, for instance, trying to mobilize public support for international arms control agreements by emphasizing how easily terrorists could steal or concoct biological weapons and the horrific consequences of their doing so—might have the opposite effect of what is intended, immobilizing people with fear and confirming their suspicions that nothing really works to prevent proliferation.

This guide reflects a conviction that research can help communicators understand why people think as they do and can reveal which communications choices are most likely to enable people to see issues in a new way. But it also reflects a belief that no single research technique or approach can provide all the answers.

- The recommendations offered in this guide draw on the experience of a diverse group of practitioners who regularly speak with Americans about global issues, as well as on findings from many different kinds of communications and public opinion research sponsored by many different organizations. The task force also benefited from extensive consultations with a handful of leading public opinion and messaging experts—including Robert Boorstin, Daniel Gotoff, Steven Kull, Celinda Lake, George Lakoff, Jeremy Rosner, and the team at the FrameWorks Institute—who have led major studies on American public attitudes on foreign policy and global issues. **The guide does not, however, reflect recommendations from any one set of communications experts.**
- **Traditional polling and survey data** provided a good foundation of information on what people think about issues at a given time and how strong their opinions are. **“Meta-analysis”** of opinion research, synthesizing large bodies of data, helped identify some of the most important common threads and constant themes across a range of opinion-gathering exercises. **Focus group** research shed light on why people hold certain views and how they reason about issues. **Media content analysis**—which tracks how the news media cover issues—helped explain where Americans get many of their dominant ideas about what the world is like, what foreign policy is, how the U.S. behaves in the world, and so on. **Message testing** research offered insights into which formulations of themes and arguments might be most compelling to the public or might raise the salience of important global issues. (For more on some of these bodies of research see “Where the Public Is Coming From” on pages 14-30.)

- Because there are limits to what can be learned about unconscious patterns of thought by asking people directly, this guide also reflects input from the **social and cognitive sciences**. Groups like the FrameWorks Institute, Cultural Logic, and the Rockridge Institute conduct studies to illuminate the “hidden reasoning” that lies behind the opinions people express in polls. FrameWorks, for instance, has conducted a series of studies to identify the “frames” (the big ideas and mental constructs that guide people’s thinking) that the public tends to employ most frequently when processing information about U.S. foreign policy and global issues; they explore how those frames may affect the public’s policy preferences; and they seek to understand which communications choices—words, images, messengers, metaphors, and more—trigger which associations and stories in people’s heads.
- Lessons learned by successful communications **practitioners** and foreign policy issue experts also inform the recommendations offered in this guide. The *U.S. in the World* Task Force worked together to sort through the research findings and advice offered by communications experts and to apply the experts’ advice to their own experiences—and in turn, we asked several communications experts to comment on the practitioners’ ideas and questions.
- The task force’s review of multiple bodies of research and input from communications advisors revealed considerable common ground among experts on communications, messaging, and public opinion—and significant areas of divergence. While many data are available on public attitudes about international affairs and on ways to advance particular arguments, the science behind crafting communications and messaging recommendations is not exact. Pollsters with specific goals—such as helping a group achieve a certain legislative victory—offer one kind of advice based on a particular perspective and methodology; pollsters with longer time horizons and an interest in trends in public opinion can offer different advice. Cognitive linguists bring a unique lens to interpreting data. Public relations professionals, advertising executives, political campaigners, social psychologists, grassroots organizers—all are accustomed to addressing different set of concerns and view communications through their own particular lens. Researchers come to different conclusions about which big ideas and “frames” (and in which sequence) should dominate communications. **The answers are rarely cut-and-dried**, and the smart consumer of communications advice will maintain an open mind, a critical eye when reviewing new messaging research, and an experimental attitude.
- This guide reflects areas of agreement and near-agreement among the many communications experts and practitioners we consulted. It does not, however, reflect any one school of thought or demonstrate how one might carry out the recommendations of a single body of research. Indeed, some communications experts and organizations that advised the task force have published their own recommendations and tool kits that are fully consistent with their own findings (For links to relevant Web sites, see the boxes on pages 14-30 and the Keeping Current section of www.usintheworld.org.) Where there were clashes of opinion—either among communications experts or between the communications experts and the communications practitioners—we have tried to portray those differences in the “Keep in Mind” sections of the messaging recommendations so that users of the guide can make their own **informed choices**.

This guide’s design and content are meant to help diverse messengers reference common themes, common big ideas, and elements of a shared big story—even if the details of their communications differ. When that happens, each communicator’s message is more resonant and compelling for nonexpert citizens, and the cumulative effects of communications are more powerful.

- Communications choices that unite diverse messengers around shared themes and messages can be enormously powerful. Think of how the broad themes of freedom, dignity, and equality linked the various dimensions of the civil rights movement—from education, to voting rights, to housing discrimination—and how those themes have served to link the original civil rights movement to subsequent efforts to ensure equal rights for women, the disabled, and others. The *U.S. in the World* Task Force was inspired by the possibility that advocates of principled and constructive American policies on one set of issues—say, global environmental challenges—might **begin to echo some of the same big themes** as advocates of principled and constructive American policies on other issues—development, energy, global poverty, the proliferation of deadly weapons, and more. Similarly, the task force understood the potential value of a policy wonk in Washington beginning to tell the same big story about America’s role in the world as a grassroots organizer in Walla Walla, Washington.
- The *U.S. in the World* Task Force sought to develop research-based messaging recommendations and sample language that would help communicators meet both the **short-term** communications goals of today’s policy debates and the **longer-term** goal of building a broad-based, well-informed, engaged constituency for pragmatic, constructive, cooperative, and principled U.S. global engagement. Task force members rejected advice that would put a dishonest spin on issues, or that risked undercutting long-term public education goals—even if some of those strategies (like pitting domestic needs against international needs) might provide a particular issue (like the cost of acting alone in Iraq) with a short-term boost in salience.
- The task force members hope that new and diverse messengers will continue to seek to identify the common “chapter headings” of the big story that they share—even if they cannot find common ground on every detail of their policy priorities. We hope that the repetition and reinforcement of that big story will help to strengthen communications on behalf of **single-issue causes** and to advance a vision for America’s role in the world that connects those issues in **a broad foreign policy framework**. And though we recognize that reaching agreement on the elements of a shared big story is difficult and requires patience and sustained work, we believe that the continued search is worth the effort.

WHERE THE PUBLIC IS COMING FROM

How does the U.S. public currently see the world and America's role in it? There's no simple answer. The polling data—and interpretations of the data—often seem contradictory. The following “interview” with a virtual John/Jane Q. Public is designed to shed some light on this subject by bringing to life a composite of majority or median public positions, based on responses to scores of recent polls and surveys. An annotated version of this interview that includes the actual poll questions and responses can be found at www.usintheworld.org.

Scattered throughout the interview are excerpts from some of the most thoughtful and thought-provoking research on public attitudes toward U.S. foreign policy. These excerpts focus on “where the public is coming from”—not on the results of message testing or on the communications implications of opinion research findings. Messaging recommendations from the experts quoted here, and others, were synthesized as part of the *U.S. in the World* process and are reflected throughout the guide.

THE VOICE OF THE PUBLIC | BY STEVEN KULL,

Director of the Program on International Policy Attitudes

(Some passages of this mock interview appeared previously in the September/October 2001 and May/June 2004 issues of Foreign Policy.)

U.S. ROLE IN THE WORLD

Q: Rumor has it that in the '90s, with the end of the Cold War, you were in the mood to withdraw from the world, but all that changed with September 11 and now you are much more ready for the U.S. to use its military power. Are these rumors true?

A: Hmm. Not really. After the Cold War I did not think it was an option for the U.S. to withdraw from the world. We're so interconnected with the world now it's not really an option. September 11 did drive that home, though, so whatever lingering ideas I had about whether we could just turn our backs on the world—those pretty much got wiped out.

Q: So you like the way the U.S. is involved in the world?

A: Well, I didn't say that. Before September 11 I felt that the U.S. played the dominant role—like being the world policeman—more than it should. And I still feel that way now. It seems like we always feel that we have to be out front as the big world leader. I'd like to see that ramped down some.

Q: So it does sound like you want to disengage from the world somewhat.

A: No. I just want to see the U.S. work together with other countries more—have the U.S. do its share in solving problems together with other countries. I don't like being the Lone Ranger so much. We should work through the UN more.

Q: But since the UN Security Council refused to back the war against Iraq, haven't you soured on the UN?

A: Well, I was disappointed that the UN failed to come to an agreement on Iraq. But that does not mean I don't want to keep trying to work through the UN. I do. In fact, I would like to see the UN play an even bigger role in the world than it does now.

Q: Why is it so important to work in these multilateral ways?

A: Well, first of all, I don't like us having to do the job all by ourselves. I'd rather share the burden. But it's also that the UN just has the right to do things the U.S. does not necessarily have the right to do. So it's probably going to work better, because it's not just the U.S. throwing its weight around.

Q: But didn't you support the U.S. going to war with Iraq even though it did not have UN approval?

A: Well, before the war I thought we should take time to build support at the United Nations. Once the UN inspectors were in Iraq, it seemed like we should give them a chance. I feel that we were too quick to use military force. But I also felt then and still feel now that if the president decides to use military force, it is important to stand behind him.

Q: Why was it so important to get UN support?

A: I'm not sure we have the right to march in and overthrow a government, even if it is trying to build nuclear weapons.

Q: Does the United Nations have the right to intervene like that?

A: Yeah. Definitely.

Q: What if a country poses an imminent threat to the United States? Is unilateral action justified then?

A: Well yeah, I mean if it's in self-defense and they are about to attack. But it should be pretty clear-cut.

Q: Did you think that Iraq posed such an imminent threat?

A: Probably not.

Q: What do you think about the argument that that the war was justified because Saddam was a dictator violating the rights of its people?

A: I don't really think the United States has the right to do that kind of thing. You still need UN approval, unless it is something really large-scale and extreme—like genocide.

Q: Do you think what Saddam was doing reached that level?

A: Well it was pretty bad, but, no, not like genocide. There are probably other governments in the world right now that are as bad as Saddam's.

THE NEWS AMERICANS SEE

The Center for Media and Public Affairs examined the broadcast and print media's treatment of global news during the month immediately following 9/11 and during March 2002, six months later, comparing this to pre-9/11 coverage.

"Surprisingly, the terrorist attacks on 9/11 produced only a small increase in foreign news coverage [on television], from 22 percent of all network news stories before September 11 to 29 percent of all stories after September 11. And with two-thirds of all the post-9/11 coverage consumed by Afghanistan, Pakistan, Israel, and the Palestinian Authority, international coverage took on an even narrower focus. In the two months of post-9/11 news that we analyzed, no other country averaged as much as one story per week per network.

"[W]ar and destruction continued to dominate the [television] news media, with 7 out of 10 discussions dealing with armed conflict or natural disasters. But in contrast to pre-9/11 foreign news coverage, the United States was now called on to intervene in these crises with much greater frequency. When a specific course of action was proposed ... the U.S. was urged to take military action 10 times more often than to engage in diplomacy, even after the war in Afghanistan had wound down. [T]he U.S. was cast as the principal actor on the world's stage, ... urged to act on its own three times as often as in concert with its allies ...

"As television is still the primary news source for most Americans, the framework it has created for understanding international events is troubling. Throughout the 1990s, Americans were shown a world that was brutal, chaotic and of little relevance to their concerns. And television did little to convey the economic, ethnic, historical, political and social dimensions to international problems—or the possibility that diplomacy and international cooperation might provide solutions. When intervention was prescribed, it was usually in military terms, and without concern for the approval or cooperation of other nations. These trends continued after 9/11 and were amplified by America's need to defend itself from foreign attack. Although the volume of foreign news increased, its breadth diminished. ... (Our study preceded the debate over war with Iraq, which further intensified these trends.)"

"The parochial qualities of foreign news coverage—intense but fleeting interest in a few flash points directly affecting the U.S. and an emphasis on unilateral action—provides Americans with little sense of the long-term nature of international problems or commitments or the importance of diplomacy and international cooperation."

("A World Apart: Coverage of Foreign News Before and After 9/11," Center for Media and Public Affairs, November 2003; prepared for the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. For more, see www.cmpa.com)

Q: So what do you want to see happen now in Iraq?

A: I would like to see this whole thing put under the UN. Let's not have it be so much the United States out front and being shot at.

Q: But what if that means the United States must let other countries be involved in making key decisions?

A: (Shrugs) What's the big deal with that?

Q: What about humanitarian military intervention and peacekeeping? Do you think the U.S. should participate in those kinds of things?

A: Well that's kind of complicated. I do think that if things like genocide are happening, or if a lot of people are being killed or driven out of their homes, then the world has to step in and do something about it. And sometimes you'll have to use military force. So I am basically for this kind of thing.

Q: So what's the complicated part?

A: Well there are two things that concern me. One is that I am tired of the U.S. always taking the lion's share of the responsibility for everything. And frankly, if others are not willing to do their part, then sometimes I think we should just hang back until they do.

Q: Is it your impression that the U.S. has contributed more than its share of the troops for peacekeeping operations?

A: Yeah.

Q: What percentage would you estimate that the U.S. has contributed?

A: I'd guess the U.S. has contributed about nearly half of all the troops. Now if the other countries would contribute, say, three-quarters of them, it would be fine with me for the U.S. to contribute something like maybe a quarter.

Q: So what is your other concern?

A: You know, I don't think we should go into a situation if it is not really going to do any good. I don't think we should go in just to, you know, make a gesture to show we are good guys and all. I mean, if I felt confident it was going to work, or if the military expressed some confidence that it would work, then, yeah, let's definitely go for it. But, whenever there has been talk about sending troops in, up in Washington everybody starts screaming and yelling about whether we are just going to get stuck there like we did in Vietnam and that it won't really do any good in the end and our troops are going to die in vain. Hell, how am I supposed to know if they are right?

Q: Is it a question of not wanting to put U.S. troops in harm's way unless there is a clear connection to U.S. national interests?

A: I'm not sure what you mean.

Q: Well, do you think that it was important for U.S. national interests to intervene in Bosnia or Kosovo?

A: Hmm, well yeah, I think that if we don't intervene the problem might spread, and then we could really be sorry. But sometimes you also need to intervene because it is the right thing to do, when horrible things happening to ordinary people, civilians, women, and children.

Q: But isn't the preeminent principle that the U.S. should use its power to make the world be the way that best serves U.S. interests?

A: Well, sure, U.S. interests are important. I just don't think that that is exactly what we should be focused on in a narrow way. I think we should coordinate with other countries and develop ideas for what works best for everybody. I mean isn't that what we all learn growing up about how to get along with people? Why should it be different when you are dealing with other countries?

INFORMED OPINIONS ON WORLD PROBLEMS

Deliberative polling is a technique developed by James Fishkin, professor of government at the University of Texas at Austin, that sheds light on how opportunities for high-quality citizen discussions affect opinions—“public consultation for public policy.”

“In 2003, the world’s first Online Deliberative Opinion Poll® revealed the potential for a new form of democracy on the Internet. Public consultation on the Internet now occurs primarily through ‘quick votes’ with self-selected samples. There are also a few efforts to conduct traditional polling. But information technology now offers new potential for an entirely different form of Internet democracy—one that is both representative and informed. ...

“After deliberating, the participants increased their willingness to take responsibility for problems around the world. The percentages who placed priority on providing food and medical help to poor countries rose from 51 percent to 67 percent, on protecting human rights in other countries from 49 percent to 60 percent, on protecting weaker nations against aggression from 56 percent to 68 percent, and on reducing world poverty from 50 percent to 60 percent. The percentage who agreed that ‘global warming is a serious problem, and we need to act now’ rose from 49 percent to 61 percent. The percentage who were willing to make sacrifices to deal with environmental problems such as requiring higher mileage from vehicles and cleaner ways of producing electricity rose, even though the questions stipulated that those changes might require less powerful automobiles and higher electricity rates (from 70 percent to 77 percent for automobiles and from 50 percent to 58 percent for electricity). ...

“There was also increased support for foreign aid as a way of promoting democracy abroad (from 33 percent to 42 percent) and for foreign aid spending in general (11 percent to 22 percent). In addition, there was increased agreement with the notion that foreign assistance should be conducted through ‘The U.S. and allies acting through the U.N. and international institutions like the World Bank’ as opposed to the U.S. or its close allies acting themselves (a rise from 42 percent to 57 percent). On international trade, the percentage who agreed that imports cause a loss of jobs declined from 47 percent to 34 percent and the percentage who wanted to repeal NAFTA declined from 44 percent to 33 percent. ...”

(For more, see the By The People Web site at <http://www.pbs.org/newshour/btp/polls.html>)

TERRORISM

Q: So how do you feel about the war on terrorism?

A: I think dealing with terrorism is one of the most important foreign policy issues and I support the president’s efforts.

Q: How did you feel about the war against Afghanistan?

A: That was completely clear. We were attacked; we had to go after al Qaeda. On top of that, we had the UN and the other countries behind us.

Q: How do you think President Bush is handling the war on terrorism?

A: Pretty well. He’s a strong leader and seems determined. I think he probably needs to use more diplomatic methods. Don’t get me wrong—I realize this game is rough. We should try to find the terrorists and if we do, we should kill them. But overall, I think Bush tends to overemphasize being assertive rather than being cooperative.

Q: But isn't the lesson of 9/11 that we can't wait for other countries when it comes to using military force against threats to the U.S.?

A: Hmm. Actually I think the major lesson is that we need to work more closely with other countries.

Q: Overall, do you feel safer as a result of the government's efforts in the war on terrorism?

A: I can't say that I really do. Maybe a little.

Q: Doesn't the fact that no attacks have occurred on U.S. soil since September 11 mean that the Bush administration's efforts have worked?

A: Not really.

Q: So you don't think it is important for the U.S. to be assertive in confronting terrorism?

A: I do think it is important—I just think we are overemphasizing it, and this can make people mad at us in the Islamic world, and when that happens it's easier for terrorist groups to recruit new members and raise funds. I think we need to make greater efforts to improve relations with people in the Middle East.

Q: So you don't think there is a fundamental clash of civilizations that makes that impossible?

A: No, I think we can find common ground.

UNDERSTANDING POLITICAL WORLDVIEWS

In The American Prospect (September 2003), George Lakoff—professor of cognitive science and linguistics at the University of California, Berkeley, and a senior fellow at the Rockridge Institute—explained his findings on how people's political worldviews are related to "family values":

"Conservative and progressive worldviews can be understood as opposing models of an ideal family—a strict father family and a nurturant parent family. ...

"[In the strict father family], the world is a dangerous and difficult place, there is tangible evil in the world and children have to be made good. To stand up to evil, one must be morally strong—disciplined. The father's job is to protect and support the family. ... The child's duty is to obey. ... When this view is translated in politics, the government becomes the strict father whose job for the country is to support (maximize overall wealth) and protect (maximize military and political strength). The citizens are children of two kinds: the mature, disciplined, self-reliant ones who should not be meddled with and the whining, undisciplined, dependent ones who should never be coddled. ... The highest moral value is to preserve and extend the domain of strict morality itself, which translates into bringing the values of strict father morality into every aspect of life. ... America is seen as more moral than other nations and hence more deserving of power. ...

"[In the nurturant parent family], it is assumed that the world should be a nurturant place. The job of parents is to nurture their children and raise their children to be nurturers. To be a nurturer you have to be empathetic and responsible (for yourself and others)....Responsibility implies protection, competence, education, hard work and social connectedness; empathy requires freedom, fairness and honesty, two-way communication. ... Social responsibility requires cooperation and community building over competition. In the place of specific strict rules, there is a general 'ethics of care'. ... In this view, the job of government is to care for, serve and protect the population (especially those who are helpless), to guarantee democracy (the equal sharing of power), to promote the well-being of all and to ensure fairness for all. The economy should be a means to these moral ends. There should be openness in government. ... The United States should [recognize] ... the same moral values internationally as domestically. ..."

(For more, see www.rockridgeinstitute.org)

Q: Do you like President Bush's idea of trying to promote democracy in the Middle East?

A: Democracy is good thing, and it would be great to see it spread. But I'm not sure we should try to impose it on people. Overall, I think the people in the Middle East want us to play a less dominant role, and I think we should, too.

Q: Would you reduce the U.S. military presence in the Middle East? Would you pull U.S. troops out of Saudi Arabia?

A: Yes. Now that Iraq is no longer a threat. And over the next 5 to 10 years we should probably reduce our overall military forces over there.

Q: But aren't those forces important for fighting the war on terrorism?

A: Actually, I think they increase the likelihood of terrorist attacks.

PROLIFERATION OF WMD

Q: Now that we have cracked the Pakistani nuclear weapons ring that was providing technology to North Korea and Iran, Libya has come around, and Iraq is no longer a threat, are you beginning to feel less concerned about the spread of weapons of mass destruction?

A: Are you kidding? I'm sure there are other countries out there with secret WMD programs. This is still one of the things I'm most concerned about.

Q: So, does this discovery that Pakistani scientists were evading international arms control inspectors make you feel that we should give up on trying to solve this problem through arms control, and rely instead on the threat of using military force against countries that develop weapons of mass destruction?

A: No. But we should give international inspectors more power to go wherever they want to make sure that people are not developing them.

EARLY IMPACTS OF THE "WAR ON TERRORISM"

Jeremy Rosner, Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research, Inc., and William McInturff, Public Opinion Strategies, reporting on a bipartisan survey conducted in March 2003 for the Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation:

"There are preliminary but important indications that the ongoing war against terrorism, and the approaching war in Iraq, could have longer-term impacts on the opinions of the American public toward global engagement—just as most previous wars have exerted a powerful influence on such opinions. ...

"For example, a very strong majority, 81 percent, found this [argument] in favor of greater global engagement very or somewhat convincing: "Recent events prove that it's not enough to have the world's biggest military and that we must invest more in building better relations with other countries and improving the ability of countries to work together to combat problems like terrorism and weapons of mass destruction."....

"Similarly, 86 percent are very or somewhat convinced by the argument that "recent events prove we need to do more to protect ourselves from instability in the Mideast, which means more serious efforts to reduce our dependence on Mideast oil." The intense reaction here—54 percent find this very convincing—suggests that the war may result in a much stronger public focus on energy policy in coming political ... debates. ...

"Although ratings for the [UN] have slipped somewhat, 71 percent of registered voters are very or somewhat convinced by the argument that "recent events prove that we need to make the UN stronger, so it can do more to address problems like terrorism and weapons of mass destruction."

(For more, see www.vvaf.org/newsroom)

Q: If we do that it would mean that the international inspectors could be poking around U.S. biological laboratories. Aren't you concerned that countries could learn commercial secrets, or that they might learn things about our counter-bio-terrorism research?

A: Where do you get these weird arguments? I can't believe anyone in the U.S. government takes them seriously. Obviously—it's more important that we get to look around other people's laboratories!

Q: But if we put pressure on countries like Pakistan to let in inspectors, this might lead to a backlash in Pakistan so that it will not cooperate with us in the hunt for al Qaeda.

A: I think arms control is just too important. We can't back away from that.

Q: Do you think the U.S. should ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty?

A: Yes, of course. Haven't we?

Q: Well, there is concern that this could limit development of U.S. nuclear weapons.

A: I don't find that very convincing. I think we should probably aim to get rid of nuclear weapons eventually, not develop new ones.

Q: Incidentally, did you know the U.S. has committed to doing that as part of the treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons?

A: No, I didn't. But that sounds good. We should probably try harder to do that, though of course we have to do it together with other countries, so we can be sure that everybody else is disarming too. That might take a while. But for now it makes sense to me that if we want other countries to not develop nuclear weapons, we shouldn't be making new and improved ones for ourselves. It might even make sense to clearly promise non-nuclear countries that we will not use nuclear weapons against them—I mean, if we don't want them to build nuclear weapons.

Q: But don't you think that with the threat of chemical and biological weapons, the U.S. should have nuclear weapons there as a means of deterring their use?

A: No. That doesn't make sense to me. I don't think we should ever be the first to use nuclear weapons.

Q: So, do you like the idea of the U.S. and other nuclear powers reducing the number of nuclear weapons kept on high alert?

A: Sounds like a no-brainer to me.

Q: It seems you don't think nuclear weapons should play such a big role in U.S. defense. How many nuclear weapons do you think the U.S. needs to make sure other countries are deterred from attacking it?

A: Oh, I think about a hundred should be enough. I realize that would probably mean a cut below what we have now. We probably have, what, about twice that number?

PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS OF U.S. GLOBAL ENGAGEMENT, PRE- AND POST-9/11

In 1999–2001, the FrameWorks Institute conducted extensive research for the Global Interdependence Initiative of the Aspen Institute on how Americans perceive and think about the United States' role in the world. In 2003–2004, with support from the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, FrameWorks revisited its pre-9/11 findings, utilizing a variety of research methodologies.

Key findings from before September 11th (emphasis added throughout):

- “Americans are not uninterested in international issues, contrary to conventional wisdom. ... However, they **lack confidence and standing on these issues.** ...
- Americans want the U.S. to play an active role in world affairs. ... They **want to see the U.S. as a respectful citizen in the world community**, helping raise other countries up and collaborating ... to forge new solutions to global problems. ...
- [There is] a **misperception that America is already doing more than any other country** ... because Americans rarely see any other actors on the global stage.
- Additional problems arise from the **perception that the world outside our borders is one in which disaster strikes repeatedly and without the possibility of prevention**, and one in which solutions are rarely effective or permanent.
- **Americans lack an ability to assign responsibility ... [and] an understanding of cause and effect ...**, as well as an ability to assess the viability of solutions, many of which are explained in highly technical terms ... [Therefore they **cannot**] **easily conceptualize a wide array of alternatives to current policies.** ...”

In its post-9/11 research, FrameWorks found much that was unchanged. Though often distracted by important domestic concerns, **“Americans continue their high level of interest in the world.”** As before, **“Americans continue to describe the United States' current role in terms of interpersonal relationships”**—but “those roles have turned increasingly negative, from big brother and policeman to bully, self-serving, egotistical, and hated behind our backs.” In addition, **Americans still express “a conviction that the U.S. is the only player on the world stage, doing more than its share.”** And **“a positive and practical vision of the U.S. as effective team-player in service to a world we all share remains sorely lacking.”**

FrameWorks also reports some important shifts since its earlier research:

- **“Recent events have resulted in new isolationists and new interventionists.** The narrow focus of American media and public discourse on terrorism, national security, and war has transformed the way that many Americans perceive their options to engage in the world. The very term “engagement” has come to mean self-interested aggression for many. ... In this context, liberals have begun to equate playing a positive role in the world with staying home and staying out of other countries' business. ... Conservatives, by contrast, are the new interventionists, eager to engage in the world as long as this is defined in terms of national security....In light of this redefinition, Democrats today are increasingly likely to believe the U.S. is doing more than it should in the world and are less likely than Republicans to support an active role in international affairs ...”.
- **“Americans' international concerns are driven as much by anxieties about misuse and abuse of U.S. leadership and power as they are by insecurity and protectionism.** ... [T]he heightened focus on international issues has deepened, not changed, Americans' desire to play a positive role in the world. ...”
- “[Because of the] conviction that the U.S. is the only player on the world stage, doing more than its share, ... **the idea of leadership has been corrupted as well, reminding people that America is “going it alone” again,** either because of arrogance or because other countries are unwilling to do their part. ...”

(For more, see www.frameworksinstitute.org and www.aspeninstitute.org/gii)

DEALING WITH NORTH KOREA

Q: Are you concerned about North Korea's nuclear program?

A: Yes. Right now North Korea is the country that poses the biggest threat to us. It's very important.

Q: Do you think that seeing the United States overthrow Saddam Hussein has given the North Koreans pause?

A: No, it probably made them more motivated than ever to build nukes.

Q: What do you think about some limited use of military force, such as bombing their nuclear power plants?

A: I don't think so. Besides, I'm not sure we have the right to do that kind of thing.

Q: What about overthrowing their government?

A: Definitely not.

Q: What do you think about how the United States has been approaching North Korea?

A: We should take a more diplomatic approach, rather than trying to intimidate them by implying we might attack. I mean, isn't their fear that we would attack what got them all riled up in the first place?

Q: Are you saying that the Bush administration is not doing all that it can to achieve a diplomatic resolution?

A: Maybe it could be doing more.

Q: Some people say that would just be trying to revive the 1994 agreement. Even though North Korea agreed to stop its nuclear weapons program and let in inspectors in exchange for aid, this has clearly failed.

A: (Shrugs) I still think we need to try to get it back on track. We don't really have the option of going to war, so what are you going to do?

Q: But it was North Korea that violated the agreement by restarting its nuclear weapons program. Some people argue that talking with North Korea would be the same as submitting to blackmail.

A: I don't find that argument convincing. I just think that communication holds out the best hope.

Q: What if that doesn't work?

A: Well, maybe then we should take some steps in a military direction ... I'm not sure. But if the South Koreans don't want us to do that, then I'm not prepared to just plow ahead. After all, they are the ones that would get the brunt of any war.

Q: But if the United States were to attack North Korea, would you be supportive then?

A: Well, like I said before, I generally feel that you should back the commander in chief even when, if you were to ask me what to do, I would say "let's not." But if it was part of a UN operation, then I would strongly support that.

- Q: Would you support establishing diplomatic relations with North Korea?**
- A: Of course. Haven't we already done that?
- Q: Would you support a deal in which the U.S. makes a formal declaration that it will not attack North Korea if it gives up its nuclear weapons program?**
- A: Sure. Why not?
- Q: Do you think that would keep the North Koreans from pursuing nuclear weapons?**
- A: I don't know. But why not try it?
- Q: What about withholding food aid so as to put more pressure on them?**
- A: No, I don't think that when there are starving North Koreans we should use food aid as a political weapon. It's not their fault what their government is doing.
- Q: What about providing aid in exchange for North Korea stopping its nuclear weapons program?**
- A: I would support that. I think there is a good chance that the real reason they are doing this is to get aid.
- Q: Does that mean you are confident that giving aid will stop them?**
- A: No, not really.
- Q: How confident are you that this aid really reaches the people who need it?**
- A: Not very confident. But I still think we should do it.

ATTITUDES ON SECURITY

In July and again in September 2003, Celinda Lake of Lake Snell Perry and Associates conducted a review of public opinion data on security and U.S. foreign policy, for the Proteus Fund. Among her findings:

“The attacks of September 11th have shaken the sense, brought on by the end of the Cold War, that the world was a less dangerous place for our country. Three-fourths of Americans believe the world is more dangerous than compared to ten years ago. ... Three fourths of the public believes that occasional acts of terrorism will be part of life in the future ... [although] most people do not feel personally threatened. ... Women with school age children have become much more concerned about security than other women and men. The ‘soccer moms’ have become ‘security moms’. ...

“Americans are wary of unilateralism and the doctrine of preventive war. These sentiments are particularly strong among women. They [believe] that our nation’s security depends on stronger alliances with other countries. However, if Americas believe our country is being threatened with an imminent attack, Americans believe that we have the right to overthrow a hostile government that threatens our security without United Nations approval. ... Americans do worry [about] spreading our armed forces too thin and don’t want the United States to be the world’s policeman. Even when expressed in moralistic terms such as removing brutal dictators, Americans are still wary about military intervention. ...

“What is unclear from the public polling data is to what extent the public is willing to entertain alternative strategies that are broader and include a longer term vision about enhancing America’s security interests beyond waging military actions on terrorists and making sure America is prepared in case we are attacked again. The mainstream media has yet to explore other frameworks for discussion security issues and which non-military approaches to security may resonate with the public. ...

“People reject the argument that we need to drill in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to increase our national security. ...”

FOREIGN AID

Q: How do you feel about giving foreign aid in general?

A: Well, in principle I think we should give some foreign aid. I think we have a moral obligation to try to help, especially when people are starving. But I have a problem with a number of the ways that we go about doing it. First of all, I think we give kind of a lot, especially given all the problems we have here at home.

Q: How much of the federal budget do you think goes to aid?

A: Hmm, about 20 percent or so. Probably that should be cut back some. Ten percent sounds pretty good.

Q: How would you feel about spending 1 percent?

A: Oh, that'd be fine. But the amount of spending isn't the only thing I have a problem with. I think too much money goes to countries with poor human rights records, and that probably about half of all the aid money ends up in the pockets of corrupt government officials there. Hardly any of it really ends up helping the people who really need it.

Q: Any other problems, while you are at it?

A: Actually yes. I am tired of the U.S. always being the big sugar daddy.

Q: Well, the U.S. is much bigger than other countries. Do you think that, as a share of its GNP, the U.S. gives more than other countries?

A: Oh, definitely. I think every country, including the U.S., should give its fair share.

Q: What other changes would you like to see?

A: Well, I would like to see more emphasis on helping poor countries. Maybe we needed to use aid to keep countries on our side during the Cold War, but I don't think that's all that necessary now. I don't really like the idea of using aid as a way of trying to influence other countries—you know, a bribe or something. But I do feel quite good about helping the hungry.

Q: But many of these really poor countries are far from here—in Africa, for example—and don't have any real bearing on U.S. interests.

A: Actually, I like the idea of aid going to Africa. They really need it there. I don't really buy all this talk about U.S. national interests. If there are people hungry somewhere they should get aid, whether it serves the U.S. interest or not.

Q: So, are you saying you want to put all the money into humanitarian relief?

A: No, not just that. You know, if you give a man a fish he eats for a day, but if you teach a man to fish, he eats for a lifetime. So, I think it is important to help poor countries develop their economies—you know, help educate them, things like that. Overall, I feel better about giving them know-how than giving them things.

Q: So are you saying you would be willing to spend more to help poor countries?

A: Well, yeah, but it's really important to me that other countries do their share. I really prefer to do things together with other countries, like working through the UN. Then we can be sure everybody else is pitching in.

Q: How much of all development assistance do you think the U.S. gives?

A: Gosh, I don't know, maybe a third, maybe more.

Q: How would you feel if the U.S. gave about 12 percent?

A: No problem.

Q: You know the 29 industrialized countries of the OECD recently set the goal of trying to cut world hunger in half by the year 2015. Is that the kind of thing you'd like to see the U.S. be part of?

A: Yeah, that sounds great.

Q: Do you think that is a feasible goal?

A: Sure, if all the wealthy countries pitched in.

Q: Would you be willing to spend some money to see this happen?

A: Of course.

Q: How much do you think it would cost the average taxpayer in the industrialized world each year to fulfill this goal of cutting world hunger in half by the year 2015?

A: Oh, maybe about \$50.

Q: And would you be willing to pay that if the other countries would too?

A: Yeah. Sure. No problem.

THE GLOBAL FIGHT AGAINST HIV/AIDS

*From a press release dated April 3, 2002, reporting on a national bipartisan poll conducted by Republican pollster **Bill McInturff** of Public Opinion Strategies and Democratic pollster **Robert Boorstin** of Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research for the Better World Campaign and the Center for Strategic and International Studies:*

"American voters consider the HIV/AIDS pandemic to be one of the most important international public health issues today and support an increased U.S. financial commitment to international HIV/AIDS partnerships. ..."

"The study clearly shows that policy elites grossly underestimate how much Americans appreciate the urgency of the global HIV/AIDS crisis. Policy elites predicted that only 15% of the American public would believe the global AIDS crisis to be 'extremely' or 'quite serious.' In reality, 75% of Americans polled identified the spread of HIV/AIDS in developing nations to be 'extremely' or 'quite serious.' In fact, the survey found that preventing the spread of AIDS is second only to stopping drug smuggling as an international issue that Americans believe the U.S. government should spend more. ..."

"[T]he survey found that both policy elites and the American electorate believe that this global emergency is best handled multilaterally, with voters indicating a preference for the United Nations and its member organizations. ..."

"More than one-third of those polled believes the rapidly spreading AIDS pandemic in developing nations will impact the health and safety of the U.S. in the near future."

Commenting on the research, Bill McInturff said:

"We asked people whether or not you believe that spending more money would actually create meaningful progress [on global AIDS] or it won't make much difference. To me this is the pivot point which advocates have to communicate, because **when you sit with people in focus groups, they'll tell you hundreds of reasons why they don't feel guilty about why we're not doing more, and those hundreds of reasons normally come down to the issue of, well, they waste the money, it doesn't go to the right people, I would spend the money if it really went to help people, or there's nothing really we can do because the scope of the problem is so large it won't really change anything.** ...The people who are the most supportive of this issue are the most likely to believe that you could do more."

(For more, see www.betterworldfund.org)

GLOBALIZATION AND TRADE

Q: So how do you feel about globalization and the growth of international trade?

A: Hmm. I guess I would have to say lukewarm. I think it has been great for businessmen, but I don't think it has been all that great for American workers or for people in foreign countries.

Q: Would you say you favor free trade, or are you a protectionist?

A: I only get two options again? Look, I can see that there are a lot of benefits from trade. I know that I am paying lower prices at the store because of all that cheap labor overseas. But I also know that there are people here who are losing jobs because factories are going overseas. Now if you are going to force me to choose between low prices and the guy down the street losing his job, then I am going to have to say, I do not have the right to have that guy lose his job just so that I can get a cheaper pair of sneakers. It's not fair for some people to take the brunt if it so the rest of us can benefit. So yeah, let's keep up some of those trade barriers. But that's not really what I want to do. I know trade is basically a good thing, and in the long run there ought to be a way for everybody to benefit.

Q: So what are you saying?

A: What I would really like is for the government to do more to help the guy down the street, help him find a job, give him some job training. If I really believed that the government was going to do that then I would say, yeah, let's open things up.

Q: But the things you are describing could take some time to implement. Don't you realize that if we slow the growth of trade that this could slow the growth of the economy?

A: You know I don't always just think about the growth of the economy. That's very abstract. Of course I understand that when the economy grows, there is more money around and that can lead to good things. But there is also the human dimension. Those GNP numbers can't count the cost of disruption in the lives of people. And there's also the human dimension of the overseas workers. I don't like the idea of buying cheap products if they are made in sweatshops with bad working conditions. Something should be done about that.

Q: But don't you know that if the workers in those countries did not have those jobs, even if you might call them working in sweatshops, they might not have any job at all?

A: You know I don't buy that kind of thinking. I just think that if people are making clothes that I wear on my body, I have a responsibility to be sure that those workers are not being mistreated.

Q: So how is that going to help?

A: Look, I don't have this all figured out. But it seems to me that all of this trade is making a lot of money for businessmen everywhere, but not for workers. The rich keep getting richer and the poor keep getting poorer. So there is probably enough money around to help out all around. You know, we are always being told that trade is this wonderful thing and it generates so much wealth. But hey, where is it? Besides, sometimes you just have to take a stand for what is right, and hopefully the world will start acting right.

Q: So are you really saying that you would be willing to pay more for something just to make sure it was not made in a sweatshop?

A: Yes, I would. Actually, it would probably be even better to make sure that when we agree to open up trade with a country, that we first make them promise to treat their workers right. It's not only the moral thing to do, it's also not fair for American workers to have to compete with workers who are being exploited. If we let that happen, it's going to get worse for workers everywhere. Also, it would probably be a good idea too to make sure that if U.S. companies go overseas, that they don't get to lower their environmental standards. If they can lower their standards, that would be bad for the environment and it would make it even harder for workers here at home to compete.

Q: But by putting all these conditions on the growth of trade, aren't you really just being a protectionist? Aren't you just really trying to stop the growth of trade?

A: Well, you can call it what you like. I just don't see that trade by itself is such a wonderful thing. In principle it can be, but it all depends on how it's done. Over the last few decades while everybody has been going on and on about how wonderful the growth of trade has been, the average American workers' wages aren't really going up. And people in poor countries don't seem like they are getting much better. Meanwhile, the rich keep getting richer. So you tell me that taking better care of workers and the environment is going to slow down this "wonderful" process—(shrugs) so what? I'm not in any hurry.

Q: So, overall, are you saying you want to put the brakes on new trade agreements? Do you think that the trade agreements we have made have been a mistake?

A: No, I didn't say that. As a general rule, if another country says that it will lower its trade barriers if we will lower ours, then I am inclined to say, fine. Basically, I think trade agreements are a good thing. Even NAFTA is sort of okay with me. I just think there are some other good things that need to be considered, and we should take these barriers down in a gradual and careful way so that these other concerns figure into the picture too. Like, human rights is another thing. Like with China. I think we need to take a stand on that, and not just let the interests of the businesspeople run everything.

A CAUTIONARY NOTE ABOUT POLLING

Daniel Yankelovich, cofounder and chairman of Public Agenda and founder of the public opinion research firm of Yankelovich, Skelly and White, wrote in Fortune magazine in 1993:

"Public opinion on any issue develops slowly over a long period—at least 10 years for a complex issue. ... [It's] a big mistake just looking at the raw numbers. ... We assume that public opinion is some kind of phenomenon like wind velocity, whose variations can be measured, and that the measurement is valid. Public opinion is in fact less like a physical process than a biological one, evolving in...stages. Unless one knows opinion's stage of development on an issue, poll numbers will usually mislead."

Yankelovich drew on these and other observations when he was interviewed on public opinion and the war on terrorism for a "Public Agenda Special Edition" in 2002:

Q: You suggest there are several stages in the way public opinion forms and solidifies. Where are we now with regard to public opinion on the war on terrorism?

A: The first stage—opinion formation—is when people's consciousness is raised and they develop a sense of urgency about an issue. Consciousness has been raised and a sense of urgency has been stimulated, so we're through that stage.

The second phase—working through—is more complicated. In it, people work through the issue, confront tradeoffs, and wrestle with conflicts and values. We're in the early part of that stage with respect to terrorism. On the one hand, we want to strike back, but we're finding it difficult to strike back. We don't want revenge, but we don't want to be perceived as wimps. We don't want to start a holy war but we want to make sure we can't be pushed around this way. We don't know the full magnitude of the threat. We haven't really wrestled with how much sacrifice we're willing to make.

In the final stage, you have resolution, where people have made up their minds, where people have made judgments with their heads and also their hearts. ...

(For more, see www.publicagenda.org)

GLOBAL WARMING

Q: So let's talk about global warming. Do you think global warming is something real?

A: Oh yeah. It used to seem like scientists were arguing about it, but now it seems like they have come to the consensus that it's real.

Q: And do you think it is caused more by human activities or by natural causes?

A: Oh, I think we humans are making the problem.

Q: So do you think that the effects of global warming are starting to be felt now?

A: Some. Though I don't think the effects will be really serious during my lifetime.

Q: Do you worry about it a lot?

A: A fair amount. It's not the most important environmental problem. I'm more concerned about pollution. But it's important.

Q: Are you willing to take steps to curb global warming even if it might have some negative impact on the economy?

A: Some. But I think we can have a strong economy and address environmental issues too. It's not an either-or. I don't think the problem is so pressing that we have to take steps that would be really drastic.

THREAT OR OPPORTUNITY, OR BOTH?

Jeremy Rosner, of Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research Inc., reports on research conducted in December 2003 for the Open Society Institute:

"[T]he research suggests that there is a large base for a foreign policy agenda that is founded not only on fear of terrorism and foreign dangers, but also an optimistic determination to create a more peaceful and prosperous world. As on so many foreign policy issues at this point, the public is closely divided on this question. A 48 percent plurality feels that, 'More than at most times in our history, the U.S. now is threatened and must take steps to protect its own people and security'; while 45 percent choose the alternative view that, 'More than at most times in our history, the U.S. now has opportunities to help build a more peaceful world and ensure freedom and decent lives for more people around the world. ...'"

"Moreover, many key parts of the public actually favor the latter statement stressing the opportunities for building peace, freedom, and better living conditions around the world. A majority of opinion formers favor this view (50–43 percent), along with majorities of younger people (51–45 percent of those under the age of 30), mothers (52–39 percent), Americans who have traveled abroad relatively often (53–40 percent among those who have taken at least 4 trips abroad over the past 10 years), and those living in big cities (56–38 percent in cities of over 1 million). ..."

"[Americans] sense that the U.S. is over-extended abroad, spending too much time and money on foreign problems and too little on problems at home. The view is less outright isolationism, and more a desire for 'minimalist internationalism'—a feeling that the U.S. has a role to play abroad, but that it should not do too much. In particular, the public is troubled by the sense that the U.S. is acting too much on its own in world events, which they sense leads to higher costs, and they express a desire for greater cooperation with other countries in addressing security challenges. ..."

(For more, see www.soros.org/initiatives/washington)

Q: So do you support the U.S. participating in the Kyoto Treaty?

A: Yes. Aren't we?

Q: Well, actually not. The Bush administration is opposed to it.

A: Really? Hmm. That doesn't sound good to me. But maybe I don't know enough to judge.

Q: As you may know, there is a major controversy about whether the developing countries should be required to cut their emissions that contribute to global warming. Some people say on a per-person basis, less-developed countries produce far less greenhouse gases, and so they should not be required to limit their emissions until they develop their economies more, while others argue that the less-developed countries produce a substantial and growing amount of greenhouse gases and should be required to limit their emissions. What do you think?

A: I think they should be required to limit them some, but I don't know if we can really ask them to actually reduce them the way that the developed countries need to.

Q: So, what if we cannot get developing countries—or any other country, for that matter—to limit their emissions? Should the U.S. still try to reduce its emissions?

A: We should go ahead even if the others do not follow.

Q: If the less-developed countries are willing to limit their emissions, do you think the developed countries should provide the technology and training necessary to help them?

A: Definitely. You see, now that's a kind of foreign aid I really like.

Q: Just one last question. Do you think that, as compared to the average American, you are more or less supportive of taking steps to reduce global warming?

A: Oh, definitely more supportive. I can see why politicians have so much trouble taking the necessary steps to deal with the problem. If everybody was like me, it would be quite different.

TAB 2
TOP 20 RECOMMENDATIONS

CONTENTS

6.	TOP 20 RECOMMENDATIONS	32
7.	WONK-SPEAK TRANSLATOR	44



US. in the World
TALKING GLOBAL ISSUES WITH AMERICANS:
A PRACTICAL GUIDE

Note: Sources for facts and figures in this section, along with recommended sources for keeping facts and figures up to date, are available in the “Keeping Current” section of www.usintheworld.org.

TOP 20 RECOMMENDATIONS

A Summary (see pages 34-43 for details)

SET UP ARGUMENTS WITH BIG IDEAS AND CONTEXT, THEN GIVE SPECIFICS.

1. Start by signaling to your listeners what an issue is “ABOUT,” before flooding them with details. Put your arguments and facts in the context of **big, cross-cutting ideas** that are familiar to Americans.
2. Put your proposals and arguments in the **context of an interconnected world**.
3. Explain why your proposals are **smart/effective/pragmatic/realistic** in the context of today’s world. Evoke big ideas familiar to Americans about what constitutes **sound decision making, leadership, or management**.
4. Explain why your proposals are **the right thing to do**. Evoke big ideas familiar to Americans about what constitutes **decent behavior** and talk about the **kind of country we want to be in the world**, with reference to our ideals and traditions—who we strive to be as people.

HELP THE PUBLIC UNDERSTAND WHAT CAN BE DONE (BY WHOM) TO MAKE A DIFFERENCE.

5. **Provide a context and background for problems, and explain which actions (by whom) are most important** to their solution. Give an answer to “so what can be done about it?” before it gets asked.
6. **Stress a “can-do” approach. Inspire listeners** with your vision of how America can work with other countries to make the world safer and better. **Don’t open with comments that overwhelm** listeners about the enormity and complexity of problems, and **don’t use fear or guilt as entry points**.
7. When appropriate, cite **examples of other countries (and NGOs) that are working alongside the U.S.** to counter the mistaken but widespread public assumption that “we are doing it all.”

“BIG IDEAS” ABOUT SMART, PRINCIPLED U.S. GLOBAL ENGAGEMENT

Below are some key concepts that apply across multiple issue areas. Consultations with diverse foreign policy and public opinion experts suggest that concepts like these constitute a connective tissue that holds together the elements of a shared vision for how America should be in the world. These concepts are familiar to Americans, who understand their importance from their own life experiences. We’ve loosely grouped these concepts into categories for shorthand reference, recognizing that other groupings are possible but hoping to suggest how you can determine which kinds of “big ideas” will best help you convey your vision and give meaning to your facts and figures. You will find the concepts listed below evoked frequently, in different words, throughout the guide. Each time you invoke them in your own words, you will help to reinforce within the public key elements of a shared vision for America’s role that experts and advocates in multiple fields are trying to advance.

- **Pragmatic/Smart/Effective/Realistic** ... results-oriented, sound decision making, good management, effectiveness, doing what works, common sense, cost-benefit, getting results, sensible distribution of resources
- **Farsighted** ... prevention, investment, insurance, innovation, vision, stewardship, future generations
- **Comprehensive** ... seeing the big picture, connecting the dots, using all available tools, addressing all the moving parts, balanced approach, complex problems require comprehensive solutions
- **Trustworthy** ... keeping promises, practicing what we preach, avoiding double standards
- **Collaborative** ... teamwork, team leadership, respecting and listening to others, taking others’ priorities into account
- **Principled ... Right Thing to Do** ... putting America’s strength to great purpose, fairness, justice, being ethical, common decency, doing our share, living up to our values, the American way

- 8. Cite examples of **what works** and offer **success stories**—especially ones that demonstrate **comprehensive approaches** and **durable, systemic solutions**.
- 9. **Empower listeners** by telling them **what they can do** to help. **Talk about yardsticks** citizens can use to evaluate policy actions and progress over time. (See “Engaging Citizens,” Tab 8.)

KEEP IT SIMPLE.

- 10. Before you do interviews or speak publicly, determine your **3 or 4 most important messages** that can draw in listeners and serve as **“gateways”** for making more complicated points. Word them in ways that **invoke big concepts** familiar to Americans (see recommendation 1 above).
- 11. **Don’t be afraid to repeat yourself.**

TALK SO YOU WILL BE HEARD.

- 12. In radio and television interviews, **talk with your audience of citizens**—not to the reporter. Keep this in mind when talking to print journalists who will quote you.
- 13. **Avoid jargon and acronyms.** Use words that make sense to your audience.
- 14. **When appropriate, use analogies, metaphors, and comparisons from daily life** to help listeners understand your point.
- 15. **Use numbers sparingly, and put them in context.**
- 16. **Be sincere and honest** at all times. And **be yourself.**

KEEP YOUR COOL—AND STICK TO YOUR BIG IDEAS—WHEN FACED WITH HOSTILE QUESTIONS OR CRITICISMS.

- 17. Use a **reasonable, rational** tone. **Don’t attack personally** or attack the motives of those with whom you disagree. **Avoid partisan attacks.** **Question others’ assumptions**, not their integrity.
- 18. Show both the **benefits of approaches you propose** and the **costs of alternatives.**
- 19. **Don’t repeat your opponents’ position**, bad questions, bad facts, or misconceptions. **Break the habit of saying “This is NOT about X, it’s really about Y. ...”** Plan ahead to **bridge effectively** from bad questions or criticisms to the big ideas and frames that shape your arguments.

KEEP QUESTIONING COMMUNICATIONS CHOICES.

- 20. **Keep asking tough questions** about your communications choices. **Keep talking to your peers** about your decisions and experiences.

TOP 20 RECOMMENDATIONS

For talking about global issues with
Americans

SET UP ARGUMENTS WITH BIG IDEAS AND CONTEXT, THEN GIVE SPECIFICS.

1. **Start by signaling to your listeners what an issue is “ABOUT,” before flooding them with details. Put your arguments and facts in the context of big, cross-cutting ideas that are familiar to Americans.**

In the largest sense, what is the issue ABOUT to you? Seizing an opportunity? Being a smart and effective problem solver? Leading in a way that inspires followers? Living up to our values? Leaving a better world to future generations? And so on ... What are the “chapter headings” of the big story you’re trying to tell? Which “frames” (see “Core Concepts and Terms,” page 10) will you use to give meaning to your facts and figures?

If you don’t have answers to these questions before you speak, and if your language doesn’t consistently reflect your answers, listeners will come up with their own big story. Your opponents, too, will happily fill the void. The result may be that familiar chains of reasoning are triggered in your audience that keep your arguments and facts from getting a fair hearing. But if you’ve figured out your big story and made good framing choices that you’ve grounded in research, you can encourage listeners to think differently, see your arguments and facts in a new light, and remember your most important points.

You can evoke big ideas in multiple ways. For instance, if you wanted to set up your detailed arguments about global environmental problems with the big idea of safeguarding the planet for future generations, you could do so literally by saying, “This is about the kind of legacy we leave for future generations ...” or indirectly by saying, “My dad took me fishing each week, and now I take my son fishing. I’m working on saving our oceans because I want my son to be able to share the same joys with his children ...”

This guide recommends big concepts and frames that research suggests will help you to put across your facts and arguments more effectively. It deliberately highlights particular frames in sample arguments and responses to common critiques. In recommendations 2, 3, and 4, we describe three key categories of big ideas that appear frequently in the guide: interconnected world, doing what’s smart, and doing what’s right.

2. **Put your proposals and arguments in the context of an interconnected world.**

When you prompt Americans to consider how we’re linked to the rest of the world, you create a more supportive context for the rest of your arguments. From the perspective of “interdependence,” isolationism and withdrawal from the world become unrealistic. Teamwork seems more a requirement than an option. The golden rule takes on new meaning. Thinking long term is smart leadership. Tackling complex problems with comprehensive solutions is a necessity. Realism acquires a new definition. And so on.

Conversely, wording choices that push Americans toward an “us-versus-them” way of thinking—or that reinforce the idea that the world “out there” is a scary place where only bad things happen—can

have the opposite effect. Having the respect and trust of other nations might matter less. Blaming others can become routine. Hatred can be fueled. Issues can seem more cut-and-dried. Power and force can seem to be the only things others will understand. And so on.

You can encourage interdependent thinking by emphasizing the values, aspirations, challenges, and outcomes we share with others around the world (e.g., in an interconnected world, we succeed or fail together ... the global environment affects everyone on the planet ... a healthy global economy benefits us all ... we all want the same thing for our kids, etc.). This guide suggests different ways of invoking the idea of interconnectedness; also see the “interdependence” entry in the Wonk-Speak Translator on pages 44-46.

3. Explain why your proposals are smart/effective/pragmatic/realistic in the context of today’s world. Evoke big ideas familiar to Americans about what constitutes sound decision making, leadership, or management. ←

Americans are a pragmatic, results-oriented, can-do people. We want our policy choices and behavior around the world to reflect common sense and to get the job done. The box to the left lists some of the widely shared “big ideas” about smart U.S. policy and behavior in an interconnected world that emerged from conversations with scores of experts consulted in the *U.S. in the World* process. These big ideas also resonate with nonexpert Americans, who understand what smart decision making and effective leadership look like from their own life experiences.

Like all big ideas, these concepts can be evoked by speakers in countless ways, both literally (“smart policymaking connects the dots on complex issues”) and indirectly (“the old saying about how ‘a stitch in time saves nine’ holds true here”). Depending on your audience, you might emphasize different concepts and choose different words to evoke them. As we note in recommendation 2 above, giving your audience a perspective of interdependence will help them see why your definitions of what is pragmatic and realistic make sense.

4. Explain why your proposals are the right thing to do. Evoke big ideas familiar to Americans about what constitutes decent behavior and talk about the kind of country we want to be in the world, with reference to our ideals and traditions—who we strive to be as people. ←

In addition to wanting pragmatic problem solving, Americans want this nation to be a force

“BIG IDEAS” ABOUT SMART, PRINCIPLED U.S. GLOBAL ENGAGEMENT

Below are some key concepts that apply across multiple issue areas. Consultations with diverse foreign policy and public opinion experts suggest that concepts like these constitute a connective tissue that holds together the elements of a shared vision for how America should be in the world. These concepts are familiar to Americans, who understand their importance from their own life experiences. We’ve loosely grouped these concepts into categories for shorthand reference, recognizing that other groupings are possible but hoping to suggest how you can determine which kinds of “big ideas” will best help you convey your vision and give meaning to your facts and figures. You will find the concepts listed below evoked frequently, in different words, throughout the guide. Each time you invoke them in your own words, you will help to reinforce within the public key elements of a shared vision for America’s role that experts and advocates in multiple fields are trying to advance.

- **Pragmatic/Smart/Effective/Realistic** ... results-oriented, sound decision making, good management, effectiveness, doing what works, common sense, cost-benefit, getting results, sensible distribution of resources
- **Farsighted** ... prevention, investment, insurance, innovation, vision, stewardship, future generations
- **Comprehensive** ... seeing the big picture, connecting the dots, using all available tools, addressing all the moving parts, balanced approach, complex problems require comprehensive solutions
- **Trustworthy** ... keeping promises, practicing what we preach, avoiding double standards
- **Collaborative** ... teamwork, team leadership, respecting and listening to others, taking others’ priorities into account
- **Principled ... Right Thing to Do** ... putting America’s strength to great purpose, fairness, justice, being ethical, common decency, doing our share, living up to our values, the American way

for good in the world, to try to do the right thing. We want our policy choices and behavior to reflect common decency and the common good as well as common sense. The box on the previous page also includes some of the big ideas about values that the *U.S. in the World* process revealed as important to experts and citizens when they think about principled, responsible U.S. engagement.

Arguments about pragmatism and decency in an interdependent world can overlap; that's why the boxed list isn't divided into two separate sections. Big ideas about decent behavior—like the importance of the golden rule or practicing what we preach—can also be invoked to make pragmatic arguments (e.g., we live in an interconnected world, and we know what goes around comes around, so we should be concerned about the implications for America of how we treat others). Similarly, pragmatic arguments (e.g., about the need for teamwork to address shared problems) can be linked to values (e.g., respecting others and taking their concerns into account are both aspects of how we'd like to be in the world and a foundation for effective teamwork). By showing how your ideas and proposals are both **smart/effective/pragmatic and the right thing to do**, you're likely to appeal to more of your audience. But the concepts you choose to emphasize may vary, depending on your audience.

HELP THE PUBLIC UNDERSTAND WHAT CAN BE DONE (BY WHOM) TO MAKE A DIFFERENCE.

- 5. Provide a context and background for problems, and explain which actions (by whom) are most important to their solution. Give an answer to “so what can be done about it?” before it gets asked.**

Whether your goal is to educate citizens generally or to win public support for specific policy changes or actions, a key challenge is to define the issues in ways that allow people to see solutions. Do this successfully and you can equip listeners with a framework for continued learning and inspire them to get involved. They may think, “Now I get it ... I know the trade-offs ... It makes sense that we try to do X so we can make a dent in this problem.” If you don't help people understand what can be done, you may leave audiences confused and apathetic: “I can see how important it is to address this problem, but I don't get it, it's way too complicated ... I guess I'll leave it to the experts.”

Help people see the big picture about what is happening, not just a snapshot that captures a moment in time and space. Provide enough context to help listeners understand causes and effects; describe how problems came about and how certain actions can make a difference. Point to systemic factors that have exacerbated problems and to systemic solutions (i.e., not just plucky individuals or heroic rescuers) that could change things for the better. Make sure you leave listeners with a clear sense of your judgment about the levers we need to pull to create the kind of change you advocate.

- 6. Stress a “can-do” approach. Inspire listeners with your vision of how America can work with other countries to make the world safer and better. Don't open with comments that overwhelm listeners about the enormity and complexity of problems, and don't use fear or guilt as entry points.**

Americans get mostly bad news every day about the rest of the world (see “Where the Public Is Coming From,” page 14-30), given the media's disproportionate emphasis on wars, conflicts, and humanitarian and natural disasters. It can seem that global problems are too big and too numerous to handle—from the spread of biological weapons to biodiversity loss, from escalating violence to rising sea levels. There's plenty of blame being thrown around for what isn't working, but no one seems to have a positive vision of what can be done. Not surprisingly, many Americans report

feeling overwhelmed and powerless, which hardly encourages them to think more about global issues, let alone act on them. “Oh no, another huge problem we can’t do much about. How depressing ...”

If Americans are to be inspired to care about and support your ideas for U.S. global engagement, they need new and positive pictures in their minds about the possibility of being effective and doing good in the world. They need to believe that it’s possible for the United States, working with others, to actually help solve serious global problems.

The next time you talk about big, complex problems, try not to start out with scary statistics to grab attention. Try leading with a positive vision of what can be done. Instead of starting with images of border-crossing pollution and terrorism, try talking about the steps we can take to create a healthy environment or to reduce the frustration and resentment on which extremism feeds. Rather than leading off your PowerPoint presentation with pictures of hundreds of AIDS orphans, start with images of kids who now have opportunities to learn and thrive. Don’t ignore the drama and scale of the problem ... just don’t make it the dominant frame for your message.

A positive vision and problem-solving attitude will carry more listeners with you. And it’s what most Americans would like to hear—for a change.

7. When appropriate, cite examples of other countries (and NGOs) that are working alongside the U.S. to counter the mistaken but widespread public assumption that “we are doing it all.”

The vast majority of Americans want our nation to be helpful to others around the world and believe we should contribute our share to solving global problems. But they don’t want us to have to do it all or to be the world’s police force. The misperception also persists among large portions of the public “that America is doing it all, paying more than other nations to help poor countries, contributing the most peacekeeping troops, putting out all the world’s fires, and so on (see “Where the Public Is Coming From, page 14-30).

Given a lifetime of reinforcement—images in the media, rhetoric from politicians, patriotic books at school—most Americans’ strong belief that we’re doing everything won’t be shaken by mere facts. If citizens are to respond to your calls to do more, they also need to see that other actors on the world stage are sharing the burdens of problem solving. They need positive images and stories of countries working alongside one another in pursuit of shared goals—whether ensuring that all children have a chance to go to school, tackling global warming, promoting democracy and peace, cracking down on weapons proliferation, or preventing terrorist attacks.

Talk about international teamwork in ways that highlight the contributions of multiple players. Include NGOs and other nongovernmental actors that are lending a hand. Avoid solutions and success stories that are exclusively America-centric, which may only reinforce the suspicion that we are doing more than our fair share.

8. Cite examples of what works and offer success stories—especially ones that demonstrate comprehensive approaches and durable, systemic solutions.

Time and again, Americans have shown a willingness to respond to needs around the world and to rise to challenges. But for sustained engagement, results matter; we want to know that we’re investing resources and energies wisely, not pursuing pie-in-the-sky dreams or flawed strategies.

If we want more citizens to take more of an interest in the world, to support initiatives that could bring us a better energy future, lock down loose nuclear materials, alleviate poverty, curb global

warming, and so on, we need to be telling them more about what's going right around the world, more about what we have succeeded in doing. Without such stories—and faced with an onslaught of media coverage devoted to everything that's going wrong—we can hardly expect citizens to believe there is much reason for America to try harder.

Introduce solutions early in the narrative to head off the assumption that none exist. Try to choose stories that show America working with others to make a difference. Choose examples that show durable results. Describe successful models that have been, or could be, applied in other countries or regions or used to address other problems. Favor wide-angle stories that demonstrate the potential for systemic change (e.g., how investments in health care and education transformed an entire region by giving local people the tools and resources they needed to improve their communities) over those with a narrow lens (e.g., how an individual in an African village borrowed \$50, started a successful business that helped her family, and paid back her loan). When possible, explain progress as lifting all boats, not solely for America's advantage, to reinforce the notion of our interconnectedness (see recommendation 2 above).

9. Empower listeners by telling them what they can do to help. Talk about yardsticks citizens can use to evaluate policy actions and progress over time. (See “Engaging Citizens,” Tab 8.)

As caring, generous, can-do people, Americans instinctively want to help. Communicators who talk to citizens routinely report back from face-to-face encounters with citizens that “people want to know what they can do.” Research for the *U.S. in the World* project showed, however, that few communicators have or offer good answers to this question. And when it comes to foreign policy issues, citizens often have no idea how to keep track of issues, let alone make a difference.

In your comments, try to incorporate ideas—both general and specific—for how citizens can get involved in working toward solutions. Talk about basic yardsticks citizens can use to interpret what they read and hear—in the news or from policymakers and candidates—about international affairs and foreign policy. See “Engaging Citizens,” pages 135–140, for ideas.

KEEP IT SIMPLE.

10. Before you do interviews or speak publicly, determine your 3 or 4 most important messages that can draw in listeners and serve as “gateways” for making more complicated points. Word them in ways that invoke big concepts familiar to Americans (see recommendation 1 above).

You will rarely be asked every question you'd like to be asked or have time to say everything you want to say. Step back from your mountain of experience and knowledge and ask: What are the 3 or 4 points or ideas I most want listeners to take away? Once you've decided, develop clear, nontechnical language to help drive your top-level points home. Use wording that evokes—or is consistent with—the big ideas related to the issue you're describing for your listeners (see recommendation 1). Craft short versions that are complete enough to stand alone but can also help you make transitions into more complex territory. Practice delivering 10-second or shorter versions of your most important points. Don't wait for the perfect opportunity or question to deliver these messages—it may never arrive. Use these points to stay focused on what you want to say.

Your key points should be framed in ways that help to get people interested and into the tent, encouraging them to keep listening, keep learning, and maybe get involved. For that reason, it would be a mistake, say, for a development assistance advocate to think that a top-level message

for a broader public is something as specific as “we need to get the details right on the Millennium Challenge Account if USAID and UNDP are to effectively advance the Millennium Development Goals.” A more appropriate top-level message might be something like, “We’ve learned what works to help people and countries lift themselves out of poverty. Let’s join with our international partners to invest in cost-effective solutions—like improving access to basic education and health care—that pay for themselves many times over.”

11. Don’t be afraid to repeat yourself.

Help your audience remember your big ideas and 3 or 4 key messages by repeating them in different ways. Having them on the tip of your tongue will help you keep returning to your message and reinforcing it. You can avoid sounding scripted by using different words each time. Say you’ve already told listeners that a smart strategy on terrorism should be “comprehensive, not one-dimensional.” You can repeat the idea with phrases that invoke the same notion (e.g., “We need to use every tool that’s available, we can’t afford to forgo any tool that’s proven effective, be it diplomatic, economic or military. ...” “We can’t rely too heavily on any one strategy ... a balanced approach is more likely to produce lasting results ...”).

TALK SO YOU WILL BE HEARD.

12. In radio and television interviews, talk with your audience of citizens—not to the reporter. Keep this in mind when talking to print journalists who will quote you.

When interviewed for broadcast media, you won’t “know your audience” as well as you might in face-to-face settings. But your listeners still are real people—in Des Moines, in Wichita, and the like. Talk to them, not Ted Koppel. This guide’s recommendations will help you to convert complexity into manageable chunks of information and to translate expert-speak into language that makes sense and resonates with real people.

13. Avoid jargon and acronyms. Use words that make sense to your audience.

When average citizens tune in to foreign policy issues, experts often bombard them with an endless stream of arcane facts about the world. Moreover, they tend to speak in jargony language that only has meaning for other experts. Vague shorthand like “Rwanda,” “Kyoto,” or “the Marshall Plan”—which may say a lot to an audience of Council on Foreign Relations members—means nothing to a nonexpert citizen. Nor do acronyms and abbreviations like USAID, IAEA, and FTAA, which are about as familiar to most Americans as the term “ICANN” (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) would be to anyone but a computer whiz. It turns out that even phrases and words that experts assume everyone understands—WMD, development assistance, cooperative threat reduction, international norms, soft power—are unfamiliar if not unintelligible to most Americans.

To reach wider audiences, turn your wonk-speak into words citizens will hear. Use declarative sentences and the active tense. When you speak, keep asking yourself, “Can I really assume they know what this means?” This guide’s “Wonk-Speak Translator” (page 44) may jump-start your thinking about alternatives.

14. When appropriate, use analogies, metaphors, and comparisons from daily life to help listeners understand your point.

In our fast-paced, information-overloaded society, we rarely have much time to explain complicated issues or elaborate on key points. TV and radio talk shows usually give guests less than a minute to speak before being interrupted. The format of most print stories encourages us to speak in sound bites that can be quoted. Human beings routinely rush to make sense of incoming information, quickly deciding whether to continue paying attention or to move on (see “Core Concepts and Terms,” pages 10-13). Every word out of our mouth counts.

You can use fewer words and be more effective by using analogies, metaphors, and comparisons from daily life to evoke ideas and experiences that ordinary people can relate to. For instance, if you want to explain “capacity building” to listeners who have never heard the term, one strategy is to define the jargon, which might simply put your audience to sleep. A shortcut is to explain the concept through a familiar, memorable adage: “Give a man a fish; you have fed him for today. Teach a man to fish; and you have fed him for a lifetime.” The same holds for conveying the essence of your argument. Your call for more patient U.S. diplomacy in an international negotiation might make more sense if cast in terms of your grandmother’s expression that “we can catch more flies with honey than with vinegar.” Your argument that it is sensible for America to do more to combat global warming today even in the face of some uncertainty might be best understood through an analogy to investments in insurance policies or the preventive steps we take to ward off disease.

This approach can be particularly important in talking about foreign affairs because—according to cognitive linguists and sociologists—most Americans think of international relations metaphorically in terms of interpersonal relations. This helps to explain why more Americans will connect with a communicator who argues, for instance, that “America shouldn’t have been like the sore loser that stomped off the field before the game finished” than with the communicator who says “It wasn’t fair that America terminated the treaty negotiation abruptly after winning so many concessions, abandoning a process that we had spent years working on.”

Incorporating comparisons that invite people to draw on experiences in their families, communities, and businesses to understand your issue will help you engage nonexpert audiences, potentially opening minds and triggering new ways of thinking. An added benefit: These comparisons are highly quotable.

15. Use numbers sparingly, and put them in context.

Don’t expect numbers alone to tell your story or help to drive home your 3 or 4 key messages. Without the right big ideas that put them in a meaningful context, your numbers will just be mind-numbing. For instance, merely reporting that we have helped to secure “ten thousand tons” of nuclear material in Russia leaves listeners guessing how important the progress we’ve made really is. But if you put those tons in context (e.g., how many *bombs could have been made* from those tons ... *what percentage of the total problem we’ve licked in securing those tons ...*), your numbers reinforce a larger message: This is a fixable problem, we’re making headway, and we could do more with greater investments.

Bring numbers to life by converting the statistics you cite most often into repeatable, contextualized phrases that nonexpert people can grasp, relate to, and visualize. “Three billion people” would mean more to someone who didn’t know the world’s total population if instead expressed as “nearly half the people on our planet.” “Two dollars a day” becomes more concrete if it is put in the economic context of “less than most of us pay for a gallon of milk.” “One-tenth of one percent of our GNP” is intelligible if it is translated into “\$37 per American every year—about as much as most of us

spend on a couple of tickets at the movies and a bag of popcorn.” Likewise, “the UN’s annual budget is only \$10 billion dollars” translates into “less than what Arkansas alone spends on its people in a year.” And so on. Use simple numbers that help you tell positive stories and avoid staggering statistics that merely reinforce how overwhelming problems are (see recommendation 8 above).

Finally, don’t expect mere statistics to correct deeply held public misperceptions, such as the widespread notion that America spends 15 to 20 times what it actually does on foreign aid. Without a carefully considered door-opening strategy, your facts may never sink in because they totally contradict what your listeners have long believed (“Her numbers just can’t be right, that can’t be the whole story.”). Similarly, if you set up numbers with big ideas that just don’t resonate with your audience, you risk losing your listeners before you even get to the numbers (e.g., saying “America is the least generous of all industrial countries when it comes to foreign aid” may just make your audience defensive or incredulous: “How dare that guy suggest we’re not generous?! Where does he get his numbers?!”). Consult the sample wording in the guide’s “Arguments and Facts” and “Common Critiques and Effective Responses” sections to create strategies that will help you segue to your well-framed numbers.

16. Be sincere and honest at all times. And be yourself.

As you work to implement recommendations from communications and public opinion research, don’t get so hung up on mechanics that you lose yourself in the process. For instance, though it is true that a “reasonable, rational” tone will get you furthest with most audiences (see recommendation 17), that doesn’t mean you can never be passionate, provocative, or funny—or express anger. If you come across as overly scripted, your listeners will tune out.

Use this guide and other communications advice you receive as a starting point to help you be more effective in using your own voice. Don’t stray from what you believe or from sound scholarship to conform to a message. People have very good antennae for spin. Instead, use communications research to help you craft messages that allow you to speak the truth from your perspective in ways that have more lasting resonance and impact.

KEEP YOUR COOL—AND STICK TO YOUR BIG IDEAS—WHEN FACED WITH HOSTILE QUESTIONS OR CRITICISMS.

17. Use a reasonable, rational tone. Don’t attack personally or attack the motives of those with whom you disagree. Avoid partisan attacks. Question others’ assumptions, not their integrity.

Everyone wants to make America and the world better and safer; the differences that exist are over how. In laying out your differences with others, you will appeal to the widest possible audience when you use reasonable, rational language. Coming across as very emotional, defensive, or partisan could undermine your credibility with listeners who are tired of the bickering and blaming that goes on among experts and politicians.

It’s possible to be critical and still use a rational and reasonable tone. Avoid falling into the “politics-as-usual” whiner trap by prefacing critiques with optimistic messages (e.g., “Americans have proven time and again that we have the know-how and the can-do spirit to ...”) and by offering your own constructive or positive proposals to accompany your criticisms. Incorporate facts, not just rhetoric, framed in the context of your big ideas.

18. Show both the benefits of approaches you propose and the costs of alternatives.

Your arguments about what defines smart policy—and your critiques of alternatives—will be strengthened if you can root them in arguments about effectiveness and ineffectiveness as well as notions of right and wrong.

For instance, while most Americans intuitively understand the need for friends and strong alliances in the world, their support deepens when they understand how we have benefited from them in the past and what happens without them. Though most Americans express discomfort with go-it-alone strategies, their discomfort is exacerbated when they understand the costs of acting alone. Arguments grounded in facts and results, not just in concepts or theories, will resonate the most.

19. Don't repeat your opponents' position, bad questions, bad facts, or misconceptions. Break the habit of saying "This is NOT about X, it's really about Y ..." Plan ahead to bridge effectively from bad questions or criticisms to the big ideas and frames that shape your arguments.

Stop doing those with whom you disagree the favor of repeating their arguments or big ideas. Doing so only helps them carry out recommendations 1, 10, and 11 above by reinvigorating the images and notions they are working hard to put into listeners' heads. Once you've done so, you'll face an uphill battle to make your big ideas and messages stick.

Say, for instance, that you are on television with a counterpart who has just attacked all United Nations bodies as bureaucratic, wasteful talk shops. To demonstrate that you are a pragmatic realist who recognizes the need for reform, your instinct might be to agree with part of the critic's comment before challenging it—for example, "Sure, we know that the UN system is seriously flawed, and we should encourage reforms like X, Y and Z. ... But UN program X is working well and we should invest more in it." Or you might try to rebut the criticism—for example, "The UN is not a talk shop that wastes taxpayer dollars ... it actually is a place where we get a big return on our investment." With either response, though, you've made your life more difficult by reminding listeners of the criticism and invigorating a "system broken, beyond repair" mindset.

A better strategy for responding to a bad question or criticism is to bridge quickly back to your big ideas and your frames. For instance, if someone asks "Isn't the UN just an ineffective waste of taxpayer dollars," start your answer with your definition of what the UN is, as opposed to what it isn't (e.g., "Actually, the UN is ... a place where we get a big return on our investment ... [give an example]. ... Like any institution, it periodically needs updating and retooling to work well ...") Similarly, resist being drawn into discussions of issues or positions that you are uncomfortable addressing; they can't report what you don't say.

And whatever you do, don't reinforce other people's arguments and big ideas when they aren't even present by saying things like: "This isn't about [what they say] ... it's really about Y." or "Some experts argue X. I disagree." "The question is not [what they say], it's really ..." "I know most people assume [a myth or misunderstanding] ... but the reality is that ..." If you want to set up a contrast, at least reverse the order (e.g., "this is about Y, not about X"). Tune into an interview show or read a speech and notice how many times experts violate this very basic rule of effective communication. It will make you laugh—and serve as a good reminder to stop doing it yourself.

Effective bridging allows you to answer a question honestly, not evade it—but to do it on your terms. Play with the sample texts in "Common Critiques and Effective Responses" to come up with effective bridging strategies that work for you.

KEEP QUESTIONING COMMUNICATIONS CHOICES.

20. Keep asking tough questions about your communications choices. Keep talking to your peers about your decisions and experiences.

As we stress in the preceding sections (“Key Background for First-Time Users” and “Core Concepts and Terms,” pages 8-13), there is a lot that experts on communications, messaging, and public opinion agree on—and much that they don’t. Though a great deal of research data are available on public attitudes about international affairs and ways to advance particular arguments, the science of crafting communications and messaging recommendations is inexact. Pollsters with specific goals—for example, helping a group achieve a particular legislative victory—offer advice based on one perspective and methodology; pollsters with longer-term time horizons offer different advice based on other techniques. Cognitive linguists bring a unique lens to interpreting data. Public relations professionals draw on different experiences. The same goes for sociologists, focus group leaders, advertising executives, political campaigners, advocacy leaders, grassroots organizers, politicians who have gone on bus tours, and so on. The answers are rarely cut-and-dried. The *U.S. in the World* process is based on a belief that everyone has something to contribute to the search for better communications choices.

We hope that you will connect with others who share similar interests and goals—challenging your communications choices, talking about them with others, and continuing to track research. To that end, we offer selected resources to help in the “Keeping Current” and “Community Resources” sections of *U.S. in the World’s* Web site, www.usintheworld.org.

WONK-SPEAK TRANSLATOR

Foreign policy discussions are often filled with jargon and technical terms that are either meaningless to many nonspecialists or mean something different in daily usage. With some audiences, the use of more technical language is perfectly appropriate. What's important is to know the difference and be prepared to adjust accordingly. Below are some frequently used terms that are unclear to most of the nonexpert public. We hope that the alternatives below will jump-start your thinking about other possibilities that will help you get your point across more effectively. Remember that metaphors and examples can also help you to explain what you mean.

Arms control regime The network/web of international laws and rules that countries have set up together to ...

- ban or limit certain dangerous weapons
- require inspections to make sure that laws are followed
- set up penalties for when rules are broken

Climate change / global warming Our burning of oil, gas, and coal for energy is creating a thickening blanket of carbon dioxide [and other gases] that's trapping heat inside Earth's atmosphere

Cooperative threat reduction Working with other countries that still possess dangerous weapons to ...

- help them lock down their arsenals—so terrorists or criminals can't steal deadly weapons or the material to build them
- help provide peaceful employment for weapons scientists who might otherwise be tempted to sell their knowledge to the highest bidder

Counterproliferation • Steps we take to counter [respond to] the spread of deadly weapons and reduce the chance that they will be used

- Defensive and offensive steps we take (like technologies, military plans, force, or the threat of force)
- “Fighting fire with fire”

See “nonproliferation” below, which refers to preventing the spread in the first place.

Development • Impoverished communities and nations becoming more prosperous and peaceful, with decent government and the protection of human rights

- Families and individuals gaining access to education, health care, economic opportunities, and the basic dignity and freedom we take for granted
- People in other countries lifting themselves out of poverty, building better lives for themselves and their children

- Development assistance/ foreign aid*
- Helping people and countries lift themselves out of poverty
 - Support for/Help with/Investment in [development; see above], provided by governments, often working through reliable nonprofit organizations

Note: Many development experts and public opinion researchers discourage the term “foreign aid” because it is neither clear nor viewed positively (it can remind people of the distinction between home and abroad, and “aid” suggests a passive recipient).

- Externality*
- Indirect costs that the people in charge don't factor into company bottom lines or the prices we pay, but that someone ends up paying ...
- for example, a dirty coal-burning power plant doesn't pay for the air pollution it generates, but communities pay in health care costs because of the asthma and other respiratory illnesses that pollution causes

- Hegemony*
- Dominance over others
 - Being the sole superpower
 - The world's most powerful nation
 - U.S. military and economic power outdistances others [examples]

- Interdependence*
- Interconnectedness
 - Interwoven
 - We all share one planet
 - Our world is tied together by satellites, jet planes, the Internet, and a web of business and human links
 - Global or international community
 - Global family
 - The world is too small for us to ignore the impact of our actions on others

- Legitimacy*
- Acceptance of a government's decisions [actions, right to make decisions] by others who are affected [a nation's citizens, other people around the world, other countries, and the like]

- Multilateral*
- Consulting with allies and other nations
 - Acting in cooperation with our partners
 - [Global] teamwork
 - Sharing the burden

- Nation building*
- Supporting states and societies as they rebuild their communities, economies, government institutions, and the like
 - [Doing the above] after a crisis, or to prevent a complete collapse that could threaten regional or global security

Nonproliferation • Preventing [stopping] the spread of deadly [nuclear, chemical, and biological] weapons to countries and groups that don't have them
• Stopping deadly weapons from falling into the wrong hands.

Norms Shared understandings of the kinds of behavior that are expected of all nations [sometimes put on paper when we negotiate international laws and agreements, sometimes just respected because of the power of example]

Per capita Per person

Policy coherence • In tackling complex challenges (like development), making sure that one set of policies doesn't undermine the impact of another
• Avoiding giving with one hand while taking with the other
• Taking a comprehensive approach, connecting the dots

Precautionary principle • "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure"
• The smart and responsible notion of not waiting for absolute scientific certainty before acting to stop serious threats to health, the environment, and the like

Preemption Taking military action against potential opponents before they have threatened or taken action against us

Reform Update. Renovate. Rebuild. Retool

Rule of law • The expectation that we all follow the same laws and are subject to the same punishment for breaking laws
• Real laws and rules, not just words on paper, that govern our behavior and prevent power from being exercised arbitrarily

Soft power • Our ability to influence [or persuade] others without force or coercion, because of the appeal of our values and culture [say, because we set a good example]
• Attractive power

Unilateral • Go-it-alone
• Acting without allies or partners
• Bearing all the burden ourselves
• Acting like a global police force

Weapons of mass destruction • Nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons
• Deadly weapons that can cause mass civilian casualties

TAB 3
AMERICA’S ROLE IN THE WORLD

CONTENTS

8. MESSAGING RECOMMENDATIONS, HELPFUL ARGUMENTS & FACTS

A. Why Our Foreign Policy Matters So Much 48

B. What Our Foreign Policy Should Look Like 50

9. COMMON CRITIQUES & EFFECTIVE RESPONSES

A. “We spend too much abroad. Domestic needs come first.” 52

B. “Soft issues are nice, but security/survival issues come first.” 53

C. “No country is perfect. America is a benign superpower.” 54

D. “There is no such thing as an ‘international community.’” 55

E. “Peace is best achieved through strength.” 56

F. “You see the world the way you want it to be, not how it really is.” 57

G. “We can’t rely on the old strategies anymore.” 58

Representative Quotes 59



U.S. in the World
TALKING GLOBAL ISSUES WITH AMERICANS:
A PRACTICAL GUIDE

Note: Sources for facts and figures in this section, along with recommended sources for keeping facts and figures up to date, are available in the “Keeping Current” section of www.usintheworld.org.

MESSAGING RECOMMENDATIONS

PRIORITY REMINDERS FROM “TOP TWENTY”

2. Put your proposals and arguments in the **context of an interconnected world**.
3. Explain why your proposals are **smart/effective/pragmatic/realistic** in the context of today’s world. Reference big ideas about **sound decision making, leadership, or management**.
4. Explain why your proposals are the **right thing to do**. Evoke big ideas familiar to Americans about **decent behavior**.
6. **Stress a “can-do” approach. Don’t open with fear, guilt or comments that overwhelm** listeners about the enormity and complexity of problems.
9. **Empower listeners** by telling them **what they can do** to help. **Talk about yardsticks** citizens can use to evaluate policy actions and progress over time. (See “Engaging Citizens,” Tab 8)
13. **Avoid jargon and acronyms**. (See “Wonk-Speak Translator,” Tab 2)

Do

- Give **examples** showing that **facing problems early is a smart investment** that can pay off for us all.
- Emphasize that we need international partners to tackle shared problems in an interconnected world. Explain that global teamwork can work well, and how America’s active participation can be a key to success. (Also see Tab 4 recommendations on international cooperation.)
- **Emphasize that how we act matters, not just what we do**. Talk about what kind of country we want to be in the world, with reference to our ideals and traditions—who we strive to be as people. Talk about the values and aspirations we share with other people around the world.

Don’t

- **Avoid starting with an emphasis on the “dark side” of interdependence** (e.g., the threat of infectious diseases, the dire effects of global warming, fears of anti-Americanism leading to terrorism and nuclear proliferation).
- **Don’t assume that people are being selfish, uncaring, or isolationist** if they say that America spends too much abroad. When they talk about taking care of “ours first,” they are usually expressing an altruistic desire to help others in their own family and/or community. Assume they want to give something to help others abroad; the question is how much—and whether it is effective.
- Avoid reinforcing distinctions or comparisons between “home” and “abroad.”

Don’t

- **Don’t use guilt, shame, or mere facts** to suggest what America should do or that it should spend more abroad. For instance, simply citing the fact that America is ranked among the lowest of rich countries in per-person contributions on development spending is unlikely to get you far; that fact is often rejected by listeners because it goes against the deeply held belief that America does it all and pays for everything around the world.

Keep in Mind

- When you know your audience well, **you might rearrange the order in which you introduce your “gateway” arguments**. For instance, you might open with a pragmatic argument for why citizens should care about foreign policy when talking with groups that are intensely concerned about specific problems affecting them or their communities (e.g., poverty or joblessness). By opening with an explanation of how foreign policy choices can affect these problems, you can demonstrate that you care about the listeners’ concerns and thereby have a better chance of getting a fair hearing of other points you want to make. Other audiences may be more responsive to opening with a *values-based* argument. But keep in mind that the **sequencing of arguments and frames is a hotly contested area of public opinion research**. (See Tab 1, “Key Background and Core Concepts and Terms”).
- **If you talk about America’s size and power, be aware that this may sound like “arrogance” and inadvertently trigger a negative reaction among those who want the U.S. to be more humble in the world**. Emphasize the importance of paying attention to our impact on others, of practicing what we preach, and of working with others.

Common Critiques & EFFECTIVE RESPONSES

- We spend too much abroad. Domestic needs come first. (p. 52)
- “Soft” issues are nice, but survival/security issues come first. (p. 53)
- No country is perfect. America is a benign superpower. (p. 54)
- There is no such thing as an “international community.” (p. 55)
- Peace is best achieved through strength. (p. 56)
- You see the world the way you want it to be, not how it really is. (p. 57)
- We can’t rely on the old strategies anymore. (p. 58)

8A WHY OUR FOREIGN POLICY MATTERS SO MUCH

Arguments & Facts to Help You Make Your Case

Interconnected World

Our world is increasingly interconnected—we need other nations, and they need us, to build a better future. To get things right at home, we must often work with others abroad:

- To protect ourselves: Attempted terrorist attacks on New Year's Eve 2000 were prevented because Canada, Jordan, and other countries tracked down the perpetrators before they reached the U.S. Since 2001, our partner countries have arrested 3,000 suspected terrorists and their supporters.
- To stop potential threats from becoming real: International inspectors track nuclear weapons in countries like Iran and North Korea, where Americans are not welcome.
- To secure our economic future: We can't be isolated from the global economy, so we need to make sure that it produces good jobs and rising living standards for ourselves and others.
- To protect the global environment, we must share the legacy we leave for our children.
- To share the costs of fighting HIV/AIDS, or protecting the oceans, which would be too much for the U.S. alone but when our generosity sparks contributions from others, we have enough to get the job done.
- To live out our most basic values—the shared human desire to live in a world where common decency and hope for the future prevail.
- Who builds these links? Not just governments but also individual Americans, who travel and study abroad, have ties to family and friends, and live global lives more than at any time in the past.

Pragmatic

What happens abroad affects our security, our jobs, our health, and our way of life. With transocean travel and trade, the Internet and satellite TV, the world can come to our door very quickly. Our foreign policy—how we relate to governments, people, and trends around the world—is crucial to shaping the world and to facing problems early. It's just not smart to let problems build up unattended.

- As the world gets smaller, the best way to keep ourselves safe is to work with other countries to prevent or stop threats like terrorists, deadly weapons, illegal drugs, and unknown diseases before they cross our borders.
- No one running a business can afford anymore to ignore the world economy: Between U.S. exports to other countries, and foreign employers in the U.S., the global economy supports one in nine American jobs even as it can take other jobs away.
- Many of the daily activities we take for granted—from eating fresh fruit and vegetables out of season, to using cell phones, treating diseases, or watching our favorite sports stars—depend on the contributions of other nations and on our trade and relationships with them.

- When U.S. doctors work with their colleagues to solve the mystery of SARS, bird flu, and other diseases, they're promoting world health—and helping to make sure that those diseases won't appear in the U.S.

Our actions also have a profound effect on the citizens of other countries,

because the United States has the world's largest economy, strongest military, and most-exported culture. If the U.S. chooses to ignore or oppose peacemaking efforts, peace may not get made. Which trade agreements the U.S. supports, and how we work to shape world markets, will have profound effects on faraway workers and communities. We need to look into the future to understand those effects—and how they might boomerang to affect us.

- How important are we? Our military is so large that by 2005, we will spend more on it than all other countries on Earth combined spend on their armed forces. Our economy is twice as large as the second largest one.
- Our impact goes far beyond the actions of our government. Pop culture is our second largest export, and almost everyone who sees TV anywhere in the world will at some time see American programming. For better or worse, that becomes billions of people's window on America—wealthy, tolerant, and successful, but sometimes violent, materialistic and self-absorbed.
- Sometimes we have a serious impact on other countries without realizing it, or without intending to affect them at all. Those effects, in turn, can make people who should be our partners hostile to us. For example, our trade agreements sometimes threaten entire national industries—like grain farmers in Mexico or cotton farmers in West Africa—in countries and regions where farming is the only alternative to starvation.

How we act also affects what we can accomplish, and how much of the burden others are willing to share.

When we live up to our promises, follow the rules we expect others to obey, and match our actions to the values we proclaim, then we gain the respect and trust of others and the ability to rally them to our cause.

- When we engage generously, it often helps us down the road. For example, the countries in Central Europe who turned to us for help in building postcommunist societies are now some of our most dependable allies. Think of where we would be today if South Korea were poor, autocratic, and desperate like North Korea.
- Certain behaviors needlessly antagonize our partners—just as they antagonize us when we are on the receiving end. We find it hard to understand when some nations don't do more to fight terrorism; they may be concerned with local war, disease, or poverty, and they wonder why we don't seem to care about those challenges. We may see some issues in a negotiation as intensely important to us; others may see our behavior as a threat to take our ball and go home.
- What matters is not rules for rules' sake, or cooperation for cooperation's sake, but whether we reach the outcome we want—and whether we can count on our partners again next time.

Right and Smart

Respect

MESSAGING RECOMMENDATIONS

PRIORITY REMINDERS FROM “TOP TWENTY”

2. Put your proposals and arguments in the **context of an interconnected world**.
3. Explain why your proposals are **smart/effective/pragmatic/realistic** in the context of today’s world. Reference big ideas about **sound decision making, leadership, or management**.
4. Explain why your proposals are the **right thing to do**. Evoke big ideas familiar to Americans about **decent behavior**.
7. When appropriate, **cite examples of other countries (and NGOs) that are working alongside the U.S.**, to counter the mistaken but widespread public assumption that “we are doing it all.”
8. Cite examples of **what works** and offer **success stories**.
9. **Empower listeners** by telling them **what they can do** to help. **Talk about yardsticks** citizens can use to evaluate policy actions and progress over time. (See “Engaging Citizens,” Tab 8)
13. **Avoid jargon and acronyms**. (See “Wonk-Speak Translator,” Tab 2)
17. Use a **reasonable, rational** tone. **Don’t attack personally** or attack motives. **Avoid partisan attacks**. **Question others’ assumptions**, not their integrity.
18. Show both the **benefits of approaches you propose** and the **costs of alternatives**.

Don’t

- Don’t equate foreign policy—explicitly or implicitly—with the struggle against terrorism or with national security policy. Evoke a bigger picture in listeners’ heads, one that could include the broader range of issues on America’s foreign policy agenda.

Keep in Mind

- If you call for U.S. “leadership” on an issue(s), be clear about the *kind* of leadership you are advocating and about *how* you want the U.S. to be as a leader (e.g., the kind of leadership that creates followers, the kind that encourages other countries to share burdens). Simply calling for more “leadership” in general could inadvertently trigger the mindset that “the U.S. is already doing so much, why should we always be the ones to lead?” and it could offend those who want America to be humble in the world.

Keep in Mind

- If calling for more investments in nonmilitary tools, **don’t open with statements about what the military can’t do**. Instead, acknowledge the importance of the military and explain why other tools are also important to keeping America strong and effective in today’s world.
- Talking about “root causes” can inadvertently trigger thinking that problems are big and hopeless or that you are not sufficiently attentive to pressing symptoms. However, **talking about prevention** may help you to effectively argue for farsighted, comprehensive approaches.
- Avoid statements about a “**potential/inevitable eventual decline**” of American power, which fail to appeal to Americans’ optimism and invite criticism. Framing related arguments with the concept of **overreaching militarily may get a better hearing**.
- **Avoid words like “empire” and “imperialism”** that will turn off large portions of your audience, because most Americans definitely do not see U.S. actions in that light.
- **Avoid language that could encourage listeners to think only about narrow self-interests or that could encourage an “us versus them” mindset**.

Common Critiques & EFFECTIVE RESPONSES

- We spend too much abroad. Domestic needs come first. (p. 52)
- “Soft” issues are nice, but survival/security issues come first. (p. 53)
- No country is perfect. America is a benign superpower. (p. 54)
- There is no such thing as an “international community.” (p. 55)
- Peace is best achieved through strength. (p. 56)
- You see the world the way you want it to be, not how it really is. (p. 57)
- We can’t rely on the old strategies anymore. (p. 58)

8B WHAT OUR FOREIGN POLICY SHOULD LOOK LIKE

Arguments & Facts to Help You Make Your Case

Farsighted

We're at our best as a nation when we see the world as it is and respond with farsighted leadership to prepare for tomorrow's challenges today.

Farsighted policies connect the dots, recognizing how one issue is linked to others we care about—for example, how fighting terrorism is linked to money laundering, collapsed governments, and regional conflicts.

- A smart foreign policy will be ready to use force when it's the right thing to do but will build up every tool we have—diplomacy, trade and economic support, cultural ties—so that we aren't asking our military to do it all.
- A pragmatic foreign policy will use prevention to identify and deal with problems before they become so serious that they threaten our safety or way of life:
 - As the Cold War was ending, Presidents George H. W. Bush and Bill Clinton, along with Congress, began using U.S. resources to secure or remove nuclear materials from the former Soviet Union. Today, with terrorists on the hunt for nuclear weapons, every dollar spent to make those weapons safe looks like a terrific investment.
 - President Reagan joined other governments in recognizing the need to do something about the ozone hole that was destroying the atmosphere and threatening the world's health. Now, thanks to the treaty he signed with 182 other governments, chemicals that harm the ozone layer have been largely phased out, and scientists believe that our atmosphere is making a slow recovery.
- Farsighted leadership also means wisely managing our resources here at home, so that we can afford to maintain our military and civilian engagement in the world.

American Way

The U.S. will do best in the international arena when we unite with others around shared values, and when we honor the same values we cherish and try to promote at home—

justice, opportunity, and fairness for all; respect for people's rights and tolerance for the diversity of others; creating strong communities that give everyone a voice. Our goals abroad are not fundamentally different from what we strive for at home—a world in which common sense and common decency prevail.

- Our foreign policy should strive to match our aspirations for ourselves—what our country's Founders described as “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” In a world where borders are breaking down, we can only secure those blessings for ourselves by helping extend them to others.

- Throughout our history, when we've put forward a vision in which those values were paramount—whether helping to found the UN, NATO, and other international organizations, helping to lead the global fight against smallpox and other diseases, or proposing rules to limit the threat from dangerous weapons, teams have sprung into existence to work with us, and the results have worked for us and others alike.

We're inevitably going to need others to achieve many of our goals. We're at our best in the world when our actions demonstrate that we understand this.

**Interconnected
World**

- From Korea in the 1950s to Iraq in 2003, from our successful fight against smallpox to today's struggle with HIV/AIDS, and from the creation of economic institutions that helped us grow strong in the 20th century to the uncertainty about how to promote growth for us and others in the 21st, U.S. leaders from both parties have always understood that we need to work with others. It's just common sense.
- A smart foreign policy will expand our options by building ties of respect with other nations, so that we can count on them—and they know they can count on us.
- We will always do better when we are, as President Bush has said, a humble nation, not an arrogant-seeming one. We're not perfect; in fact, our values are more inspiring when we're honest about our own struggles and shortcomings.

We're at our best when we build structures and habits of cooperation with others and do not try to do it all ourselves. A smart U.S. foreign policy will enable us to work with others to build durable strategies and structures for cooperation—treaties and agreements to resolve difficult issues, institutions that bring us together to work out disagreements—so we will have reliable partners to help us respond to global threats.

Teamwork

- Efforts to help societies rebuild after a conflict have been most successful (e.g., in East Timor and Kosovo) when the U.S., the UN, and other partners have split up the assistance according to what each does best.
- Effective teamwork can overcome challenges: Several times in the past few decades, countries have threatened to start building or selling nuclear materials in large quantities. But still, only 8 countries have nuclear weapons, and none has used such a weapon since 1945—because the U.S. and its partners have used innovation and teamwork every time to find new ways to discourage making and buying the weapons.
- Effective teamwork evolves over time. The European Union, which today sets economic, health, labor, and foreign policy for a bloc of countries whose size rivals that of the U.S., started out as a coal-and-steel-based trade organization among 6 war-torn European nations after World War II.

Common Critiques

& EFFECTIVE RESPONSES

9A “We should spend less (time and money) on foreign issues, more at home. ‘Home comes first’. ...”

***Basic advice:** Avoid reinforcing distinctions (or relying too heavily on comparisons) between “home” and “abroad.” Emphasize our interconnected world, in which active and collaborative engagement is realistic, farsighted, right and smart.*

“... In an increasingly interconnected world, **we need other nations, and they need us, to build a better future.** What’s more, we can’t solve our problems at home without also engaging with the rest of the world. By working with other countries to stop epidemics that could come to our shores, by joining international efforts to ease the poverty and indignity that can be exploited by terrorist groups, and by building trust and goodwill in the global community, we benefit others and ourselves. It’s a win–win situation. ...”

“... **The world is an interconnected system,** and Americans understand that the well-being of any part of that system depends on the health of the whole, and vice versa. That’s why the overwhelming majority of Americans want this country to play an active role in the world. When we join international efforts to help impoverished countries become stable, productive members of the global community, it’s an investment in a better future for everyone. ...”

“... We all share one planet. **What happens abroad affects our security, our jobs, our health, and our way of life—and what we do has a profound effect on others’ lives.** Just as we must attend to needs and problems at home, we must also work actively with international institutions and nonprofit organizations to help address problems of poverty, injustice, and environmental degradation in other countries. We’re at our best in the world when we **understand these connections and act accordingly. ...**”

“... The fact is, if we **invest in solving global problems early**—like halting the spread of new infectious diseases before they reach the U.S., and easing the suffering and indignity that foster anger and violence—we **save both lives and money. ...**”

9B **“It’s nice to care about ‘soft’ issues, but we can’t do everything; we have limited resources and have to set priorities. Security issues must take precedence ...”**

Basic advice: Paint a bigger picture, with a longer timeline, to show the costs of a narrow, shortsighted approach and the benefits of “connecting the dots.” Emphasize the commonsense notion of using comprehensive strategies to address complex challenges.

“... You can’t have a smart security policy without **a smart foreign policy that looks at the big picture and connects the dots** between issues—like understanding how regional conflicts, collapsed governments, and persistent poverty and indignity interact to provide a fertile recruiting ground for extremists and terrorists. A smart foreign policy **makes progress on many fronts at the same time**—as it must, in our increasingly interconnected world. ...”

“... If we **define security too narrowly**, focusing only on its military aspects, we’ll **miss important opportunities to help make the world a safer place**, for us and for others. We’ll miss opportunities to prevent conflict—for example, by working with other nations to relieve the conditions of poverty and indignity that extremists exploit. We’ll miss opportunities to join with others in addressing long-term environmental threats, like global warming, before they balloon into crises. We’ll miss opportunities to nurture the trust and cooperation of other nations, which may be wondering why they should contribute to the fight against terrorism when we don’t seem to care much about their concerns. And without the trust and cooperation of other nations, our ability to play a constructive role in solving a wide range of global problems will be limited. ...”

“... **Smart problem solvers look at causes as well as symptoms, and they recognize that having an immediate impact is not necessarily the same as achieving lasting results.** A responsible and effective foreign policy will tackle what’s urgent—protecting Americans from terrorist attacks—without neglecting what’s important—like addressing the hopelessness and indignity that can make fanaticism attractive and terrorism acceptable in the first place. We **can’t afford tunnel vision or shortsightedness** when it comes to facing the complex challenges of the 21st century. ...”

“... **America has many sources of strength and inspiration** to draw on in facing the challenges of the 21st century, including security. To suggest that we define ourselves solely in terms of anger and fear is to ignore the pragmatic, generous, can-do spirit of the American people. We have the capacity to defend our country against terrorism without abandoning our larger goal of helping to build a more hopeful, peaceful, and prosperous world. ...”

“... As we line up our priorities, let’s not forget that **our ability to rally other countries** to our side for the struggle against global terrorism ultimately **depends on our willingness to pursue shared global interests, not just national ones.** Even America’s closest friends can’t be expected to trust an America that wields its vast power only to advance its own narrowly defined objectives. When we engage generously and pitch in to help solve some of the problems all nations share, we inspire the respect and friendship we need to make progress on today’s global challenges. ...”

9C **“You blame America for not being perfect, not doing enough. But no country is perfect. On balance, we’re better and do more. ...”**

Basic advice: Acknowledge Americans’ traditional generosity and focus on what it means to live up to it fully. Emphasize principled engagement, putting our strength to great purpose.

“... Americans are caring people. We give generously to nonprofit organizations that work in crisis situations around the world. But **unless our private acts of generosity are combined with the kind of large-scale, sustained initiatives that only government can undertake, we may not make a lasting impact.** When government does its part of the job, we can help poor countries build healthy, stable societies that are able to prevent and withstand crises. ...”

“... **Americans want the U.S. to do its share** in international efforts to solve global problems like hunger, illiteracy, and the spread of HIV/AIDS. That hasn’t changed and never will. But **because we’ve been concentrating on the military aspects of America’s role in the world, we’ve lost track of the fact that our nation’s relative contribution to the relief of human suffering has fallen behind** that of other nations. Let’s get back to doing our share and inspiring others with our example. ...”

“... The United States has a strong tradition of generosity and a history of inspiring others with its vision. We’re **honoring that national tradition** when we ask whether America can and should be doing better now. And by **holding ourselves to a higher standard**, we’re following **an ethical code that’s part of every faith tradition.** ...”

“... **Our country is always at its best when it’s striving to do better.** Americans understand the importance of trying to live up to what this nation stands for—including values like fairness and the idea that every person should have an opportunity to improve his or her life. In an increasingly interconnected world, we can only secure these blessings for ourselves by helping to extend them to others. **We won’t always live up to our ideals, but common sense and common decency require us to try.** ...”

“... **The real question is whether the United States is doing enough to achieve one of its most important goals—helping to create a more peaceful, secure world.** Every dollar we spend on fighting global hunger, illiteracy and the spread of HIV/AIDS is an investment in regional and global stability. That’s smart, and it’s the right thing to do. Many other countries, large and small, are stepping up to the plate. Compared with the scale of the problems and our capacity to make a difference, are we doing enough?. ...”

9D “There is no such thing as an ‘international community’. ...”

***Basic advice:** Treat the global community as an emerging reality that the U.S. can help to shape or not, and point to the consequences of our choice. Emphasize farsightedness and America’s history of leadership in this area.*

“... We know how profoundly events in far-off places can affect us and how interconnected nations and people are becoming, thanks to the ties of travel, communications, and trade. We’re already living in a global neighborhood. The challenge for us now is to work with other nations to **transform this global neighborhood—slowly but surely—into a global community**, with shared values and a shared commitment to solving our common problems. It’s a natural next step. ...”

“... We could act as if the rest of the world doesn’t exist, but that’s not **the American way**. Historically, we’ve been at our best—and have been better off—when we found common ground with others and worked together to solve common problems. That’s the vision that inspired the United States to take the lead in creating many of the existing institutions of international cooperation, like the United Nations. Helping to shape a peaceful, prosperous global community in the 21st century should be a deeply American project. ...”

“... You all know **people who’ve turned their backs on their community, and their lives seem the poorer for it**. Likewise, we can choose to live as if there’s no global community taking shape around us—but we’ll be the poorer for it, too. ...”

9E **“A strong America is the most important ingredient for a peaceful and prosperous world. Peace through strength should be our watchword when dealing with today’s security challenges. ...”**

Basic advice: Talk about the kind of country we want to be in the world, and how we use our strength; show the costs of overreliance on the military and the benefits of a more holistic and collaborative approach. Emphasize effectiveness and the commonsense notion of using comprehensive strategies to address complex challenges.

“... The real question is, **are we doing everything we can** to help make our increasingly interconnected world more peaceful—for us and for others? We’ve built the world’s strongest military force. But if we’re to make progress on today’s tough security challenges, we also need smart and farsighted diplomacy, the trust and respect of our allies, the help of effective global agencies and institutions, and the moral authority that comes from acting in ways that are fundamentally consistent with our values. Right now, **we’re neglecting some of the most important foreign policy tools** and resources we have at our disposal. ...”

“... As a decent and responsible nation, our first choice should be to prevent and contain threats through nonmilitary means, so we don’t have to use our military strength. If we make force the centerpiece of our foreign policy, it’s like **asking the young men and women in our military to bear the entire burden of America’s global role**. That’s not fair. We have many other ways of doing our share to make the world a better place. ...”

“... Strength means using every muscle you have—diplomatic, economic, and moral as well as military. ...”

“... Just because we have **a big military hammer doesn’t mean every problem is a nail**. ...”

“... In an increasingly interconnected world, **shared problems need to be addressed through a shared commitment** by many nations. That means the **force of our example** will often be more important than the example of our force. Abiding by global rules, treating other countries with respect, and honoring our promises—these are the actions of a decent and responsible nation, and they inspire other countries to do the same. ...”

“... Unfortunately, **much of the world now sees us as a bully** who isn’t willing to work with other countries unless they agree to do things our way. **That isn’t strength**, and Americans of both parties know it. When our actions are seen as arrogant or hypocritical, it limits our ability to play a constructive role in building a more peaceful, prosperous world, for us and for others. We need partnerships based on trust and respect to get the job done. Working together multiplies our strength, expands our options, and divides our costs and risks. ...”

“... There’s a difference between power and authority. Power is the ability to compel by force and sanctions, and there are times when we must use it. Authority is the ability to lead, and we depend on it for almost everything we try to achieve. Our authority is built on the attractiveness of our values, on the force of our example, on the credibility of our commitments, and on our willingness to listen to and stand by others. If we use our power in a way that antagonizes our friends and dishonors our commitments, we will lose our authority and our power will mean very little. ...”

9F **“You just don’t understand how dangerous the world is. You see the world the way you want it to be, not how it really is. ...”**

Basic advice: Lay claim to realism. Emphasize effectiveness, pragmatism.

“... **Leaders who see the world as it really is understand that we are more effective when we work with others.** A go-it-alone approach has real costs, and far-reaching and unforeseeable consequences. In extreme circumstances, we may not have time to seek support from others before we use force. But announcing in advance that we will use force whenever and wherever we choose—without regard to what others think or the rules we ask others to follow—may hurt us more than it hurts those seeking to harm us. ...”

“... Then let’s **apply the lessons we’ve learned from other challenging times—** lessons about there being strength in numbers, and the value of having allies; lessons about the wisdom of connecting the dots on complex issues and addressing causes as well as symptoms; lessons about the need to plan and think ahead; and lessons about balancing our military strength with the kind of strong, smart diplomacy that helps turn dangerous situations around. ...”

“... **An “us versus them” view of the world can become a self-fulfilling prophecy. That’s** one of the most dangerous threats of all. ...”

“... Many nations are concerned about the same global problems as we are. **We’re not alone in understanding these threats,** and we don’t have to be alone in the steps we take to address them. In an increasingly interconnected world, shared problems need to be addressed through a shared commitment by many nations. Working together, we can get the job done. ...”

“... The reality is that most of today’s big global challenges simply can’t be managed by any one nation, no matter how strong. Many other challenges are best handled by a team of nations, each contributing its share. That leaves very few challenges that we can deal with effectively by acting alone. **We need allies and partners more, not less, in difficult times. ...”**

9G **“Terrorism is a whole new ballgame. We can’t rely on old strategies anymore. ...”**

Basic advice: Break out of the “old versus new” trap; we need the best of both. Emphasize effectiveness and the need for comprehensive approaches to complex challenges.

“... A smart strategy against global terrorism will be comprehensive, drawing on both time-tested approaches and new ones. Military force may work in limited circumstances—but we can’t afford to neglect the other effective tools available to us, like strong diplomacy, intelligence sharing, and international teamwork to disrupt the financial networks that keep terrorists in business. And we can’t ignore the long-term challenge of addressing the economic and political frustrations that terrorists exploit. **Overreliance on a military strategy** risks winning battles on the ground, while in the process losing the long-term struggle for the hearts and minds of the rest of the world—particularly the Muslim world. ...”

“... The key question is how best to protect American lives. Global terrorism takes advantage of the ways in which our world is interconnected. This means that we need strong antiterrorism partnerships to fight back. In fact, we’ve been our **most effective against terrorists when we’ve worked with other countries** to destroy terrorist networks, not just a single camp or training site. Any strategy that unnecessarily antagonizes other nations weakens our alliances when we need them most. ...”

“... The use of military force is the oldest strategy of all—and sometimes it’s the only or best option available. But the threat of terrorism is too complex to handle with any single instrument—especially not with a blunt instrument like military force. We’ll be more effective in the short run if we work with other nations to **tackle this problem in a comprehensive fashion, on multiple fronts—**through intelligence sharing and international teamwork to halt the flow of funds to terrorist groups, for example. And we’ll be more effective in the long run if we and our allies **work together to prevent this threat** by resolving the festering regional conflicts and real or perceived injustices that terrorists exploit. ...”

“... The real question is: Are we doing everything we can to reduce the threat of global terrorism? Right now, **we’re neglecting some of the most important tools and resources** for achieving that goal. A strong military alone won’t do it. We need smart and farsighted diplomacy, the trust and respect of our allies, the help of effective global agencies and institutions, and the moral authority that comes from acting in ways that are fundamentally consistent with our values. We need to take homeland security seriously, and make far more meaningful investments in improving the ability of local police forces, firefighters, and medical and public health professionals to act with speed and coordination in the event of an attack. **We need a comprehensive strategy that includes the best of both the old and the new. ...”**

Representative Quotes

AMERICA'S ROLE IN THE WORLD

"We can achieve far more through persuasion than bullying, through humility than arrogance, through generosity than sanctions, through the force of example than the example of force. We can be the nation that accepts constraints even when it doesn't have to, guided by principles rather than power."

Anne-Marie Slaughter

Dean,
Woodrow Wilson School

"The United States can neither appear to be acting only in its self-interest, nor can it in fact act as if its own national interest were all that mattered. Even at times of dire emergency, and perhaps especially at those times, the world's sole superpower needs to demonstrate that it wields its great power on behalf of its principles and all who share them."

Robert Kagan

Senior Associate,
Carnegie Endowment for
International Peace

"America shows the world that it is possible for people of all colors, creeds, and nationalities to live side by side in peace and freedom. That is the most important lesson for the world to learn right now."

Robert Wright

Author

"Military power and economic power are both examples of hard command power that can be used to induce others to change their position. Hard power can rest on inducements (carrots) or threats (sticks). But there is also an indirect way to exercise power. A country may obtain the outcomes it wants in world politics because other countries want to follow it, admiring its values, emulating its example, aspiring to its level of prosperity and openness. In this sense, it is just as important to set the agenda in world politics and attract others as it is to force them to change through the threat or use of military or economic weapons ... If the United States represents values that others want to follow, it will cost us less to lead."

Joseph Nye

Dean, Kennedy School of
Government,
Harvard University

"A global backlash to U.S. power is not inevitable. ... Our leaders have the ideas, means and political institutions that can allow for [order] even in the midst of [asymmetries] of power... But the United States needs to rediscover the solutions that it has brought to the problem of unequal power in the past. These solutions are celebrated in our national political tradition. The rule of law, constitutional principles and inclusive institutions of political participation ensure that governance is not simply a product of wealth or power. The wealthy and the powerful must operate within principled institutional parameters. Because a rule-based order generates more stable and cooperative relations within the country, even the wealthy and powerful gain by avoiding social upheaval, which puts everyone's interests at risk. America can once again take this old domestic insight and use it to shape post-Cold War international relations. And it is time to do so now, when America's relative power may be at its peak."

John Ikenberry

Professor, Georgetown
University

Richard Haass

President, Council
on Foreign Relations

"Counterterrorism ... is a priority, not an organizing principle for American foreign policy. It will influence the focus of attention and resources and will require that we address other foreign policy challenges such as state failure and nation building. But counterterrorism cannot be a doctrine. There are simply too many critical issues for which opposition to terrorism provides little or no direction, including implementing a new global trade agenda, building civil societies or advancing democracy around the world, meeting the transnational challenges from infectious disease to climate change that increasingly define this era, or integrating China, Russia, India and others into the major undertakings of this era."

Michael Hirsh

Senior Editor,
Newsweek

"[If] the world only gets marching orders [from America] and not a common vision, it will be less inclined to follow them. ... [Carrying] a big stick and [speaking] loudly at the same time ... only turns one into a schoolyard bully. And bullies always have their comeuppance."

Newt Gingrich

former Speaker of the
House of Representatives

"I will suggest to you that the challenge of U.S. dominance, which none of us fully appreciate yet, is that we are like a 12,000 pound elephant in the world's living room, and we wake up in the morning and we shake our head because we think we're still a cute hamster like we were with Jefferson and Adams, and our trunk breaks five pieces of family china. And the entire planet stares in horror, and we have no clue."

Madeleine Albright

former Secretary of State

"The idea that Americans—residents of the most powerful land in history—are now truly living in fear of bin Laden has failed to impress the majority of people around the globe, whose concerns about terrorism are dwarfed by the challenge they face in simply staying alive despite the ever-present perils of poverty, hunger, and disease. The United States' cause would therefore be heard more clearly and listened to more closely if [we] substituted bridges for bluster and spoke more often of choices relevant to the day-to-day lives of more of the world's people. That means spelling out consistently not only what Americans are against, but also what they are for, and making clear that this includes helping people everywhere live richer, freer, and longer lives."

Leslie H. Gelb

former President,
Council on Foreign
Relations and

Justine A. Rosenthal

Council on Foreign
Relations

"Morality, values, ethics, universal principles—the whole panoply of ideals in international affairs that were once almost the exclusive domain of preachers and scholars—have taken root in the hearts, or at least the minds, of the foreign policy community. ... Moral matters ... are now a constant force that cannot be overlooked when it comes to policy effectiveness abroad or political support at home."

TAB 4
INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

CONTENTS

10. MESSAGING RECOMMENDATIONS, HELPFUL ARGUMENTS & FACTS

A. International Cooperation: Why We Need It	62
B. International Cooperation: How to Improve It	64
C. Why What the World Thinks of Us Matters	66

11. COMMON CRITIQUES & EFFECTIVE RESPONSES

A. “America must not compromise its sovereignty/flexibility.”	68
B. “We can’t entrust decisions about U.S. security to others.”	69
C. “We’re not opposed to all treaties ... just the bad ones.”	70
D. “International organizations/bureaucracies are inefficient.”	71
E. “Being resented for being No. 1 goes with the territory.”	72
F. “Leadership is not a popularity contest.”	73

Representative Quotes	74
-----------------------	----



U.S. in the World

TALKING GLOBAL ISSUES WITH AMERICANS:
A PRACTICAL GUIDE

Note: Sources for facts and figures in this section, along with recommended sources for keeping facts and figures up to date, are available in the “Keeping Current” section of www.usintheworld.org.

MESSAGING RECOMMENDATIONS

PRIORITY REMINDERS FROM “TOP TWENTY”

2. Put your proposals and arguments in the **context of an interconnected world**.
3. Explain why your proposals are **smart/effective/pragmatic/realistic** in the context of today’s world. Reference big ideas about **sound decision making, leadership, or management**.
4. Explain why your proposals are **the right thing to do**. Evoke big ideas familiar to Americans about **decent behavior**.
7. When appropriate, **cite examples of other countries (and NGOs) that are working alongside the U.S.**
8. Cite examples of **what works** and offer **success stories**.
13. **Avoid jargon and acronyms like “multilateralism.”** (See “Wonk-Speak Translator,” Tab 2)
18. Show both the **benefits of approaches you propose** and the **costs of alternatives**.

Do

- **Stress that international cooperation is a means to an end** (e.g., making the world a better and safer place for us and for future generations).
- **Put a face on international cooperation** that makes it real and defines it as more than just the United Nations.
- **Reassure audiences that Americans generally favor cooperative approaches** over go-it-alone ones.

Don’t

- **Don’t defend international cooperation (or international agreements) per se or for their own sake.** Multilateralism, treaties, and agreements are not goals; they are tactics. Others will try to frame the discussion as if you have an intrinsic, ideological preference for agreements—including those with an intrinsic, ideological bias *against* agreements. Instead, talk goals associated with cooperation. Talk cost-benefit analysis.
- **Don’t make all your examples about security and terrorism.** Juxtaposition is important.

Keep in Mind

- If someone raises concerns about limits on U.S. sovereignty and freedom of action, try acknowledging the importance of the underlying **concern for freedom of action on matters of life or death, while stressing that the U.S. benefits most from a world based on rules and norms.**
- **When someone has a narrow “What’s in it for me, what’s in it for America” mindset,** try invoking rationality and common sense by making it a cost-benefit analysis and responding in terms of the language of national self-interest. (E.g., “The only way to get other countries to accept constraints is on a reciprocal basis. The issue is whether the benefits of this international agreement are greater than the cost of the constraints on us.”) **Be careful, though, not to go overboard on national self-interest when not necessary.**
- **It may not be successful**—and may be potentially counterproductive—to **argue with citizens that “we are the UN.”** When trying to stress the benefits of burden sharing that comes with arrangements like the UN, this argument can have the unintended consequence of reactivating the incorrect impression you are trying to counter: that America is doing it all (too much) in the world, including at the UN. (Note: policy elites are more receptive to the “we are the UN” argument.)
- **Avoid relying too heavily on the Iraq example when talking about the costs of “go-it-alone” behavior.** If Iraq, with all its complexities, becomes the only foreign policy issue in the minds of listeners, it can trigger isolationist impulses even among people who would ordinarily prefer to see the U.S. play an active role in global problem solving.

Common Critiques & EFFECTIVE RESPONSES

- America must not compromise its sovereignty/flexibility. (p. 68)
- We can’t entrust decisions about U.S. security to others. (p. 69)
- We’re not opposed to all treaties ... Just the bad ones. (p. 70)
- International organizations/bureaucracies are inefficient. (p. 71)
- Being resented for being No. 1 goes with the territory. (p. 72)
- Leadership is not a popularity contest. (p. 73)
- There is no such thing as an “international community.” (p. 55)
- Peace is best achieved through strength. (p. 56)
- You see the world the way you want it to be, not how it really is. (p. 57)
- We can’t rely on the old strategies anymore. (p. 58)

10A **INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION: W H Y W E N E E D I T**

Arguments & Facts to Help You Make Your Case

Interconnected World; Common Sense

Cooperation is a means to an end, a common sense tool to get things done—it's real people, in government and out, working together on issues that matter to our daily lives. Many issues we face are bigger than any one nation—even the U.S.: finding terrorists anywhere they hide; stopping killer germs before they reach our shores; making the global economy work for us and for everyone. Working with other countries and international institutions like the UN multiplies our strength, expands our options, and shares our costs and risks. Just as in our own communities, the process of cooperating on “easy” issues builds trust and relationships that help when harder issues come along.

- The United States belongs to military alliances in Europe and Asia that, when we choose to use them, mean our troops won't have to fight alone. Our partners now provide nine-tenths of the troops keeping the peace in the Balkans and one-third of the troops in Afghanistan. Even in a country as close as Haiti, soldiers from Canada, Chile, and France make up almost half the total military presence.
- The international treaties and agreements that we have helped to shape now govern much of our lives:
 - Making international air travel safe
 - Setting the rules that ensure mail and phone calls get where they're going
 - Outlawing deadly weapons
 - Fighting illegal drugs
 - Promoting basic values we share, such as ending child labor.

American Way

The U.S. has a proud history of bringing nations together for the common good.

- International institutions like the UN are not alien institutions; we helped to create them to serve our purposes, and we can lead in updating them to do the same. The U.S. was crucial to the creation of every one of the global institutions that kept the peace and built our strong economy in the second half of the 20th century—from the UN and NATO to economic institutions such as the World Bank and International Monetary Fund.
- We've built institutions not for their own sake but because we had a vision that attracted others—a vision of equality, justice, and opportunity for all. When we lose sight of that vision, we lose the support of others—often just when we need it most.
- One of our most cherished values as Americans is the idea that everyone is equal under the law; when nations around the world share that view and agree on what the law is, we are all better off.

Cooperation works—and the benefits we gain outweigh the costs.

Like most things in life, we tend not even to notice this cooperation when it's working well. But our world would be changed completely if all this cooperation didn't exist—or if we, the world's strongest nation, stopped supporting it.

Results

- International cooperation through organizations such as UNICEF, the UN Children's Fund, has improved the lives of the world's children more in the past 40 years than the world had done in the previous 100.
- Our UN dues and support for other groups during the past 40 years have also helped cut worldwide illiteracy in half and raise average global life expectancy by 20 years.
- UN peacekeepers and postconflict experts have helped end conflicts and rebuild governments in places no one else could or would—East Timor, Sierra Leone, and Liberia, to name a few.
- This UN record is remarkable, considering that all UN agencies together spend less in a year than one medium-sized U.S. state.
- Just as when we choose to belong to a particular club or church, or live in a particular neighborhood, there are costs. But also just as in our own lives, the benefits of cooperation far outweigh these costs:
 - **Expense.** The UN's annual budget [core plus agencies] is about \$10 billion dollars—just \$1.70 for each person on Earth. By comparison, the state of Arkansas spends more than that in a year. Less than 25 percent of UN costs are paid by the U.S.—a pretty good investment, considering how much it leverages from others.
 - **Freedom of action.** Sometimes we do limit our actions; but we always have the option to opt out, and usually we gain far more by knowing that others will also face limits on what they can do that might harm us.
 - **Not getting our way.** Sometimes we don't get exactly the result we want—and it's important to be ready to deal with that. But just as in life, when one decision doesn't go our way, that doesn't invalidate everything we've accomplished with others.
 - **Imperfection.** Just because people break laws here at home, we don't give up on having laws. In the same way, we can use international law—and our partners—to help catch cheating when it happens. Internationally, too, the real question is: Wouldn't we be worse off with no rules-of-the-road at all?

MESSAGING RECOMMENDATIONS

PRIORITY REMINDERS FROM “TOP TWENTY”

3. Explain why your proposals are **smart/effective/pragmatic/realistic** in the context of today’s world. Reference big ideas about **sound decision making, leadership, or management**.
4. Explain why your proposals are **the right thing to do**. Evoke big ideas familiar to Americans about **decent behavior**.
7. When appropriate, **cite examples of other countries (and NGOs) that are working alongside the U.S.**
8. Cite examples of **what works** and offer **success stories**.
13. **Avoid jargon and acronyms**. (See “Wonk-Speak Translator,” Tab 2)
18. Show both the **benefits of approaches you propose and the costs of alternatives**

Do

- **Put a face on international cooperation** that makes it real and defines it as more than just the United Nations.
- Tell listeners why it matters **how America behaves on international teams and in efforts to improve cooperative ventures**.
- **Frame America’s efforts to improve cooperation or reform institutions as expressions of American values and traditions**. Make the challenges manageable. Talk about past successes in reform. **Identify other nations and players that have been involved in pushing for more reform** and more effective cooperation.

Don’t

- **Don’t deny the need for improvement and reform** (e.g., with regard to international institutions, treaties, and the UN) **when appropriate**. However, **don’t do so in ways that merely reinforce images of inefficiency and failure**. Instead, **put your agenda for improvement or reform in a larger context**—of what is working, of past successes, of challenges facing all institutions, of what is possible.

Keep in Mind

- **Esoteric details about the UN and other institutions’ reform agendas won’t be of much interest** to most of your audiences.

Keep in Mind

- **If you are addressing concerns about cooperation being too constraining or costly**, try talking in terms of **cost-benefit analysis**. Ask listeners to consider **what the world would end up looking like without** such arrangements.

Common Critiques & EFFECTIVE RESPONSES

- America must not compromise its sovereignty /flexibility. (p. 68)
- We can’t entrust decisions about U.S. security to others. (p. 69)
- We’re not opposed to all treaties ... Just the bad ones. (p. 70)
- International organizations/bureaucracies are ineffective, inefficient. (p. 71)
- There is no such thing as an “international community.” (p. 55)
- We can’t rely on the old strategies anymore. (p. 58)

10B INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION: HOW TO IMPROVE IT

Arguments & Facts to Help You Make Your Case

Can-do

All institutions need periodic retooling to meet new challenges.

From the UN, NATO, and the World Bank to international human rights standards to the basic rules of trade, the U.S. played a key role in developing all the key pillars of the international community. We are better off because we did; and we still have the strength, ingenuity, and foresight to work with others to make those institutions strong and useful for the future. A great deal has changed in the world since those institutions were created—but we are certainly still up to the challenge. We get good results when we cooperate to update and improve international institutions so that they can meet 21st-century challenges:

- **More responsive to private citizens:** Increasingly, private citizens and not-for-profit groups play an important part in shaping international negotiations. Neither the treaty banning landmines nor the agreement to publicize globally the risks of smoking could have happened without citizens' involvement. Religious groups and private citizens have also played key roles in negotiating peace agreements in Burundi, Sudan, and elsewhere.
- **Better run to private-sector standards:** At the UN, for example, reform has scored important successes, such as creating a strong inspector general and cutting headquarters staff by 20 percent.
- **Deserving public trust:** Across the international community, pressure from governments and civic groups has led to more openness and accountability in how money is spent and how decisions are made. Things aren't perfect, but the public has access to documents and meetings that was unthinkable just a decade ago.
- **Support shared values:** Critics of the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and other institutions intended to invest in poor people have pointed out that it makes no sense to support some goals in ways that undermine others, such as lending to corrupt or undemocratic governments, funding projects that harm the environment, or forcing countries to shortchange health and education to meet budget targets. These institutions are retooling—and can do more—to maximize the benefits of having strong international support while minimizing unintended harm.

Practice What You Preach

Successful partnership is a two-way street. Some of the most important things we can do to get the kind of cooperation we want from others involve being a good partner ourselves. We can't expect others to honor rules we refuse to obey, or to keep their promises when they perceive that we don't keep ours. Conversely, we know that when we acknowledge and respect the interests and concerns of others, they are much more likely to respect ours.

- Where we've cooperated with others from the beginning on security and peacekeeping, we bear much less of the burden; in the Balkans, for example, U.S. troops have always shared the burden with others and are now just a tenth of the forces keeping the peace.

- Our partners find it hard to understand when most of the world's nations together agree on a treaty based on principles we say we hold dear, yet we insist on special treatment for ourselves or announce that we will walk away instead of working to make a treaty better. For example, it is clearly in our interest to prevent other countries from obtaining dangerous nuclear and biological weapons, yet we aren't taking part in a treaty that forbids the testing of nuclear weapons (the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty), and we opposed a treaty banning germ warfare. We think of ourselves as second to none in supporting women's rights, yet we haven't adopted the Convention to End Discrimination Against Women; we have also opted out of agreements banning landmines, limiting the use of child soldiers, establishing basic rights for workers, fighting global warming, and the like. Yet in all these areas, we support the goals of the agreements, and in many cases, American ideas and beliefs actually provided the impetus for negotiations.

Success is measurable. We can judge success by whether our actions bring us closer to our goals and make successful cooperation more likely in the future. Helpful questions include:

Results

- **Does updating forms of cooperation make a difference?** A revolutionary partnership of UN agencies, pharmaceutical companies, American hospitals, private foundations, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the Government of Botswana is helping that African country become the first to aim to test and treat every citizen for HIV/AIDS—and also to research an AIDS vaccine that could be used everywhere.
- **Is cooperation leading to measurable gains in solving a problem?** Smallpox was eradicated, and polio has almost been wiped out, only because doctors, scientists, and governments from around the world worked together to track and fight the diseases wherever they appeared. In the same way, international health cooperation helps fight diseases like SARS, flu, and HIV/AIDS—and helps scientists watch out for dangerous germs and bioweapons.
- **Is it making people, institutions, and nations more likely to work together in the future?** NATO, an alliance of the U.S., Canada, and West and Central European nations, has had a remarkable record in bringing those countries, as well as others that hope to join in the future, together not just on military matters but also on broader security, economic, and human rights concerns. Also, shortly after 9/11, all UN members agreed to take dramatic steps to increase their cooperation against terrorism. But that agreement hasn't been followed up strongly, and it has yielded relatively little.
- **Could we do it alone?** In many areas—from shouldering the costs of rebuilding Iraq to preserving the Brazilian rainforest to fighting child labor in South Asia—the answer is no.

MESSAGING RECOMMENDATIONS

PRIORITY REMINDERS FROM “TOP TWENTY”

2. Put your proposals and arguments in the **context of an interconnected world**.
3. Explain why your proposals are **smart/effective/pragmatic/realistic** in the context of today's world. Reference big ideas about **sound decision making, leadership, or management**.
4. Explain why your proposals are the **right thing to do**. Evoke big ideas familiar to Americans about **decent behavior**.
7. When appropriate, **cite examples of other countries (and NGOs) that are working alongside the U.S.**
18. Show both the **benefits of approaches you propose and the costs of alternatives**.

Do



- Talk about the **example we want to set**, and the force of America's example.
- When pointing to suggested policy changes that could help to improve our standing abroad, **emphasize the goodwill of Americans and our good intentions** and that most people around the world like Americans but object to certain policies.
- Do recall that our **power grows as much out of our prestige/values as our military might**. Remind your audience that **we do have some control** over what people think abroad based on what we do: **World opinion surveys demonstrate that foreign views about America rise and fall, depending on what the U.S. happens to be doing**.
- Do point out that those who really hate us and wish us harm are a tiny, though dangerous, minority.
- Acknowledge that we're not perfect but are **at our best when striving to do better**.

Don't



- **Don't get pulled into discussions on an immature or emotional level** (e.g., “You only want to be liked ... who cares what the French think?”). Stay **rational**, and keep reframing in terms of **effectiveness and rational pursuit of interests**, why your approach is more **pragmatic**, recalling how much others **have the potential to contribute** (e.g., global problem solving, burden sharing, sharing troops).

Common Critiques & EFFECTIVE RESPONSES

- Being resented for being No. 1 goes with the territory. (p. 72)
- Leadership is not a popularity contest. (p. 73)
- There is no such thing as an “international community.” (p. 55)
- Peace is best achieved through strength. (p. 56)
- You see the world the way you want it to be, not how it really is. (p. 57)

10C WHY WHAT THE WORLD THINKS OF US MATTERS

Arguments & Facts to Help You Make Your Case

Interconnected

In an interdependent world, we need the respect and support of others to safeguard our security, to work together on common challenges, and to show that our values and priorities have merit. When that mutual respect is lacking, the quality and dependability of our partnerships are harmed.

- **Shared understandings matter:** To prosecute terrorists successfully in other nations, we must find common standards, even where our law enforcement procedures are different.
- **Shared goals matter:** To share the burden of peacekeeping in countries as diverse as Afghanistan, Haiti, and Iraq, we must have international partners that agree with our actions, and international institutions must have the capacity to get the job done.
- **Respect matters:** To have partners on these or any issues, we need a foundation of trust and respect in what we choose to do, and how we choose to do it.
- **Reciprocity matters:** If other countries are going to take risks on our highest-priority issues, they expect us to help them face their highest concerns.

American Way

It's the American way to be respected and admired, not feared, for our strength. Since 1945, the U.S. has been a dominant force in world affairs. We have enjoyed an astonishing degree of acceptance and even support worldwide—because we were seen as using our power, though not perfectly, to promote broader shared interests in justice and liberty. From that perception, as well as from our strong military and vibrant economy, flows our power in this new century.

- How strong was American prestige at its height? During the 1963 Cuban missile crisis, a senior American diplomat was sent to France to explain the U.S. position to French president Charles de Gaulle. After the diplomat made his case, he prepared to show satellite photos that would offer proof. De Gaulle stopped him, saying “I do not wish to see the photographs. The word of the president of the United States is good enough for me. Please tell him that France stands with America.”
- Half a million foreign students study in the U.S. each year—their experiences, and the people they meet, are one of the world's most important windows into what America is like. In the past, many world leaders spent time here, and that shaped their perceptions and actions of us positively. That may be changing. Recently, a senior Polish official was asked why his government had supported the U.S. in Iraq. He answered: “I look around the Polish cabinet and see that almost every single person spent a year or more studying or teaching in the United States. I look at the next generations of Polish leaders and see that almost none of them have the same experience. They would not make the same decision.”

When people around the world fear the effect we have on their lives, that matters.

In surveys, people all over the world express support for the basic values—rule by the people, economic freedom—that we share. Yes, there are some people out there who do hate us and want to do us harm, but most people are just concerned, resentful, or afraid that the U.S. wields its power in ways that don't reflect real concern for the effects our decisions have on others.

- A 2002 survey of 38,000 people in 44 countries found that overwhelming majorities admire the U.S. for its technological achievements and enjoy U.S. cultural exports.
- Yet the same survey found that majorities in most of the 44 countries believed that
 - The U.S. does not take the interests of their countries into account when making decisions that affect them
 - The U.S. does not do enough to solve global problems
 - U.S. policies contribute to the growing gap between rich and poor nations
 - Their traditional way of life is being lost, and they disliked the spread of U.S. ideas and customs.

Regard for the U.S. fluctuates over time. We often forget that the rest of the world is an interested audience for everything we do. Their regard turns to distrust and dislike when we don't practice what we preach, fail to show respect for others, fail to do our share, and seem to be crowding out other cultures with our own.

- For example, when we press other countries to give up nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons but then talk ourselves about our plans to develop and test new types of these weapons, those countries ask why they, which are so much weaker, shouldn't have new weapons as well.
- We see ourselves as generous donors, both as individuals and as a society; but others see that we don't pay our share of UN dues, and that what our government invests in fighting poverty worldwide amounts to just 9 cents per American per day. Both sides are true; both have an effect.
- Citizens of other countries know that we aren't perfect at home; they wonder how we have the right to criticize their governments when we too sometimes encounter official corruption, wrongful convictions, or mistreatment of minority groups. We know we're not perfect—but we often don't come across that way to outsiders.
- What should we do? Acknowledge our mistakes when we make them. Do more to seek out the opinions of others, and help protect the values and concerns of others, by doing our fair share to end wars and fight poverty and disease. Try to be the kind of people in the world that we try to be at home.

Common Sense

Practice What We Preach

Common Critiques

& EFFECTIVE RESPONSES

11A “International cooperation compromises our sovereignty and reduces our freedom of action. ...”

***Basic advice:** Talk about the benefits of cooperation, for us and everyone; in an interconnected world, it’s the key to making progress on shared problems, it’s the right thing to do and it works. Emphasize effectiveness, teamwork.*

“... **The real question is, how can we accomplish what needs to get done?** Independent action is important for solving some problems. But most of today’s big global challenges—like global terrorism and the growing threat of global warming—simply can’t be managed by any one nation, no matter how strong. Many other challenges are best handled by a team of nations, each doing what it does best. **The key to making progress on these shared problems is making a shared effort.** That’s just common sense. Working well with others is part of being effective in an increasingly interconnected world. ...”

“... America has maintained a position of global strength for the past 50 years not by staying out of international agreements but by helping to shape them. So **we know from experience that in the long run, cooperation gives us greater influence and flexibility of action than going it alone.** International agreements help us predict what others are going to do, which enables us to lay out our own policies more intelligently. And each time we demonstrate that we can be a good team player, it’s that much easier to bring our partners along the next time. ‘My way or the highway’ feels good in the short run—but ultimately it limits our options and may lock us into acting alone when we don’t have to. ...”

“... **In an increasingly interconnected world, we succeed or fail together.** As a decent and responsible nation, America should be committed to working with others to make our world a better place. When nations work together as a team, everyone benefits. ...”

“... **Sharing innovative solutions and inspiring international teamwork is the American way.** When we live up to that tradition, we earn the respect and cooperation of other nations—and together, we get results. ...”

“... **Everyone benefits from international agreements and laws that make the world a more orderly place.** If we want other countries to follow those rules, we have to follow them as well. It’s a matter of common sense and common decency—**“doing unto others as you would have them do unto you.”** Americans understand this; that’s why overwhelming majorities favor cooperative approaches over going it alone, even if we have to give up some freedom of action. ...”

11B “We can’t entrust decisions about America’s security to other countries or to international institutions. ...”

Basic advice: Talk about how choosing to cooperate can make us safer in the long run. Emphasize effectiveness, teamwork, doing what’s right and smart.

“... The choice is always ours, whether to consult with allies and seek their cooperation, or go it alone. We should base that choice on **a realistic assessment of the best way to achieve our national security goals**. The fact is that today’s top national security challenges—controlling the spread of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, and fighting global terrorism—can only be managed effectively through international partnerships. And partnerships can’t thrive without consultation and mutual respect. ...”

“... This is a bogus concern. We would have plenty of support from other countries, and from international law, for acting in self-defense against an imminent attack. But even then, we would be better off if we had partners, and if our actions enjoyed the support of other nations. **To share the burden of combat and peacekeeping, we need international allies that trust us**—and trust can only be built on a foundation of consultation and mutual respect. ...”

“... We expect others to listen to us and our ideas about how they should act, including when and how they should take military action. And we benefit when other nations abide by treaties that limit the use of force—like the rules that prohibit unprovoked invasions or the use of chemical weapons. If we expect others to honor these constraints, we need to honor them ourselves. It’s a matter of **practicing what we preach**. ...”

“... **When we use military force in concert with others, our actions are more likely to be seen as legitimate and necessary**. That helps us achieve our goals in the short run—and **makes us safer in the long run**. The trust we build by consulting with allies and respecting international rules encourages other nations to come to our aid when U.S. security is threatened, and to share the costs of combat and postcombat reconstruction. When our use of force is perceived as illegitimate, our actions increase hostility to the U.S. and incite other nations to throw up roadblocks to our initiatives. ...”

11C “We’re not opposed to all treaties—just the bad ones. ...”

***Basic advice:** Focus on what an effective treaty is—we don’t have to get our way on everything—and remind people of why we and the world benefit from them. Emphasize farsightedness, pragmatism.*

“... We want treaties that work for us and for the world, like the network of agreements that has succeeded in limiting the spread of nuclear weapons for the past 50 years. When a treaty promises to help countries make progress together toward solving a shared problem, and **when the benefits of cooperation outweigh its costs**—as they often do—then we know we’re on the right track. That’s **what makes a treaty worth signing**, not whether we get our way on every detail. ...”

“... We want treaties that work, for us and for the world. But the U.S. doesn’t need to get its way on every detail for a treaty to be good. If you refused to buy a house because you didn’t get your way on every point in the negotiation, you’d be sitting outside in the cold; **if you rejected every business deal that involved compromise, you’d soon be bankrupt. ...**”

“... Cooperation is a commonsense strategy for getting things done in an interconnected world. Treaties are one way of making progress together toward solving shared problems. **Just like laws here at home**, international treaties sometimes end up being less effective than we had hoped. But we don’t give up on having laws; we work to make them better—because we know how much worse off we’d all be with no rules-of-the-road. The same logic applies to international agreements. You **can’t let the perfect be the enemy of the good**; that’s just common sense. ...”

“... Everyone wants treaties that work for us and the world. But **when the United States—the biggest member of the global team—walks away from imperfect treaties** that address critical global problems, without trying to negotiate improvements, **we undermine progress toward effective solutions**. That’s not right; America should be a constructive force in the world, not a spoiler. What’s more, turning our back on international initiatives sends a strong signal that we don’t care about the rule of law. It causes others to question our motives and doubt our commitment to making the world a better place for everyone. In the long run, this kind of behavior has a negative effect on our standing and credibility in the global community. ...”

11D “International organizations like the UN are inefficient and wasteful; there are better ways to get things done. ...”

Basic advice: Acknowledge but don't dramatize the need for improvement, and link it to the importance and proven value of these organizations; describe a constructive role for the U.S. Emphasize pragmatism, can-do, teamwork.

“... **All institutions need periodic retooling to meet new challenges.** The UN is no different—and important reforms are already under way to make it better run, more open to input from citizens and citizens' groups, and more responsive to today's global needs and threats. Let's do our share to keep improving the one place where all nations can come together to tackle tough global problems. ...”

“... The world—and the United States—has benefited enormously from the peacebuilding, health, and environmental initiatives of international organizations. Now some of those organizations need retooling to meet new challenges and conditions. **Americans are doers and fixers.** Let's work with other nations to strengthen and equip our international organizations to meet new challenges and conditions. ...”

“... All institutions need periodic retooling to meet new challenges. The UN is no different—and important reforms are already under way. We should play an active and constructive role in that process; our involvement is critical to its success. But as we work with other nations to make international organizations more efficient and effective, we also need to remember that **these institutions don't have to be perfect to be good for us—and good for the world.** ...”

“... The UN and its agencies can point to real successes in the areas of global health and hunger, conflict resolution and peacebuilding, arms control, and human rights—all on an annual budget that's less than what the state of Arkansas spends in the course of a year. Institutional reforms already under way will help the UN function more efficiently and effectively. These **reforms must be accompanied by a commitment from all member nations to ensure that important UN agencies have the resources they need to do the job.** ...”

“... The United Nations still embodies humanity's highest hopes for peaceful cooperation and the advancement of shared human values. That's the vision that inspired the United States to take the lead in creating the United Nations after World War II. **America has a proud history of bringing nations together for the common good.** Helping to strengthen and improve the institutions of international cooperation **should be a deeply American project.** ...”

11E **“Being resented for being No. 1 goes with the territory. Other countries, like France, will always criticize and resent us because they’re jealous and want to limit our power. ...”**

Basic advice: Show that what we do and how we do it matters; focus on what kind of country we want to be in the world—and on the impact of our choices. Emphasize trustworthiness, teamwork, team leadership.

“... U.S. power has been a fact of global life for a long time now—and attitudes toward America have gone up and down during that period, sometimes by substantial measures. Because America’s **status as a superpower hasn’t changed, something else has to be driving those fluctuations** over the years. The answer is the content, style, and tone of U.S. foreign policy. ...”

“... You’ve seen it in your workplaces and on the sports field: There are leaders who are trusted and admired, even when they do things some members of the team don’t like, and there are leaders who are not. The difference is in how the person leads—respectfully and with the interests of others in mind, or arrogantly and with indifference to others’ needs and concerns. We know which teams stick together and accomplish more. ...”

“... Most Americans believe it’s possible for most people and countries to find common ground and pursue shared goals, despite real differences of opinion and perspective. ‘My way or the highway’ isn’t the way to do it. The history of American foreign policy shows that **it’s possible to be powerful and respected at the same time**—if we treat others with respect and try to see things through their eyes. ...”

“... Some kinds of behavior needlessly antagonize others. If you’re in a crowded room and you unintentionally step on someone’s toe, you may be the target of momentary resentment. If you stomp heedlessly over people’s feet to get where you want to go, you’ve unnecessarily antagonized an entire room. Policy choices have complex effects and are unlikely to please everyone. But policymaking that consistently ignores other countries’ needs, interests, and advice **undermines the trust and respect that enables countries to work together to get the job done. ...”**

“... Most people around the world still like Americans. But they worry when the United States seems determined to do what it wants, when it wants, regardless of the impact its decisions have on others. **They worry that we might be indifferent to their needs** and to the shared concerns of the international community. **Countries that fear the effects of our actions are understandably much less likely to work with us** or to contribute to the success of initiatives we launch. ...”

“... The tiny but dangerous minority of people who really hate America draw strength from the mistrust and resentment that much larger numbers of people feel toward the United States, particularly in the Arab world. People there share the widespread perception of American behavior as arrogant, bullying, and indifferent to others’ needs and concerns—especially to their central concern, the Israeli–Palestinian conflict. These perceptions don’t cause or justify terrorism, but they make it easier for fanatics to gain a wide and even supportive audience for their abhorrent actions. As we strike at al Qaeda, **we must make sure our own actions don’t create a more receptive environment** for them and other extremist groups. ...”

11F “Leadership isn’t a popularity contest. ...”

***Basic advice:** Replace “popularity” and “liking”—immature needs—with “trust and respect”—mature goals that are worth pursuing. Emphasize the increasingly interconnected world, which makes it both right and smart to cultivate trust and respect.*

“... As a decent and responsible nation, we should care about having the trust and respect of others in the community of nations. And we know that **what goes around, comes around**: When we respect and consider the priorities of others, even if we ultimately disagree with them, we earn their trust and sow the seeds of future partnerships on behalf of a safer, better world. ...”

“... In an increasingly interdependent world, we need other countries, and they need us, to address challenges that are too big for any single country—however powerful—to handle alone. If our policies and negotiating style unnecessarily antagonize our allies and undermine the trust and respect we once enjoyed, that’s a problem. It’s a problem for us—and **when we can’t build the teams that are needed to get global jobs done, it’s a problem for everyone. ...**”

“... Americans want their country to be respected and trusted, not feared, and they understand the importance of **extending respect to others if we hope to receive it** in return. ‘Do unto others as you would have them do unto you’—it’s the **Golden Rule. ...**”

“... Because the United States is in the global spotlight so often—with the world as our audience—**we need the good opinion of the rest of the world more, not less, than other countries. ...**”

Representative Quotes

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

74

James Steinberg

Vice President,
Brookings Institution

“Being a superpower doesn't have to breed resentment. For most of the post–World War II era the U.S. was a dominant force but accepted by others (at least in the West) because we were seen as using our power to protect broader shared interests in democracy, freedom, open economies.”

Michael Hirsh

Senior Editor,
Newsweek

“[T]here is a growing nexus of markets, governments, and peoples that share common interests and values. ... [But] the international community, as real, powerful, and growing as it is, shows no signs whatever of fostering a world government. The idea is absurd on its face: even as [America] beefed up [its] defense budget [in 2001] to Cold War levels, about \$390 billion, the combined budgets of all the major multinational organizations—the UN, the ICC, the World Bank—amounted to less than \$20 billion.”

William Maynes

President,
Eurasia Foundation

“To gain and hold friends, America needs a vision for the future that not only rallies its own people but attracts others. We have to stand for more than narrow self-interest. When we have, America has been the most respected and powerful country in the world. When we have not, our domestic politics have become embittered and our relations with others troubled.”

Anne-Marie Slaughter

Dean,
Woodrow Wilson School

“People get angry with America when we do not live up to our own self-professed values. We have violated one of the oldest rules in the book—the Good Book—“Why do you see the speck that is in your brother's eye but don't consider the beam that is in your eye?” We are quick to tell other countries of their failings, while apparently ignoring our own. Many of the angriest countries are those who look up to what we say we value, but cannot forgive us for not living up to our own ideals. We could stop telling the world that we are the biggest and strongest and best kid on the block, and instead prove ourselves willing to listen and learn.”

Elliot Richardson

Headed four cabinet
departments and served
Presidents Eisenhower,
Nixon, Ford, and Carter

“Sweeping across national boundaries and overwhelming the capacities of sovereign states, the worldwide impact of social, demographic, economic, technological, and environmental change is the most striking phenomenon of our time. ... We are capable of coping with at least some of the [resulting] problems. ... Just as in our own countries we build levees against floods, insulate our houses against the cold, and install traffic lights, so on the international plane we promote family planning, take steps to prevent the depletion of the ozone layer, and regulate international flights. And since the international consequences to be addressed are the product of forces that disregard every kind of boundary, the necessary responses have to be cooperative rather than unilateral, practical rather than ideological.”

“We simply cannot go it alone. The centrality of alliances in multilateral institutions to a successful foreign policy is fundamental. Alliance in multilateral institutions must be understood as expansions of our influence, not as constraints on our power. ... Alliances must be built on solid foundations, solid foundations to handle both the routine and the urgent challenges of our times. Crisis-driven coalitions of the willing by themselves are not the building blocks for a stable world. We need to think more broadly, more strategically. ... The perception of American power around the world must not rest solely on our military orientation or image. It has always been quite confidence and inner strength, not just great displays of military power, that have persuaded others to join our cause.”

Chuck Hagel
Senator from Nebraska

“I’m more concerned about those intangible things, like how do the American people feel when some of our closest allies and those who share our most fundamental values of liberalism and democracy consider us a sort of outlaw nation, a rogue nation. ... I worry that over time that can become corrosive for American foreign policy ... so it’s something that we need to worry about.”

Robert Kagan
Senior Associate,
Carnegie Endowment for
International Peace

“In a global economy, you cannot survive in certain industries unless you are able to compete on a global basis and you cannot do this without alliances. ... [Alliances] involve two companies keeping distinct identities, but agreeing to work together in a very intimate way. ... Having a CEO who knows how to forge and manage alliances—to build trust and transparency with other companies—is a critical asset for surviving. ... As with companies, so with countries. ... We have never been an island unto ourselves. We just need more allies now in more ways at more times.”

Thomas L. Friedman
Author and Columnist,
The New York Times

“That’s the problem with American values. People expect us to practice what we preach. And our open, prosperous society is so seductive that it fosters false expectations—among Americans as well as people abroad —that the whole world can somehow be Americanized.”

David Ignatius
Author and Columnist,
The Washington Post

“No country loves the U.N. all the time, especially when it doesn't get its way. The question is whether most of the time it works for us and other countries that want to reduce threats to the peace... whether we would be better off without it ... whether it plays a useful role in helping to prevent a repeat of the carnage that marked so much of the last century.”

Robert Hunter
Senior Advisor, RAND
Corporation, and former
U.S. Ambassador to NATO

Jessica T. Mathews

President,
Carnegie Endowment
for International Peace

“Closing the widening gap between Europe and the U.S. that threatens our ability to achieve our international aims and greatly reduces the likelihood that global challenges can be met, means that leaders on both sides of the Atlantic will have to adapt. Politically, it won't be easy. Americans have come to expect dominance, and Congress especially often has little patience for playing on international teams of which the U.S. is not captain. On the other hand, the American public overwhelmingly supports multilateral burden-sharing and a U.S. leadership role that is considerably broader than its military one. According to both liberal and conservative Democratic and Republican polls, it also supports working through the U.N. and other international institutions considerably more than do leadership elites.... So while the change won't be easy, it is quite feasible [and] necessary. ... [T]he long-term cost of allowing the present trend to continue will be a price we won't want to pay.”

Clyde Prestowitz

President, Economic
Strategy Institute

“It's time to wake up to the need to see ourselves as others see us ... [or] whether we want to be the people we imagine ourselves to be.”

TAB 5

TERRORISM

SPREAD OF DEADLY WEAPONS

USE OF FORCE

CONTENTS

12. MESSAGING RECOMMENDATIONS, HELPFUL ARGUMENTS & FACTS

A. What to Do About Terrorism	78
B. What to Do About the Spread of Deadly Weapons	80
C. Improving Cooperation to Prevent the Spread of Deadly Weapons	82
D. Special Topic: Talking about the Use of Force	84

13. COMMON CRITIQUES & EFFECTIVE RESPONSES

A. “Why should we absorb the first blow?”	86
B. “We have no choice but to prevent through military preemption.”	87
C. “New threats require new means.”	88
D. “We should be able to develop any weapons we need.”	89
E. “Proliferation is inevitable.”	90
F. “Verification doesn’t work.”	91
G. “Only America can prevent proliferation. We must do it our way”	92
H. “What do you propose we do when countries break international rules?”	93

Representative Quotes	94
-----------------------	----



U.S. in the World

TALKING GLOBAL ISSUES WITH AMERICANS:
A PRACTICAL GUIDE

Note: Sources for facts and figures in this section, along with recommended sources for keeping facts and figures up to date, are available in the “Keeping Current” section of www.usintheworld.org.

MESSAGING RECOMMENDATIONS

PRIORITY REMINDERS FROM “TOP TWENTY”

2. Put your proposals and arguments in the **context of an interconnected world**.
3. Explain why your proposals are **smart/effective/pragmatic/realistic** in the context of today’s world. Reference big ideas about **sound decision making, leadership, or management**.
4. Explain why your proposals are the **right thing to do**. Evoke big ideas familiar to Americans about **decent behavior**.
6. **Stress a “can-do” approach. Don’t open with fear, guilt, or comments that overwhelm** listeners about the enormity and complexity of problems.
7. When appropriate, **cite examples of other countries (and NGOs) that are working alongside the U.S.**
8. Cite examples of **what works** and offer **success stories**.
9. **Empower listeners** by telling them **what they can do** to help. **Talk about yardsticks** citizens can use to evaluate policy actions and progress over time. (See “Engaging Citizens,” Tab 8)
13. **Avoid jargon and acronyms.** (See “Wonk-Speak Translator,” Tab 2)
17. Use a **reasonable, rational** tone. **Don’t attack personally** or attack motives. **Avoid partisan attacks.** **Question others’ assumptions,** not their integrity.
18. Show both the **benefits of approaches you propose** and the **costs of alternatives**.

Do

- Remind listeners that terrorism is a **tactic** employed by extremists. This will open up possibilities to discuss the need for more comprehensive strategies to address it.
- Explain why effective strategies to fight global terrorist networks require **countries working together**. Give examples.
- Be clear about your **high regard for American troops**—especially if you plan to critique current strategies on terrorism or security policy. That will prevent listeners from mistakenly inferring that your critiques in any way diminish your opinion of the military.
- Talk about the **return on investment** for preventive measures.
- **Empower** people by focusing on what can be done to reduce the chances of a terrorist attack.

Don’t

- **Avoid any implications or possible inferences that might suggest that this is a war against Islam.**

Don’t

- **Don’t overpromise.** This is about doing everything we can to create protective nets that reduce the chances of terrorist attacks, not about eliminating the threat altogether. *Do* reassure people that we can take concrete steps every day to reduce the chances of a catastrophic event.
- **Don’t try to deny people’s fear.** But encourage them to use their critical reasoning to consider fear in the context of all the risks we face, and to support the concrete steps we can take to reduce the risks of terrorism.

Keep in Mind

- **You risk needlessly alienating large segments of the public by making the claim that America is “less safe,”** even if you believe that certain policies are having that effect. Instead, try asking **“Are we doing everything we can? Do we have our priorities right? Do we have a balanced strategy?”** Talk about your ideas for the **additional steps** we could be taking to make us safer in the **short term** and those that could make us safer in the **long term**.
- **Be cautious with appeals to morality,** because research indicates that many Americans believe we are fighting an amoral enemy that doesn’t fight fair. Focus on the **effectiveness** of tactics, smart strategies, and common sense.
- **If you argue for the transfer of some U.S. defense budget spending to other pressing needs, you risk triggering a mindset that makes it hard for listeners to hear your arguments and facts.** Calls for cuts in defense can put listeners into a mindset of insecurity, because most citizens take it for granted that any spending on defense will make America more secure. Moreover, critics can easily distort your arguments. **Possible alternatives:** Try framing your recommendations in terms of **smart choices and the distribution of resources within the defense budget;** in terms of **how we can more effectively organize our military to address threats;** and in terms of the **distribution of new spending** (e.g., how many dollars out of \$100 in new money we should spend for each important piece of a **comprehensive approach** to the problem of terrorism).

Common Critiques & EFFECTIVE RESPONSES

- Peace is best achieved through strength. (p. 56)
- You see the world the way you want it to be, not how it really is. (p. 57)
- We can’t rely on the old strategies anymore. (p. 58)
- We have no choice but to prevent terrorism through military preemption. (p. 87)
- Why should we absorb the first blow? (p. 86)
- New threats require new means. (p. 88)
- We should be able to develop any weapons we need to defend ourselves. (p. 89)
- Verification doesn’t work; bad guys just hide weapons. (p. 91)
- What do you propose we do when countries break international rules? (p. 93)

12A WHAT TO DO ABOUT TERRORISM

Arguments & Facts to Help You Make Your Case

Interconnected; Teamwork

Terrorists with a global reach take full advantage of all the ways our world is interconnected—we need strong antiterrorist partnerships to fight back.

The groups that use terror as a tactic to threaten us are mobile, flexible, and hard to trace. They threaten many nations, but the United States' unique power and visibility also make us uniquely vulnerable. This means that we have a high stake in investing in alliances and partnerships to fight back. We must defeat global terrorists globally, not just at U.S. borders.

- We've seen in Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere that our military is better off when it has partners, when its actions have the respect of all sides, and when it can depend on strong support through diplomacy, intelligence, and other means to achieve its mission.
- To start dismantling al Qaeda's worldwide networks, for example, we've needed the goodwill and hard work of UN peacekeepers to track stolen explosives in the Sahara Desert; of international bankers to track accounts in Germany, Italy, and elsewhere; of telephone companies in Switzerland to track phone cards used in Pakistan; and of the law enforcement agencies and coast guards of a dozen countries to shut down export businesses in Europe, the Middle East, and North Africa.
- The U.S. has stopped suspected attackers from crossing our borders by working closely with law enforcement agencies in Canada and Jordan (at the time of the celebrations of the Millennium New Year) and France and the United Kingdom (regarding threats to transatlantic flights)—and those are just the cases that have been publicly reported.
- When the U.S. isn't able to be a good partner and to respond to other countries' concerns, it can mean that suspects are allowed to go free, leads are not investigated, and warnings are not heeded—and sometimes that we and our men and women in uniform are left to act dangerously alone.

Comprehensive

A smart strategy against terrorism will be comprehensive and focus on preventing attacks.

Global terrorist groups rely on shadowy international networks, making use of illegal and legal facilities in many countries. Our response must be just as networked, connecting the dots among the different sites and sources for terrorist recruitment, training, and financing. That means strong diplomacy, police, and intelligence—as well as strong cooperation with other countries—as well as a strong military. And it means taking a look at all of our actions in the world—from how we get our energy to how we help poor people—to see if our actions are helping or hurting our fight against terrorism. For example:

- Breaking up the financial networks that keep terrorists in business demands help from banks, businesses, and law enforcement agencies across borders;
- Border security, and cooperation with travel authorities in other countries, are vital to ending terrorists' freedom of movement;

- Homeland security is part of our defense. We can do more to frustrate attacks on our ports, borders, cities, and industry; we can make sure that firefighters, police, hospital staffs, and others on the front lines have the equipment they need; and we can close the communication gaps among local and national officials. These moves will protect us—and they will make life harder for terrorist planners.
- Better intelligence and understanding of the cultures in which terrorists are living and working demands more investment in diplomats who can be our eyes and ears, and in language training for diplomats and intelligence officers alike. Experts say we need to at least double the number of Arab linguists the government employs—a shortage that may take 20 years to fill.
- *See the discussion of deadly weapons, pages 80-81, for more on the nuclear, biological, and chemical threat.*

Our strategy must be long term. Terrorism works as a tactic when it gets the attention of an international audience that is alienated and angry. Part of ending support for the extremists who use terrorism as a tactic is helping to shape a world where we win back that audience—and where people can see that there are better ways to address grievances.

Farsighted

79

- We must show that our values and commitments are real and have meaning—by living by them in what we do overseas, and by protecting the civil liberties and freedoms that make our country what it is at home.
- Global terrorists take advantage of weak, desperate states to hide their operations. We need to help those states grow stronger by investing in their economies, education, and health, and by looking ahead to help prevent them from failing in the first place. How much agony would we have been spared if, after its civil wars of the 1980s, Afghanistan had not been allowed to grow so desperate that the Taliban could rule it, and invite Osama bin Laden in to plan and execute the 9/11 attacks!
- Global terrorists also take advantage of places where America is hated and feared. Working now to gain the trust and respect of others, by listening to their views and showing respect for their priority concerns—disease, economic growth, poverty—is an investment in our long-term security.
- Global terrorists use conflict, injustice, and indignity as recruiting tools. It's in our interest to be on the side of those working to end violence, not exploit it, in places like the Middle East.
- *For more discussion of how we can shape a better world, see pages 82-83.*

MESSAGING RECOMMENDATIONS

PRIORITY REMINDERS FROM “TOP TWENTY”

2. Put your proposals and arguments in the **context of an interconnected world**.
3. Explain why your proposals are **smart/effective/pragmatic/realistic** in the context of today’s world. Reference big ideas about **sound decision making, leadership, or management**.
4. Explain why your proposals are **the right thing to do**. Evoke big ideas familiar to Americans about **decent behavior**.
6. **Stress a “can-do” approach. Don’t open with fear, guilt, or comments that overwhelm** listeners about the enormity and complexity of problems.
7. When appropriate, **cite examples of other countries (and NGOs) that are working alongside the U.S.**
8. Cite examples of **what works** and offer **success stories**.
9. **Empower listeners** by telling them **what they can do** to help. **Talk about yardsticks** citizens can use to evaluate policy actions and progress over time. (See “Engaging Citizens,” Tab 8)
13. **Avoid jargon and acronyms.** (See “Wonk-Speak Translator,” Tab 2)
17. Use **reasonable, rational tone. Don’t attack personally** or attack motives. **Avoid partisan attacks. Question others’ assumptions**, not their integrity.
18. Show both the **benefits of approaches you propose** and the **costs of alternatives**.

Do

- Empower audiences by **leading with positive statements**, and be **optimistic about what we can do effectively**. Focus on **smart, practical, common sense steps that we can take** (e.g., making Russian nuclear facilities more secure) and tell clear success stories.
- Talk about the **return on investment** for preventive measures.

Don’t

- **Don’t overpromise.** This is about doing everything we can to create a net that reduces the chance that terrorists can get their hands on materials and weapons, not about eliminating the threat altogether. But *do* reassure people that we can take concrete steps every day to reduce the chances of a catastrophic event.
- **Don’t make the threats so big and hideous** that people feel there is nothing they can do about them. Present a solution to match every threat.

Keep in Mind

- If you wish to address nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, **consider starting with biological and chemical weapons**, which many citizens regard as the “new” threat. To the extent that the focus is on nuclear issues, it is important to start by explaining why this set of problems didn’t disappear with the end of the Cold War.
- Because many people’s instinct is to think about these issues in terms of **homeland security**, you might first acknowledge the need for continued work on that front and then explain how we can *also* protect ourselves through other preventive and cooperative actions.
- **You risk needlessly alienating large segments of the public by making the claim that America is “less safe,”** even if you believe that certain policies are having that effect. Instead, try asking **“Are we doing everything we can? Do we have our priorities right? Do we have a balanced strategy?”** Talk about your ideas for the **additional steps** we could be taking to make us safer in the **short term** and those that could make us safer in the long term.
- **Calling for cuts in military spending risks alienating large segments of the public.** If you believe priorities need to be changed, try framing your recommendations in terms of smart choices within the defense budget, about **how we can more effectively organize our military to address threats**.
- If offering critiques, it may be helpful to base them on the **pace of progress** to help listeners understand what specifically you believe can be improved (e.g., “at current rates, it would take X amount of time to lock down all the poorly secured nuclear materials in foreign research reactors; whereas if we did X. ...”).
- **Be cautious with appeals to morality**, when many Americans believe we are fighting an amoral enemy that doesn’t fight fair. Focus on the **effectiveness** of tactics, smart strategies, and common sense.
- On this set of issues, **all roads lead to Iran, Israel, and North Korea; be prepared** to talk about them in the context of your overall argument.
- It may be problematic to make nuclear disarmament or abolition the centerpiece of your argument unless you know your audience very well. Otherwise, consider putting disarmament in a larger policy context (e.g., “many arms control treaties are based on this concept ... the possibility of disarmament has been important to getting many nations to the negotiating table. ...”).

Common Critiques & EFFECTIVE RESPONSES

- Proliferation is inevitable ... (p. 90)
- New threats require new means. (p. 88)
- America is the only country that can and will prevent proliferation—we must do it our way. (p. 92)
- We should be able to develop any weapons we need to defend ourselves. (p. 89)
- Verification doesn’t work; bad guys just hide weapons. (p. 91)
- Peace is best achieved through strength. (p. 56)
- You see the world the way you want it to be, not how it really is. (p. 57)
- We can’t rely on the old strategies anymore. (p. 58)
- We have no choice but to prevent the spread of these weapons through military preemption. (p. 87)
- Why should we absorb the first blow? (p. 86)
- What do you propose we do when countries break international rules? (p. 93)

12B **WHAT TO DO ABOUT THE SPREAD OF DEADLY WEAPONS**

Arguments & Facts to Help You Make Your Case

Teamwork

We can do a great deal, working with others around the world, to protect ourselves from the spread and use of deadly nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. To protect the U.S. as fully as we can from deadly attacks on Americans at home and abroad, we must work in a global partnership to keep these weapons away from terrorists and governments that would use them against us—and prevent them from being built in the first place. Illegal weapons networks span the globe; our partnerships to stop them must be equally global.

- Americans' fears are shared by the experts and leaders of both parties: An attack on the U.S. by a terrorist group or state armed with weapons that could cause mass civilian casualties is the greatest risk to our security.
- They also agree on the smart response: “playing offense” to keep those weapons from being built, and making sure that existing weapons don't fall into the hands of those who would harm us. Homeland defense is crucial but not sufficient.
- The U.S. can't be everywhere, doesn't catch every violation, and can't pay for every inspection. We need other nations to help do this hard, expensive work—and to help communicate the benefits of playing by the rules—and the consequences when rules are broken.
- This investment in prevention pays off—we've had some close calls, but so far no terrorist group has used nuclear weapons, no government has used one since 1945, and very few have even attempted chemical or biological attacks. We need to keep it that way.

Pragmatic and Smart; Can-do

A smart effort to prevent these weapons' spread and use will use our resources and know-how to make weapons materials and capabilities secure—and set global norms that discourage countries from building weapons in the first place. Deadly weapons are contagious—we want to stop their spread before it begins whenever we can.

- In 2003, Libya responded to years of talks and pressure from the U.S. and others by deciding that the best use for its nuclear weapons program was to give it up. That's the kind of result we want.
- We know where there are nuclear and chemical facilities and materials that aren't adequately protected—in many cases, governments like those of Russia and Ukraine have actually asked us for help in securing or destroying their dangerous materials. Russia alone has enough nuclear material to make 60,000 nuclear bombs on top of the 20,000 it already has. Sixty percent of those materials are unsecured and vulnerable to theft. It's just smart to lock down or destroy these materials before they fall into the wrong hands. But we're moving very slowly—at current rates of spending, it will take us another 10 years to secure just the materials in other countries' research reactors. We can do better.

A comprehensive plan to reduce the threat of deadly weapons

will try to solve the underlying problems that make these weapons tempting; and prepare to safeguard our people.

- Controlling deadly weapons and limiting their spread buys us time to solve the underlying problems that make countries want to spend scarce money on these weapons in the first place.
- The parts of the world today where countries and terrorist groups are looking to acquire these weapons are among the most unstable—the Middle East and South Asia. Where conflicts have been resolved—in South Africa and its neighbors, in Europe, and in the major countries of South America—no one is looking to build these deadly weapons anymore. That’s why helping to end conflicts is an investment in our own security.
- Homeland security is also important—to safeguard ourselves and to make it clear to terrorists that targeting us won’t be easy. *[For more on homeland security priorities, see terrorism, page 78.]*

This approach has a history of success. Our comprehensive partnership with other nations has actually reduced the number of nations pursuing nuclear, chemical, and bioweapons technology. We have built a strong set of laws and standards that make it clear that the international community rejects the further development and use of these weapons; and we have broad international agreement on what to do about countries that cheat.

- During the early 1960s, President Kennedy predicted that we would be unable to prevent as many as 25 nations from gaining nuclear weapons by the 1970s. But he was wrong—because he and subsequent presidents from both parties reached out to other nations to try to prevent proliferation, today only 8 countries have nuclear weapons.
- This network of law and diplomacy begun by President Kennedy convinced many major countries to drop their own nuclear weapons programs, including Argentina, Brazil, Germany, Japan, South Africa, and South Korea.
- Three countries—Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine—inherited nuclear weapons after the breakup of the Soviet Union. U.S. and international persuasion convinced them to give up their weapons and become non-nuclear states.
- Because of the Chemical Weapons Convention, 151 countries—including China, India, Iran, Pakistan, Russia, and the U.S.—gave up all chemical weapons, and 2 million chemically armed weapons have been destroyed, never to be used or fall into the hands of terrorists.
- Our joint programs with Russia and other post-Soviet states provide 40,000 weapons scientists in those countries with funding for peaceful research. That’s 40,000 scientists who have not sold their expertise to Iran, Iraq, or North Korea.
- In 2001, a bipartisan commission estimated that we could address the full range of these threats by spending just 1 percent of our defense budget over the next 10 years. That’s a price we can afford to pay.

Comprehensive

Results

MESSAGING RECOMMENDATIONS

PRIORITY REMINDERS FROM “TOP TWENTY”

6. **Stress a “can-do” approach. Don’t open with fear, guilt, or comments that overwhelm** listeners about the enormity and complexity of problems.
8. Cite examples of **what works** and offer **success stories**—especially ones that demonstrate **comprehensive approaches** and **durable, systemic solutions**.
9. **Empower listeners** by telling them **what they can do** to help. **Talk about yardsticks** citizens can use to evaluate policy actions and progress over time. (See “Engaging Citizens,” Tab 8)
13. **Avoid jargon and acronyms.** Use words that make sense to your audience. (See “Wonk-Speak Translator,” Tab 2)
17. Use a **reasonable, rational** tone. **Don’t attack personally** or attack motives. **Avoid partisan attacks.** **Question others’ assumptions**, not their integrity.

Do



- Review related guidance on pages 80-81, and “International Cooperation: How to Improve It” pages 64-65.
- Emphasize the **long-term, bipartisan legacy of political support for arms control treaties**.
- **Put concerns about the effectiveness of international cooperation into perspective** and emphasize the need to keep improving it. There are many examples of international cooperation that works well, promising efforts are under way to update and reform things that aren’t working, no institutions are perfect, etc.

Don’t



- **Don’t overpromise.** This is about doing everything we can to reduce the chance that terrorists can get their hands on materials and weapons, not about eliminating the threat altogether. But **do** reassure people that the steps we take with others can make the problem more manageable.

Keep in Mind



- In cases when the law is strong but implementation is poor, try stressing the **importance of teamwork** in doing better.

Common Critiques & EFFECTIVE RESPONSES

- Proliferation is inevitable ... (p. 90)
- New threats require new means. (p. 88)
- America is the only country that can and will prevent proliferation—we must do it our way. (p. 92)
- We should be able to develop any weapons we need to defend ourselves. (p. 89)
- Verification doesn’t work; bad guys just hide weapons. (p. 91)
- Peace is best achieved through strength. (p. 56)
- You see the world the way you want it to be, not how it really is. (p. 57)
- We can’t rely on the old strategies anymore. (p. 58)
- We have no choice but to prevent the spread of these weapons through military preemption. (p. 87)
- Why should we absorb the first blow? (p. 86)
- What do you propose we do when countries break international rules? (p. 93)

12C IMPROVING COOPERATION TO PREVENT THE SPREAD OF DEADLY WEAPONS

Arguments & Facts to Help You Make Your Case

Teamwork

Global teamwork to limit the spread of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons works.

During the past 40-plus years, the U.S. and other nations have built a network of laws—international agreements and treaties—that govern who has these weapons and how they must be stored, tested, and used. These agreements have created a broadly endorsed line between right and wrong and set penalties for breaking the rules. As a result, rule breaking is less likely—and we are more likely to know about it. The international institutions that we and our partners created together—the International Atomic Energy Agency and other bodies that watch for cheating—have made discoveries that the U.S. never could have made alone. For example:

- The strategy begun by President Kennedy has paid off. Today we have a legal network of treaties and agreements controlling nuclear and chemical weapons: the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, under which the vast majority of the world's nations agreed not to pursue nuclear weapons; the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which bans the U.S. and all other nations from testing weapons; the Chemical Weapons Convention, which outlawed chemical weapons and provided for the destruction of existing weapons; and many others. We also have impartial international agencies that monitor for cheating on nuclear and chemical technologies (the UN's International Atomic Energy Agency and the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons).
- Through these agreements, we've cut the number of countries believed to have chemical weapons in half and have reduced the number of nuclear weapons worldwide by half.
- U.S. military officials say that UN weapons inspectors have been responsible for destroying more chemical and biological weapons in Iraq than has the U.S. Army.
- It was actually inspectors working for the UN's International Atomic Energy Agency—not U.S. intelligence—who discovered signs of North Korea's hidden nuclear program in 1993.
- Business has a role to play as well, in making inspections possible in the chemical industry, in making sure its own practices discourage black-market sales of dangerous materials, and sometimes in getting those materials out of harm's way. In the 1990s, private businessman and philanthropist Ted Turner used his own funds to airlift nuclear materials out of conflict zones in the former Yugoslavia.

Can-do

In the past, deadly weapons have looked as frightening as they do today; but teamwork and U.S. determination have let us respond and adapt successfully to protect ourselves. We can again.

- In the mid-1970s, many thought that the treaty banning nuclear weapons (the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty) was useless because many countries were processing and selling nuclear materials. But the U.S. banded together with other countries to enact a

new agreement regulating how this trade could take place—and that succeeded in stemming sales to countries that were thinking of breaking the rules.

- When North Korea broke the rules and started to develop nuclear weapons, Republican and Democratic administrations alike found that the only way to make progress was to cooperate with North Korea’s neighbors—China, Japan, and South Korea.

With new technologies, the prospects are improving that intrusive inspections will be able to confirm whether or not weapons are safe.

Effectiveness

- Since a treaty banning chemical weapons came into force 8 years ago, 1,400 inspections have taken place in 51 countries—an unprecedented partnership between government and business to raise confidence and openness about how well dangerous chemicals are secured. Private industry now believes that it is in its interest to get a stamp of approval from international inspectors. The partnership is working.
- New technologies are being developed—“sniffers,” the dogs we’re familiar with at airports, and even specially bred plants, can be used to detect minute amounts of banned chemical substances.
- It isn’t easy to build and maintain these weapons, but it is getting easier to detect them—terrorists and hostile states would rather buy them ready-made, which is why we must focus on preventing them from being built in the first place.

This global team only functions if the biggest partner—the U.S.—does its part. Our partners are watching to see whether or not our own behavior is consistent with what we ask others to do, and whether we follow the same rules we set out for others.

Practice What We Preach

- It’s difficult for us to tell other nations not to develop and test nuclear weapons when, for example, we have refused to join the 104 countries that have accepted as law an agreement not to test nuclear weapons, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.
- Likewise, when we talk about building and using new, smaller nuclear weapons, the threshold for any country deciding it’s OK to use nuclear weapons goes down—and the whole foundation of international agreement that nuclear weapons should never be used is weakened. Experts believe that this might harm our security more than anything we gain on the battlefield by adding one more nuclear weapon to our arsenal.
- Other countries also notice when we talk about militarizing space—and they respond accordingly. We need to ask whether our plans are good and workable enough to truly make us safer rather than less safe.
- Other countries agreed to allow their chemical facilities to be inspected only when we accepted the same intrusive inspections—otherwise, they fear that we are using inspections to steal commercial secrets. Because we have refused biological weapons inspections, there are no inspections at all and no rules about possible bioweapons such as anthrax.

12D TALKING ABOUT THE USE OF FORCE

Special Topic

MESSAGING GUIDANCE

The American public has shown itself to be quite willing to use force to defend what it perceives as core American interests and values, and at least a large segment reacts suspiciously to communicators who don't seem to share that seriousness of purpose.

The public filters discussion of the use of force through the prism of its very high regard for the **U.S. military. The U.S. military is extraordinarily popular and one of the nation's most respected institutions.** One important reason may be that, of all our national security structures, the military is the one that most looks like middle- and working-class America. So when you stake out positions on security policy, make sure to signal your high regard for the troops themselves.

At the same time, most Americans also understand the paramount importance of having norms constraining the use of force and tell pollsters that they are quite reluctant to use military force without UN approval. Discussions of the use of force, then, can most usefully be framed as a question of **thinking through the consequences** of using military force and **expanding our options** for dealing with crises and threats as part of a global team of allied nations, rather than alone.

The notion of expanding options, not reducing them, is also key to the delicate issue of resources. Calls for cuts in defense can put listeners into a mindset of insecurity, because most citizens take it for granted that any spending on defense will make America more secure. Moreover, critics can easily distort your arguments. Try framing your recommendations in terms of **smart choices and the distribution of resources within the defense budget**; in terms of **how we can more effectively organize our military to address threats**; in terms of the **distribution of new spending** (e.g., how many dollars out of \$100 in new money we should spend for each important piece of a **comprehensive approach** to the problem of terrorism).

ARGUMENTS & FACTS TO HELP YOU MAKE YOUR CASE

We always have the right to act in our own defense. Every American president—like the leaders of every country—quietly reserves the right to use military force in response to an attack or the threat of one. It only makes sense that, as the UN Charter says, we have the right to defend ourselves when under extreme threat.

- The threat posed by terrorists with a global reach [*see What to Do about Terrorism, pages 78-79*] means that it is vital for us to be able to go after individuals or groups that threaten us. But the fact that terrorists are global has made it even more important that our response be global and that it have the support of others—thus taking away support from terrorists.

Leaders who see the world as it really is understand that we are more effective when we use force in collaboration with others, not alone.

There is no question about it—we are the world’s preeminent military power. But we’re better off when our military doesn’t have to carry the whole burden of a conflict like those in Afghanistan or Iraq alone. Senior military officers say that our forces are overstretched and could use help. They also say that the more nonmilitary options available, the easier their job is.

- The more the U.S. points publicly to its military intentions, the more we encourage countries already locked in confrontation—like India and Pakistan, or China and Taiwan—to say that they, too, may plan to use military force without provocation.
- We also discourage others from thinking that there is any point in trying to work with us, if we will eventually go off without them. In situations as different as Haiti, the Balkans, and Afghanistan, U.S. determination that military force would be used if necessary and that other countries would be involved as much as possible has produced situations where the U.S. has not carried the whole burden alone.

A go-it-alone approach has real costs, and far-reaching and unforeseeable consequences. In the most extreme circumstances,

we may not have time to seek support from others. But announcing in advance that we will use force whenever and wherever we choose—without regard to what others think or the rules we ask others to follow—may hurt us more than it hurts those seeking to harm us.

- The threat of U.S. preemption already encourages countries like Iran and North Korea to seek nuclear weapons that would make the U.S. afraid to attack.
- Preemption assumes that you have perfect intelligence on who might threaten you, and where and how—and intelligence professionals will tell you that things are rarely so cut-and-dried.
- Preemption has not stopped attacks by terrorists, who have very little to lose and who operate in diffuse networks that are hard to attack. We have been most effective against terrorists when working with other countries to strike at entire networks, not just a single camp or training site.

We can do much more to focus on smart policies of prevention.

Sometimes, force will be the best or only way to respond to a threat or crisis. But a smart policy will put most effort into widening our options, which includes developing policies that will eliminate threats before they require a military response and making sure that we don’t have to act alone.

- For example, we can use military and diplomatic tools together to prevent dangerous weapons from ever being built, and see that they are dismantled, instead of having to respond militarily when they are aimed at us. We can help negotiate settlements to local conflicts—as we did in Macedonia or in Burundi—before they are such a security threat or humanitarian catastrophe that we have no choice but to send troops.
- Focusing on prevention doesn’t close off the option of using force when we need to; but it should make it less likely that situations get out of control in the first place, requiring us to put our troops at risk. In foreign affairs, as in life, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

Pragmatic

Results

Effectiveness

Common Critiques

& EFFECTIVE RESPONSES

13A “Why should we wait to absorb the first blow? Why shouldn’t we strike before we’re attacked, even if we have to act alone? ...”

***Basic advice:** Treat preemptive action as a rare exception to the rule, and explain why it should remain the exception. Emphasize pragmatism and farsightedness about consequences.*

“... Of all the strategies at our disposal for protecting America’s security, attacking another country first is potentially the riskiest and most problematic. For practical as well as moral reasons, its use must be restricted to very rare and limited circumstances. **Keeping preemption as the last-resort option it always has been makes sense after the events of 9/11. What doesn’t make sense is moving this option from the margins to the center** of national security policy. ...”

“... International law has long recognized that a nation need not suffer an armed attack before it can take lawful action in self-defense. But **turning this common sense consideration into a declared policy can have unintended consequences.** It sets a precedent for other nations and increases the likelihood that some will use this policy as a smokescreen for unprovoked military action. In the long run, **a world in which any nation may attack at any time is less safe for everyone.** ...”

“... Preemption need not and cannot be forsworn entirely. But **if the world begins to see the U.S. as a loner unwilling to work with others, we may lose the trust and cooperation** of other nations on a wide range of critical global problems. If America’s allies and potential allies begin to suspect that our interests blind us to their concerns and interests, they will become increasingly reluctant to embrace our objectives and to share the costs of achieving them. ...”

“... In the most extreme circumstances, we may not have time to seek support from others before we use force. But announcing in advance that we will use force whenever and wherever we choose—without regard to what others think or the rules we ask others to follow—may hurt us more than it hurts those seeking to harm us. Nor has it stopped attacks by terrorists, who have little to lose and who operate in diffuse networks that are hard to attack. In fact, we’ve been most effective against terrorists when we’ve worked with other countries to destroy terrorist networks, not just a single camp or training site. **Any strategy that unnecessarily antagonizes other nations weakens our alliances when we need them most.** ...”

13B **“When dealing with the threat of global terrorism, we have no choice but to prevent attacks through military preemption. Terrorists attack out of nowhere, without warning, and don’t respond to threats or deterrence. ...”**

Basic advice: Make it about smart problem solving. Emphasize prevention, teamwork, looking at the big picture, and the commonsense notion that complex problems respond best to comprehensive approaches.

“... Global terrorism takes advantage of the ways in which our world is interconnected.

That means **we need strong antiterrorism partnerships to fight back.** Without these partnerships, suspects might be allowed to go free, leads could be missed, and warnings might go unheeded. Any strategy, whether military or nonmilitary, that unnecessarily antagonizes other nations weakens our alliances when we need them most. ...”

“... A smart strategy against global terrorism will be comprehensive, not one-dimensional.

Military preemption may work in limited circumstances—if the threat is imminent and we have sound intelligence pinpointing its source. Even then, we’re better off when we have partners, and when our actions enjoy the respect and support of other nations. But against highly dispersed terrorist networks, embedded in societies we don’t yet understand, military action may not be particularly effective. We’re **likely to achieve more through the other strategies available to us**, like intelligence sharing and international teamwork to disrupt the financial networks that keep terrorists in business. Because the threat of terrorism can be reconstituted anywhere extremism thrives, we should be joining with other nations to take preventive action against the gaping economic disparities and the real or perceived injustices that terrorists exploit. And we must do more to frustrate attacks by better protecting our ports, borders, cities, and industries. **If we rely too heavily on a military strategy, we may miss important opportunities to make progress through nonmilitary means. ...”**

“... We cannot and will not wait until the moment of greatest peril is upon us. But the threat of terrorism is too complex to handle with a single blunt instrument, like military force. ...”

“... We need to consider all options, including the use of force. But excessive reliance on military force—especially go-it-alone force—may be more problematic than its nonmilitary alternatives. It feeds the resentment and anti-Americanism that terrorists exploit, and it creates new dynamics that may inadvertently destabilize an entire region. A balanced strategy that uses the full array of foreign policy tools is more likely to produce lasting results. ...”

“... The conflict in Iraq has shown that our military men and women are second to none. But Iraq is also showing us that military preemption is a seriously incomplete answer. It’s unfair to ask our armed forces to bear the entire burden of the struggle with global terrorism when the vital tasks of prevention and reconstruction so clearly call for other strategies and resources. ...”

“... Announcing in advance that we will use force whenever and wherever we choose—without regard to what others think or the rules we ask others to follow—may hurt us more than it hurts those seeking to harm us. Nor has it stopped attacks by terrorists, who have little to lose and whose operations are widely scattered and hard to trace. In fact, **we’ve been most effective against terrorists by working with other countries** to destroy terrorist networks, not just a single camp or training site. ...”

13C **“Relying on treaties and international agreements to control the spread of dangerous weapons is old-think. We need new strategies to face the new threat of terrorists armed with deadly weapons. ...”**

Basic advice: Don't get caught in the “everything has changed” trap; use the notion of “updating” to suggest continuity without denying the need for adaptation. Emphasize the commonsense notion that complex challenges respond best to comprehensive strategies, and point to past effectiveness.

“... The most important question is: **Are we doing all we can** to control the spread of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, and to keep them out of the hands of terrorists? We need to use every tool that's available—starting with time-tested strategies of prevention and international cooperation, sensibly updated. **We can't afford to forgo any tool that's proven effective, whether diplomatic, economic, or military. ...**”

“... For almost 50 years, an interlocking system of international agreements has succeeded in limiting the spread of nuclear weapons to a handful of nations and encouraging more than 150 nations to give up all chemical weapons. Thanks to another cooperative agreement, the U.S. is helping Russia do a better job of monitoring and securing its nuclear weapons and materials; the joint program has also provided 40,000 weapons scientists in the former Soviet Union with funding for peaceful research, so they don't have to go looking for work in places like North Korea and Iran. All this means far fewer opportunities for terrorists to buy or steal deadly weapons and technology. We should **make this proven network of international law and cooperation stronger and more comprehensive**, to reduce the risks even more. ...”

“... Americans understand that we can't rely on a one-dimensional strategy to control the spread of deadly weapons. Force alone won't do it—and treaties alone won't either. But **we'd never dream of throwing out our legal system at home, just because it hasn't stopped crime entirely. We know how important the rule of law is to making any community—local or global—a safer and better place to live.** We can improve existing international laws and agreements by closing loopholes and strengthening enforcement. And we can combine the best of these law-based strategies with preventive measures—like joining other nations in efforts to help end the regional conflicts that make deadly weapons tempting, and investing more in the successful U.S. program that helps Russia secure its dangerous weapons and materials, so terrorists can't get hold of them. Internationally, just as at home, when you **combine a good legal system with smart prevention and reliable enforcement**, you get real results. ...”

“... The basic mathematics of security hasn't changed. The larger the supply of deadly weapons around the world, the more likely they are to fall into the hands of people who mean us and others harm. **A trickle of weapons is easier to contain than a flood.** This means that international agreements to control the spread of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons are as relevant as ever. They should be strengthened, not discarded. ...”

“... At many points in the past 50 years, we've wondered if our system of international agreements to control the spread of deadly weapons was adequate to face new threats. Working with other nations, **we've responded effectively by strengthening and building on what works. If we need to make an exception to the rules** because a threat is so immediate or the existing arrangements aren't functioning as they should, **we should go back afterward to improve the arrangements** and to keep the rules intact. **You may have to exceed the speed limit in an emergency, but that doesn't mean we don't all need rules of the road. ...**”

13D **“Why should we allow international rules to prevent us from developing new weapons that may be crucial to dealing with new threats—like new, smaller nuclear weapons or space-based weapons? Unlike bad countries, we’re not going to use these weapons for evil purposes—only to protect ourselves and make the world safer. ...”**

Basic advice: Arguments based on principles and pragmatism are powerful: Developing more nuclear weapons isn’t right and won’t make us safer. Emphasize farsightedness about consequences of actions.

“... The key question about any weapon is whether it protects American lives. But you can’t nuke a terrorist network, and you certainly can’t use nuclear weapons to eliminate an extremist ideology. What’s more, if the most powerful country with the most sophisticated arsenal insists on exploring new nuclear weapons, it will increase their importance and value in the eyes of other countries. That could lead to a new arms race and put more weapons and weapons materials into circulation, where they’re vulnerable to theft and diversion. **By being realistic about the limitations of nuclear defense, we can make Americans safer. ...”**

“... The radioactive and political fallout from deploying new nuclear weapons would produce severe, lasting damage. In addition to the potentially devastating effects of the explosion itself, U.S. use of a nuclear weapon would likely inflame the very extremism it was intended to suppress, turn many of our allies against us, and **shatter the international taboo** that has made the use of nuclear weapons unimaginable since World War II ended. ...”

“... For the U.S. to explore new weapons when we’re telling other countries not to is a ‘do as I say, not as I do’ approach that undermines trust in American leadership and weakens the entire system of international arms control agreements. **When we talk about militarizing space, for example, other countries may be tempted to follow suit.** That would undermine rather than enhance our own and everyone else’s security. Many experts fear that our plans for these new weapons systems are not coherent and workable enough to be worth the risk. ...”

“... Global teamwork to control the spread of deadly weapons works—but only when the biggest member of the team, the United States, does its part. ...”

“... We never want to use nuclear weapons again, or see others use them. It’s in everyone’s interest to preserve that taboo. Does it really matter if one of these horrific weapons is cleaner or smaller, or causes tens of thousands of deaths instead of hundreds of thousands? Scientists tell us that conventional alternatives to mini nuclear weapons exist or can be developed. Let’s concentrate on **researching them, instead of lowering the world’s nuclear threshold. ...”**

“... When the U.S. signed the international treaty that addresses the spread of nuclear weapons—the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty—we made a solemn commitment to reduce our stocks of nuclear weapons, not increase them. Our promise was part of a global bargain designed to encourage others to abandon or forgo the development of such weapons. That bargain has kept the great majority of nations free of nuclear weapons for decades. Let’s **remember our promise and lead by our example,** even as we work with allies to strengthen this treaty to meet today’s threats. ...”

13E “Proliferation is inevitable. ...”

Basic advice: Describe proliferation as a shared concern and show that progress is possible if nations work together. Emphasize effectiveness and teamwork; point to successes.

“... **Global teamwork to limit the spread of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons works. ...**”

“... **History shows that we can get results when we work with other nations** to enforce and, when necessary, strengthen the international laws and standards that discourage the spread of deadly weapons. For example, international agreements have succeeded in limiting the spread of nuclear weapons to a handful of nations, and these agreements have encouraged several nations—like Brazil and South Africa—to give up their plans for developing such weapons. International cooperation on chemical weapons has led to the destruction of millions of tons of chemical agents. Thanks to another cooperative agreement, the U.S. is helping Russia do a better job of monitoring and securing its nuclear weapons and materials; this joint program has also provided 40,000 weapons scientists in the former Soviet Union with funding for peaceful research, so they don’t have to go looking for work in places like North Korea and Iran. There’s much more to do, and in some areas we’re moving too slowly. But we can **build on these successes to tackle today’s weapons challenges**, if we muster the political will to do so. ...”

“... **Many nations share our concern about the spread of deadly weapons**, and history shows that we can get results when we work together to develop shared rules and enforcement mechanisms for dealing with this threat. Those **rules and mechanisms can and should be strengthened**, and the U.S. should play an important role in this process. But that’s not all we can do. We should also **support impartial international institutions**, like the International Atomic Energy Agency, that go where individual nations can’t go and exert pressure on behalf of the entire global community. **Getting serious about prevention** is critical too. We should play an active role in international diplomatic efforts to help resolve regional conflicts—like the Israeli–Palestinian conflict—that escalate tensions and create incentives for neighboring countries to develop deadly weapons. And we should increase our investment in proven, cooperative programs to help other countries do a better job of guarding their stockpiles of weapons and materials—so terrorists aren’t able to acquire or steal them. It’s hard, expensive work, but **when we use the full array of tools at our disposal, and share the burden with other nations, the odds are on our side**. We can do it. ...”

“... For just 1 percent of the current defense budget, we could secure all the nuclear bomb material in the world, taking it off the black market for good. **Getting more serious about measures to prevent proliferation would be a smart investment** in our own security. ...”

“... **Proliferation isn’t just about “them”—it’s also about us**. We can **set a good example** by significantly reducing the role of nuclear weapons in our own security policies. That would reduce the attractiveness and acceptability of these weapons in the eyes of other nations. ...”

13F **“Verification doesn’t work; it’s easier than ever for the bad guys to hide their weapons. ...”**

***Basic advice:** Without overpromising, point to the history and prospects for success, if we treat this as a shared problem and do our part in solving it. Emphasize effectiveness, can-do, teamwork, team leadership.*

“... The prospects for effective international monitoring are better than ever, thanks to new technologies for inspection and a new, shared understanding of the risk of letting outlaw regimes or terrorist groups secretly develop or acquire deadly weapons. We know we need tougher international agreements that call for more intrusive inspections and more reliable enforcement. And we know that the U.S. needs to play a leading role in shaping and abiding by these agreements; **if we don’t do our part, the global team can’t function effectively. With stronger U.S. involvement, we could make real progress on this critical front.** What are we waiting for? ...”

“... The question is: **Are we doing all we can to shape and abide by the tough new inspection and enforcement provisions** that are needed to stop cheating in its tracks? Negotiations to strengthen the **international agreement on biological weapons** broke down because the U.S. refused to allow biological weapons inspections on its turf. This means that there are no inspections at all, and no rules governing the development of possible bioweapons like anthrax. **When the U.S. doesn’t do its part, the force of international law is weakened** and others may be tempted to break the rules. ...”

“... For the past 50 years, **the U.S. has wisely taken the lead in shaping the international laws and verification procedures** that are designed to control the spread of deadly weapons. The rest of the world and the United States have benefited enormously from the enforcement of these laws. An international agreement banning chemical weapons has made possible the destruction of 2 million such weapons and 7 million metric tons of chemical agents. Now, international inspections are pressuring Iran to reveal more about its nuclear program. And inspections and verification in Iraq destroyed more deadly weapons than both Gulf wars. The system isn’t perfect, but it has kept the problem down to a trickle rather than a flood. Let’s **keep improving the system, so it works even better next time.** ...”

13G **“America is the only country that can and will prevent proliferation; we have to do it our own way. ...”**

Basic advice: Describe this as a shared problem, and emphasize the benefits of cooperation. Emphasize our interconnected world, teamwork, team leadership, and effectiveness.

“... In today’s interconnected world, the U.S. can’t achieve enduring results by acting alone. If we want to get the job done right—and solutions are available, even to this difficult problem—we need to be part of international collaborative efforts. ...”

“... In this increasingly interconnected world, shared problems like the spread of deadly weapons need to be addressed through a shared commitment by many nations. The attitude of **‘my way or the highway’ discourages others from standing with us, and it sets a bad example** that encourages others to exempt themselves from global rules and norms. We may prevail in the short term with this approach, but ultimately it undermines prospects for the very kind of collaborative global problem solving that’s necessary to prevent proliferation. ...”

“... As a responsible and mature nation, we should know that **it’s more important to do things in a way that works than it is to do things ‘our way.’** We should be asking questions about effectiveness—will going it alone produce lasting results, or will it create new dynamics and dangers? And we should be asking about costs and consequences—what are the long-term risks of losing the trust and respect of other nations? ...”

“... As a responsible and decent nation, our preferred strategy for dealing with shared global problems should be respectful, collaborative, and consistent with what America stands for—like **keeping our promises and trying to practice what we preach.** When it comes to controlling the spread of deadly weapons, this means that we need to concentrate on assembling international teams to handle a challenge no nation, however strong, can face alone. And it means that we should abide by the same restraints that we expect other nations to accept. ...”

“... Almost 50 years ago, the United States wisely took the lead in creating a system of international agreements that has succeeded in limiting the spread of nuclear weapons to a handful of countries. Believing there was strength in numbers, we assembled a growing team of nations, and together we improved the agreements as we went along. That same kind of **team leadership, by persuasion and example, is what’s needed** to address today’s threats. Its absence weakens international efforts to control the spread of deadly weapons, just when we need teamwork most. ...”

“... There’s a lot that can be done to prevent the spread of deadly weapons—but almost none of it can be done by the United States alone. Fortunately, many countries share our concern about this problem. Working with other nations, we can strengthen the time-tested system of **international agreements** that limits weapons development and testing. We can join **diplomatic efforts** to reduce the regional tensions that prompt countries to seek military dominance over their neighbors. We can **share intelligence** with our allies to track down suspected terrorists, and we can support the international agencies that work to relieve the conditions of poverty and indignity that terrorists exploit. We can **enlarge our successful partnership with Russia** to lock down that country’s stocks of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons. We can **build habits of consultation and collaboration** with other countries, so if the threat or use of force is needed to address a violation of arms control agreements, it will enjoy the backing of many nations. **Global teamwork is the way to get results on this tough issue. ...”**

13H “What happens when all your international agreements don’t work, and some country cheats or breaks the rules? Are we supposed to just tolerate it? ...”

Basic advice: Describe this as a serious, shared problem. Emphasize effectiveness, teamwork, and the notion that complex challenges require comprehensive solutions.

“... Cheating cannot and must not be ignored, wherever and whenever it occurs. Our response should demonstrate that we’re serious about enforcing the rules—and about enforcing them consistently. But **we’ll be most effective in the long run if we also keep some commonsense considerations in mind:**

- Cheating is a threat that **no nation**, even one as powerful as the United States, **can handle alone**.
- Because we need strong partnerships to counter this threat, strategies to address it should be developed **in consultation with other nations**—and when the U.S. takes the lead, we should do so in a way that **inspires others to follow**.
- Cheating is a complex threat, and as such is likely to respond best to comprehensive strategies that combine carrots and sticks and that **use the full range of tools**—diplomatic, economic, and military—available to the U.S. and other nations.
- As experiences in Iraq and Iran have reminded us, **international organizations like the UN’s International Atomic Energy Agency play a vitally important role**, doing things we can’t like inspecting suspicious sites we don’t have access to and lending legitimacy to international condemnation of violators.
- We need to **learn from each episode of cheating** and use those lessons **to update and strengthen the time-tested network of international laws** that has helped us meet proliferation threats for the past 50 years. ...”

“... Cheating is a serious threat that can’t be ignored. Instances of cheating must be handled promptly, consistently, and with steady resolve. Fortunately, **many nations are concerned about this problem, and experience shows we can get results when we work together to enforce the international laws** that discourage the spread of deadly weapons. In 2003, for example, **Libya responded to years of international negotiations** and pressure from the U.S. and others by deciding to give up its nuclear weapons program. **International organizations like the UN’s International Atomic Energy Agency can also act on behalf of the global community** to keep the pressure on suspected cheaters. Inspectors working for this agency discovered signs of North Korea’s hidden nuclear program in 1993, and have been conducting rigorous inspections of suspicious sites in Iran, forcing the Iranian government to reveal more about its nuclear program. International inspections in Iraq revealed and led to the destruction of more deadly weapons than both Gulf wars. With vigilance and teamwork, and a sustained and comprehensive effort, the international community can meet this difficult challenge. ...”

“... **We’ve had success against cheating in the past by rallying international support to deal with the problem in the short term, while working with other countries to adapt and strengthen the time-tested network of global agreements that protects us in the long term.** We can take this effective approach again. Recently, for example, we discovered that **deadly weapons and materials could be transported illegally by sea**—and that existing international law did not permit the interception of such shipments. The United States took the lead in proposing **a new multinational agreement that would make it possible to halt these shipments** before they reach their destination. Meeting new challenges by building on what works is smart, responsible problem solving. ...”

Representative Quotes

TERRORISM, WEAPONS, FORCE

Retired General Wesley Clark

former NATO Supreme Allied Commander

“... [I]n foreign policy and foreign affairs you have to work with allies. It doesn't matter what the threat is. International law trumps diplomacy. And, except under the most extreme circumstances, diplomacy trumps force. Force is the ultimate action, but improperly applied, force only kills people and breaks things. It gets you into something. It doesn't give you your success. [We need] the complete package.”

Mitchell Reiss

Dean, International Affairs & Professor, William & Mary School of Law

“[W]hile it's important to keep America's military strong, that alone won't be enough. ... [O]ther countries ... will try to find ways to counter our military dominance by searching out and exploiting our weaknesses. ... [N]ot all of the threats we face can be solved by military force, even overwhelming military force. There are transnational threats, such as HIV/AIDS, famine, cyber warfare, narcotics trafficking, migration flows, and criminal networks. These threats are growing and we need to develop other strategies with other countries for dealing with them. [And] the greatest of these transnational threats is terrorism and we know from recent experience that terrorist groups may not be deterred by a strong military posture.”

Robert Wright

Author

“We need to think comprehensively about our strategy on terrorism, employing a range of tools—not just our military—in a robust long-term strategy. We can, for instance, make progress in the war on terror through actions on many different fronts: for example, we should decrease our dependence on oil for a number of reasons—among them that oil isn't a very clean form of energy and contributes to global warming ... [and] decreasing our dependence on oil also means we won't have to cozy up to Middle Eastern dictators whose repression helps breed the resentment whose expression is terrorism. We should address contagious disease in impoverished nations because ... the AIDS virus knows no national bounds, and will gladly spread from Africa to America. But contributing to the war on these diseases also matters because it's an important goal for many nations that we need as allies in the war on terrorism. Moreover, disease-ravaged nations are more prone to the kind of internal chaos that makes them a good place for terrorists to find refuge.”

Lawrence Korb

Center for American Progress

“[A]lliances provide a vital framework to achieve a shared perception of common threats and a shared responsibility for the cost of action. They enhance rather than detract from our power and ability to succeed in today's complex threat environment.”

Immanuel Wallerstein

Senior Research Scholar, Yale University

“Over the last 200 years, the United States acquired a considerable amount of ideological credit. But these days, the United States is running through this credit even faster than it ran through its gold surplus in the 1960s.”

“Recently, strategies to address even the proliferation symptoms have veered off course as [America] has...backed away from multilateral activities. [P]roliferation problems are so complex that we would be foolhardy to think that they can be resolved by becoming fortress America or going on a rampage of thinly veiled unilateral preemptions. We need agreed tough laws and standards and the active cooperation of as many nations as possible to retard the proliferation of biological and chemical weaponry. ... We need more investment in other security-enhancing programs too—better intelligence, development of next-generation stealth aircraft and smart weapons, more Cooperative Threat Reduction programs, enhanced disease surveillance worldwide, and more foreign aid to address the disparities that sometimes give rise to anti-American sentiments.”

Amy Smithson
Senior Fellow, Center
for Strategic and
International Studies

“Some Americans, exulting in their country’s power, urge the explicit affirmation of a benevolent American hegemony. But such an aspiration would impose on the United States a burden no society has ever managed successfully for an indefinite period of time. No matter how selfless America perceives its aims, an explicit insistence on predominance would gradually unite the world against the United States and force it into impositions that would eventually leave it isolated and drained.”

Henry Kissinger
Former Secretary of State

“Our nuclear arsenal couldn't keep us safe on 9/11 ... but the Cold War madness of I-can-make-more-weapons-than-you has left us with a legacy of huge stockpiles to get rid of before any terrorist finds them or buys them. Everyone now admits having even a few major weapons systems would have been enough during the Cold War. Let’s use that as a lesson. More is not necessarily better. ... To be safe from terrorists, we need to find the reason for terrorist acts, not just outspend everyone.”

Susan Shaer
Executive Director, Women’s
Action for New Directions

“Just as the United States needs the cooperation of many allies and friends, so too must it employ a full range of foreign policy instruments. Our new resolve for engagement in the world, and our new appreciation for the magnitude of the threats we face, has brought with it a willingness to use military force when it is the best path to achieve our objectives. But in many cases, force will not be the most useful or appropriate tool in the kit. Instead, we will need a mix that includes diplomacy, economic coercion and inducement, intelligence, and law enforcement. Foreign assistance will also be critical.”

Richard Haass
President, Council on
Foreign Relations

Richard G. Lugar*Senator from Indiana*

“Unless the United States commits itself to a sustained program of repairing and building alliances, expanding trade, pursuing resolutions to regional conflicts, supporting democracy and development worldwide, and controlling weapons of mass destruction, we are likely to experience acts of catastrophic terrorism that would undermine our economy, damage our society, and kill hundreds of thousands, if not millions of people. ... The United States, as a nation, simply has not made this commitment. We are worried about terrorism, but the evolution of national security policy has not kept up with the threat. We have relied heavily on military options and unilateral approaches that weakened our alliances. We have engaged in self-flagellation over the September 11 tragedy rather than executing affirmative global strategies aimed at addressing the root causes of terrorism. ... The United States has launched a few innovative programs such as the Millennium Challenge Corporation and the Global AIDS Initiative, but we have not approached foreign policy with the determination and imagination that is required to respond to the risks that we face. Our commitment of resources has remained incremental and our suspicion of international cooperation has continued to hamper our standing and effectiveness in the world.”

Bruce Jentleson*Director, Terry Sanford**Institute of Public Policy,**Duke University*

“There are only a few things you can get me to do by hitting me over the head. At some point, I have to believe that what you want me to do is in my interest too. Military power and influence are not the same thing.”

TAB 6
POVERTY
DEVELOPMENT
TRADE

CONTENTS

14. MESSAGING RECOMMENDATIONS, HELPFUL ARGUMENTS & FACTS

A. Why It Matters How Other People Live	98
B. Helping People and Countries Lift Themselves Out of Poverty: What Works	100
C. “Nation Building”	102
D. Special Topic: Talking about Trade and the Global Economy	104

15. COMMON CRITIQUES & EFFECTIVE RESPONSES

A. “The poor will always be with us... there’s only so much we can do.”	107
B. “Foreign aid just creates dependency.”	108
C. “Poverty has nothing to do with terrorism.”	109
D. “The problem is corruption.”	110
E. “We’re already so generous. The U.S. can’t do it all.”	111
F. “The market will solve these problems—trade, not aid.”	112
G. “We invest in good performers, not every basket case.”	113

Representative Quotes	114
-----------------------	-----



U.S. in the World

TALKING GLOBAL ISSUES WITH AMERICANS:
A PRACTICAL GUIDE

Note: Sources for facts and figures in this section, along with recommended sources for keeping facts and figures up to date, are available in the “Keeping Current” section of www.usintheworld.org.

MESSAGING RECOMMENDATIONS

PRIORITY REMINDERS FROM “TOP TWENTY”

2. Put your proposals and arguments in the **context of an interconnected world**.
3. Explain why your proposals are **smart/effective/pragmatic/realistic** in the context of today’s world. Reference big ideas about **sound decision making, leadership, or management**.
4. Explain why your proposals are the **right thing to do**. Evoke big ideas familiar to Americans about **decent behavior**.
6. **Stress a “can-do” approach. Don’t open with fear, guilt, or comments that overwhelm** listeners about the enormity and complexity of problems.
13. **Avoid jargon and acronyms.** (See “Wonk-Speak Translator,” Tab 2)
15. Use numbers sparingly and put them in context.

Do

- Emphasize **“helping people in other countries help themselves** over the long term” and helping people become “self-sufficient.”
- Portray people and groups in developing countries as **capable and responsible partners**.
- Make a connection between fighting poverty and despair and building a **better and safer world** for our children.
- Use the concept of **“investing”** (in people, in global economic growth, in a better and safer world for our kids ...).

Don’t

- **Don’t start with the gargantuan scope of the development challenge.** Don’t start with words or images that try to guilt-trip or sadden people into action (e.g., pictures of crying, starving children). Focus first on the good that can be done or is already being done, and only later look at how much needs to get done.
- **Don’t portray the poor as helpless victims;** this reinforces a sense of hopelessness among audiences.
- Don’t portray America in ways that sound **paternalistic**.

Keep in Mind

- Try to strike a **balance between moral and practical imperatives**. The right relative emphasis between the two depends on the audience. Religious and progressive audiences will tend to respond more readily to a moral justification. Business or veterans’ organizations may respond better to a more even mix of moral and practical arguments. Combine arguments only when you are comfortable making both cases.
- It may be helpful, with business audiences in particular, to point out potential **win-win opportunities** in investing in poor countries (e.g., “in the big picture, alleviating poverty and promoting economic development is a win-win proposition; it can contribute to the global economy and benefit us all”).
- **Be careful about overemphasizing the poverty-terror nexus**, which may polarize many nonexpert citizen audiences. However, this argument may be persuasive to sophisticated policy audiences.
- To avoid being perceived as overstating the links between poverty and terrorism, try introducing your arguments with a variation on the following: **“Terrorists exploit** (weak states, weak links in the change, the conditions, etc.)” [See also Tab 5 for specific advice on terrorism.]
- In the light of widespread dissatisfaction with both terms “foreign aid” and “development assistance”—and the fact that both shorthand terms are jargon that may have strong negative connotations—you may be better off trying to replace them when you can with words that more clearly describe what you’re talking about—for example, *“investments in education and health that can help citizens in poor countries help themselves.”* In the final analysis, emphasizing efficacy and pointing to partners may be more important than what you call it. (Note: Several major NGOs have made a conscious decision, based on opinion research, to use the term “development assistance” instead of foreign aid.)

Common Critiques & EFFECTIVE RESPONSES

- We spend too much time and money abroad. Home needs come first. (p. 52)
- “Soft” issues are nice, but survival/security issues come first. (p. 53)
- Poverty has nothing to do with terrorism. (p. 109)

14A **WHY IT MATTERS** **HOW OTHER PEOPLE LIVE**

Arguments & Facts to Help You Make
Your Case

Interconnected World

In this interconnected world, how people in other countries live affects the U.S.—how our economy grows, whether we share the diseases and insecurity that flourish in poverty, how we do at honoring the basic rights and values that unite us as human beings. Leaders in politics, business, entertainment, and religion agree: As people outside the U.S. gain access to fundamental freedoms, modern sources of energy, basic education, and decent jobs, we gain as well.

- Innovators and community leaders around the world are working for the same goals—healthy communities, growth out of poverty, human dignity, better lives for our children. Supporting them gains us partners for the future.
- When we put all the pieces together, change is real: Many Americans care about the fate of the Brazilian rainforest, the “lungs of the planet,” for example; but it took environmental groups and governments in Brazil, the U.S., and elsewhere to help Brazilians find good jobs and farmland that didn’t depend on cutting trees, education about why rainforests matter, and support for tourism and biomedical research that can make these forests valuable resources. Now, for the first time, the rate at which the forests are disappearing has slowed.
- When we support change in one area, it pays off in others. Just sending a child to primary school, for example, helps boys and girls live longer, have healthier families, prevent diseases like HIV/AIDS, get better jobs, and earn more money—lifting up their own communities, their countries, and eventually the global economy.
- When we support people at the grassroots level with vision and commitment to help them improve their own communities, the change is lasting. The most successful support for AIDS orphans in Africa, for example, builds on the efforts of churches, mosques, and communities to care for their own children. People with next to nothing themselves were already organized to take in children, feed and care for them, and help them remember their parents—what they needed was help with buying textbooks and medicines, and in preventing the kids themselves from catching HIV/AIDS.

Investment

Investing in global economic growth—which will have a crucial effect on our own economic future—means investing in people.

We can help people living in poverty seize the opportunity to improve their own lives. Just as at home, we can support governments in making economic rules that balance market forces with citizens’ rights. And we can promote global rules on trade that are fair for everyone. *[See also section on trade, pages 104–106.]*

- With trade supporting almost a fourth of U.S. national income and one in nine jobs, our economic prospects are more intertwined than ever with those of other countries.

- Conditions differ around the world, but the foundations of healthy societies are the same everywhere: strong communities, a clean physical environment, and work that enables people to meet their needs with dignity.
- Investing in health improves economic growth. World Bank data show that Africa's economic growth rate per person would have been almost three times higher in the 1990s without the costs of HIV/AIDS.
- It's about opportunity, not money. Economists estimate that with fairer global trade rules, African countries could earn six times what they receive in assistance from wealthy countries every year. And if all poor countries' share of world trade increased by just 1 percent, their income growth would lift 128 million people out of poverty.

Helping responsible governments get stronger, offering their own people hope for a better future, is a smart investment in our own security.

Direct threats to U.S. security (e.g., terrorism) and social threats (e.g., illegal drugs, dangerous new diseases, and tainted foodstuffs) take root and grow in countries where lawlessness prevails. We fight terrorism by stopping its training camps and financiers overseas; we fight diseases like SARS and avian flu by catching and treating epidemics abroad before they reach our shores. But we can't win these fights if other governments are not capable of fighting along with us. So when we invest in training health care workers or in rebuilding government institutions after a civil war, we are investing in our own future as well.

- We depend on partners with strong and stable governments in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The governments of Ghana and South Africa offer economic hope and peacekeeping strength in West and Southern Africa. And the U.S. stopped SARS and avian flu from causing U.S. epidemics by working with well-established governments in Southeast Asia.
- Our security, prosperity, and health are especially linked to our neighbors in Mexico, the Caribbean, and Latin America. The more these countries and regions have responsible governments that can meet their people's needs and have innovative economies that create jobs and offer hope, the better off we will be as well.
- When terrorists, drug dealers, and criminals exploit nations with weak governments or civil wars to make money and find safe havens, we feel the effects. Al Qaeda ran businesses in war-torn Sudan and bought diamonds during Sierra Leone's civil war. Drug dealers thrive in chaotic Afghanistan and violent Colombia.

Americans believe that our actions should fit our values. We believe that everyone has the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—and in justice and opportunity for all. Americans possess uncommon generosity toward those in need. With the right investments, we can be a real force for change and opportunity in the lives of others.

- We are a generous country, and donations by private Americans are among the highest in the world. Those donations could get more done if our government used its resources to set the stage for private success—and raised its rate of spending to fight poverty, which today is the second-lowest per person of all the wealthy nations. That allows many other countries to believe that we don't care and to overlook Americans' private generosity.
- When Americans in focus groups are told that just \$50 per American per year above current government efforts could cut world hunger in half, 75 percent respond positively—surprised that we would hesitate to spend such a modest sum if such a significant result were possible.

**Pragmatism,
Effectiveness**

**Right Thing
To Do:
American Values**

MESSAGING RECOMMENDATIONS

PRIORITY REMINDERS FROM “TOP TWENTY”

6. **Stress a “can-do” approach. Don’t open with fear, guilt or comments that overwhelm** listeners about the enormity and complexity of problems.
7. When appropriate, **cite examples of other countries (and NGOs) that are working alongside the U.S.**
8. Cite examples of what works and offer **success stories**.
9. **Empower** listeners by telling them **what they can do** to help. **Talk about yardsticks** citizens can use to evaluate policy actions and progress over time. (See “Engaging Citizens,” Tab 8)
13. **Avoid jargon and acronyms.** (See “Wonk-Speak Translator,” Tab 2)
15. Use numbers sparingly and put them in context.

Do

- Paint a **picture that defines what the U.S. can do as bigger than just aid**—including, for example, trade policies, health care, peacekeeping, investment, environmental policies, and helping to build systems of law. Help your audience understand that rich countries’ **policies matter** for all countries’ development. Explain how development works best with the right **balance** of activities and actors, when we **connect the dots** and address **all aspects** of the challenge.
- **Quantify and contain the problems, and show how far relatively small investments can go.** Help people understand why the problems are manageable and talk about what we can do (e.g., put a proposed amount of spending in a per-citizen context or some other understandable context).
- Invoke the **“investment”** concept, for example, “through new assistance programs, through trade and through basic health and education programs.” Explain how we can “help others to help themselves.”
- Emphasize success stories that demonstrate **durable solutions** and show how certain actions, policies, and investments **helped entire groups of people**—communities, countries, and regions—to lift themselves out of poverty. Talk about the potential to duplicate these successful efforts in other countries and regions.
- Make assistance come to life by giving **examples of what assistance is and looks like** as you speak (e.g., “programs to deliver vaccinations, clean water, and schools to ...”)
- Portray people and groups in developing countries as **capable and responsible partners**. Point to the effectiveness of **local commitment**. Show how U.S. actions support processes that people in other countries have initiated.
- Point to other countries and international institutions as actors on the scene.
- See recommendations for “Talking about Trade and the Global Economy” (page 104-106).

Don’t

- When someone says “we spend too much abroad,” or “we need to take care of our own first,” **don’t treat the person as if they don’t understand the need. Don’t assume the other person is truly isolationist or is selfish**—most often they are not. The sense of obligation to poor people in our own communities is no less altruistic. **The vast majority of Americans want to give something to help poor people abroad; the question is how much.** (See “Do’s” above.)
- Do not try to counter misimpressions about how much America spends abroad with **guilt, shame, or mere facts**. For instance, the fact that America is ranked among the lowest of rich countries in its per person contributions on development spending is often rejected by listeners because it contradicts deeply held beliefs that America does it all and pays for everything around the world. (For alternatives, see “Do’s” above.)
- **Don’t talk only about successes in helping one individual without linking** that story to a larger picture of success—at the level of government, society, or community—to show how systems as well as individuals are involved. People may get “stuck” on an individual’s story and wonder why everyone doesn’t do what that plucky person did.
- **Don’t champion aid as an end in itself.** Like multilateralism (see international cooperation, page 62-63), it’s a tactic to get things done, not a goal.
- **Don’t deny that the U.S. has used and continues to use development assistance for political purposes.** Try talking about the need to close gaps between our values and actions; the need to find other ways to pressure badly performing governments to whom we give aid. Try stressing that **the more politicized aid becomes, the tougher it will be to fight corruption**.

Keep in Mind

- Agree that certain types of aid are less helpful to people in need. Aid that is primarily designed to win other countries’ support of American interests is unpopular with a large segment of Americans.
- Many Americans are leery of imposing our ways on other cultures and political systems; many oppose efforts to “impose democracy” or “export Western values.”
- **When corruption issues are raised**, align yourself with those who have been ripped off by corruption and explain that the U.S. government and NGOs are **committed to cracking down** on corruption and have made great strides. Clarify that much of America’s assistance comes via direct services channeled through well-meaning NGOs. Talk about **openness and accountability** as a key part of the new development agenda.
- See advice for talking about **trade issues**, page 104-106.

Common Critiques & EFFECTIVE RESPONSES

- We spend too much time and money abroad. (p. 52)
- There’s only so much we can do. (p. 107)
- Foreign aid just creates a cycle of dependency. (p. 108)
- The problem is corruption. (p. 110)
- We’re already so generous. (p. 111)
- The market will solve problems—trade, not aid. (p. 112)
- We invest in good performers, not basket cases. (p. 113)

14B **HELPING PEOPLE AND COUNTRIES LIFT THEMSELVES OUT OF POVERTY: WHAT WORKS**

Arguments & Facts to Help You Make Your Case

Comprehensive; Can-do

We do know what works to help people and countries lift themselves up.

Families and communities do best when they have the right mix of tools and resources available to them—when people have access to jobs and economic opportunity, basic health and education, the ability to participate in decisions that affect them, and the basic rights and dignity valued by people everywhere. What works is to offer local people a little extra help and remove impediments so that people can use their own energy, innovation, and determination to change their lives. The right combination of approaches—applied in countries like China and India, and in now-prosperous countries like Ireland and South Korea that were poor just a generation ago—has allowed millions of people to lift themselves out of poverty, and has more than doubled the number of democracies worldwide.

Smart Investments

What works: promoting education to give people the tools for

success. Investing in education—making sure every child learns the basics—pays off in improved health, longevity, and income. And access to good basic education is vital for whole countries to succeed in today's high-skills, information-based world economy.

- No country in modern times has achieved sustained economic growth without offering basic education to nearly all its citizens.
- Getting children, especially girls, to attend and stay in school is critical for their health and economic success. For each year of schooling a girl receives, her children are 5 to 10 percent less likely to die as infants. And the children and grandchildren of educated women are much more likely to be educated themselves.
- In Mexico, the number of girls in school increased by 20 percent when a private organization offered financial help to families that made a commitment to getting their kids educated. Bangladesh increased the number of kids in school by one-third by offering food aid to families that promised to have their children attend school.

Effective; Pragmatic

What works: improving health care.

It's basic: Healthy children are more likely to go to school and are more able to learn. Healthy adults can hold jobs, start businesses, farm, or care for their families. Healthy families have access to medical services, including family planning, so that their children are wanted, immunized, and more likely to survive. Killer diseases such as HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria sap resources, energy, and human potential, turning back progress that whole societies have made.

- Through UNICEF and other international organizations, international support for childhood immunization, improved nutrition, and disease control has helped raise worldwide longevity by more than one-third and cut infant mortality in half since 1960.
- Partnerships that bring together government, the UN, and private business firms make investing in health efficient and effective. One such partnership has cut the incidence of two diseases carried by parasites by 99 percent, saving the livelihoods of thousands of people and allowing whole communities to farm and grow again.

- Investments in health are incredibly cost-effective; a dose of medicine that cuts a newborn's risk of contracting HIV/AIDS in half costs less than a soft drink.

What works: getting tools for economic empowerment into the hands of people, businesses, and whole nations.

People with jobs and investment have a stake in their societies, a chance to invest in their own countries' future, and a real opportunity to achieve what people everywhere want—better lives for themselves and their children. Several practical tools have been proven to get results:

- Investing in debt relief: Many poor countries spend more in interest on old loans to foreign governments than on health and education for their own people. Canceling loans for countries that are committed to good policies and clean government can make a huge difference. For example, \$3 billion in debt relief is helping Tanzania send 1.6 million children to school. Its neighbor, Uganda, used its debt relief to make primary education free for every child, something it couldn't afford before.
- Empowering the poorest people: Microcredit—that is, offering tiny loans to start-up entrepreneurs, often women who work from home—is another way to ensure that aid money goes straight to those who need it, and to encourage entrepreneurs and self-sufficiency. In India, it takes just three years of microcredit for one in three loan recipients to move out of poverty. Global repayment rates for these loans, which can be as little as \$50, are over 90 percent—a rate commercial banks everywhere would love to match.
- Trade rules that level the field: Like people everywhere, citizens of poor countries would rather earn money than depend on handouts. Making trade rules fairer so that poor countries could compete in the global economy on an equal footing with industrial countries like the U.S. would generate more income than all the assistance programs of all the world's governments combined. Africa alone has the potential to earn from trade six times every year what it currently receives in assistance. *[See also trade section, pages 104–106]*

**Effective;
Common Sense**

What works: fighting corruption by supporting reformers who fight for clean government and democracy.

Corruption is a very serious problem, stealing from the very people we want to help. But we can combat corruption—we do it most effectively by helping the people who are corruption's first victims to fight it and to make government and business more accountable.

- A group called Transparency International—with citizens' chapters in more than 90 countries—has developed a “Big Mac Index” to highlight places where corruption raises the price of basic consumer products like fast food. In Argentina, citizen outrage over “Big Mac Index” findings drove down the corruption-inflated price of school lunches in Buenos Aires by half within a few days.
- Through another nongovernmental initiative, called Publish What You Pay, citizens are pressing to find out how much money their governments get from private companies producing lucrative natural resources—and where that money goes. Nigeria, with the world's ninth-largest oil reserves and severe corruption problems, has already pledged to publish the amount it receives from the oil industry.
- Sixteen African countries have volunteered to have outside experts come in and scrutinize their governments for corruption, human rights abuses, and poor public services, beginning in April 2004.

Effective

MESSAGING RECOMMENDATIONS

PRIORITY REMINDERS FROM "TOP TWENTY"

2. Put your proposals and arguments in the **context of an interdependent world**. Give examples of our interconnectedness.
3. Explain how your proposals are **smart/effective/pragmatic** in the context of today's world.
4. Explain how your proposals are the **right thing to do**. Talk about what kind of country we want to be in the world, with reference to our ideals and traditions—who we strive to be as people. Talk about the **values and aspirations we share** with other people around the world.
5. Place your specifics within the context of big, cross-cutting themes about smart and decent problem solving and behavior, e.g.: **Pragmatic. Principled. Far-sighted. Comprehensive. Trustworthy. Collaborative.**
10. **Stress a "can-do" approach.** Inspire others with your vision of what America can do, working with others, to create a safer and better world. **Don't use fear and guilt as your entry point** to a subject.
12. **Avoid jargon and acronyms.** (See "Wonk-Speak Translator," Tab 2).

Do

- Make the connection between these activities and helping to build a **better and safer world** for our children.
- Emphasize that nations are built by the people who live in them, but stress the value of smart investments that **"help people in other countries help themselves"** when they need it to become "self-sufficient."
- **Break down into manageable parts** what may seem like a huge task. Give examples of what has already been achieved and what can be done.
- Point to other countries and international organizations as partners in getting countries back on track.
- Explain the benefits of **getting ahead of problems through prevention and long-term planning**, and how these can be important **investments** in a better, safer world that can pay off for us all.

Keep in Mind

- **The term "nation building" can have strong negative connotations.** Try replacing it with words that describe what nation building actually represents to you (e.g., "winning the peace," "helping people and nations get back on track," "investing in stability and security," "helping to create the conditions so that the people can get back on their feet and start building their future ...").

Keep in Mind

- **Be careful not to imply that the U.S. is attempting to "remake the world in our image,"** to which many Americans react badly (not to mention other countries!). The relevant yardstick is what threat would this country pose, to its own inhabitants and to us, if we did nothing—not a mission to turn every country into Switzerland or the U.S.
- If you argue that America has a **responsibility** in post-intervention situations to contribute more to help nations get back on track, try to define "responsibility" in ways that are positive and proactive, not merely as defensive and defense-oriented ... as part of the long-term objective to make the world a better, safer place.

Common Critiques & EFFECTIVE RESPONSES

- We spend too much time and money abroad. Domestic needs come first. (p. 52)
- We're already so generous. The U.S. can't do it all. (p. 111)
- We invest in good performers. We can't invest in every basket case. (p. 113)

14C “NATION BUILDING”

Arguments & Facts to Help You
Make Your Case

Right; Smart

When governments are destroyed by war or simply collapse, threats to health, security, and prosperity spread far beyond their borders.

Rather than abstract “nation building,” what we’re actually talking about is helping local authorities to become strong enough to manage threats of violence, crime, and disease, so that local people can rebuild and threats don’t worsen to the point of harming us or our interests. It’s smart to help local authorities rebuild and fight those threats. And it’s morally right to let local people know that the U.S. shares their aspirations for a secure future.

- When the U.S. acts to fight these threats, it can make a big difference in others’ lives and our own. In the 1980s, El Salvador was trapped in what looked like an endless, violent, and spreading civil war. But the UN, with help from the U.S. and European countries, stepped in and shaped very specifically what El Salvador’s postwar government and institutions would look like. Though its postwar government is far from perfect, it is keeping the peace, holding regular elections, and not destabilizing its neighbors—something that seemed impossible in the 1980s.
- When we fail to get involved, the consequences can be very bad. When al Qaeda’s leadership went looking for safe places to hide training camps and headquarters in the 1990s, they chose first Sudan and then Afghanistan, two countries that had been wracked by internal conflict and then largely forgotten by the outside world. Their governments were so weak that al Qaeda could bribe, intimidate, and co-opt them.
- The world’s two leading sources of illegal drugs—Colombia shipping cocaine to the U.S. and Afghanistan sending heroin to Europe—are both countries where long-standing conflicts have left the government weak against bands of armed men who simply make their own law—or sell it to the highest bidder.
- We are now seeing in Iraq how a war-torn society with no clear authorities and most of its government destroyed can become a hiding place for terrorists and criminals of all kinds—and a very dangerous place for Americans and our interests.
- The U.S. and other countries have recently sent troops back into Haiti, for the second time in 10 years, after its government could no longer exercise authority. That has meant violence, death, and even greater poverty for Haitians—and fears of large refugee flows to the U.S.

Teamwork

Nations are built by the people who live in them, drawing resources and support from outside.

We can’t do it all; and we shouldn’t try without partners in the countries concerned who are first and foremost concerned with building their own country. But the UN, other organizations, and other countries have had a wide range of experience in helping countries get back on track. We don’t ever have to go it alone.

- Helping a country function successfully again involves several challenges, of which the military is only part, if it's relevant at all. What may instead be needed is to help people go home and rebuild their communities; rebuild institutions of government, education, health, and commerce; and provide security and the confidence that more conflict is not inevitable.
- Some countries specialize in a particular aspect of rebuilding. For instance, Canada, Finland, India, and Sweden train troops especially for peacekeeping duty. National police from France, Ireland, and Italy can be sent directly by their governments to help rebuild law enforcement agencies. And a country that itself struggles with poverty can have special insight into the challenges of rebuilding a society; Brazil has helped set up medical programs in Africa. If we work with other countries, everyone can do what they do best.
- The United Nations is a goldmine of people who've built their own nations and helped rebuild others, with special expertise in holding elections and re-creating infrastructure. UN staff may be experts on parts of the world that are unfamiliar to us.

When the U.S. has worked with other countries and agencies and followed the lead of people who are striving to mend their own societies, we have achieved a good track record.

We're not perfect, and we can always learn from the people themselves; but we can't walk away, any more than we can walk away from imperfect institutions in our own communities and nation. Success doesn't come overnight—remember that the U.S. took more than a decade after declaring independence to write its Constitution. But if we take the long view, we can see where the right kind of outside help has made a real difference.

- Mozambique has moved during the past 10 years from being a war-torn basket case to being one of the world's five fastest-growing economies, even after two catastrophic floods. It remains one of the world's poorest countries; but with help from the UN, Europe, the U.S., and many private organizations, its people are fighting corruption and building hospitals, schools, and—most important—hope.
- Almost 50 years ago, South Korea was a war-torn, poverty-stricken new country. It accepted significant help from the U.S. and others while setting its own priorities and sticking to them. Today South Korea doesn't need anyone's help—and in fact it helps other countries.
- More recently, the UN's support for elections and its advice on building new institutions have been critical to the success of East Timor, a brand-new nation that is peaceful and growing despite having no infrastructure or history of self-government before 1999. And in Kosovo, where a 1999 military intervention by the U.S. and NATO was followed by a UN mission, elections have been held successfully and the economy is growing.

Can-do

14D TALKING ABOUT TRADE AND THE GLOBAL ECONOMY

Special Topic

MESSAGING GUIDANCE

As much as for any issue in this guide, where your audience stands and the perceptions they bring to the discussion are likely to depend on where they sit. Even the experts have had relatively little to offer by way of gap-bridging solutions. The suggestions below for encouraging a constructive discussion start from the idea that **globalization and international economic forces are neither inherently good or bad. The job of policy is to change the ratio between good and bad effects.**

As in other areas, our economic lives are increasingly **interconnected**. We can't disengage from the global economy even if we want to, and we must understand that our well-being is connected to that of other countries. Much of the debate on this topic is very negative; try to stress a **can-do approach**. The U.S. has the resources to provide for its people and be an engine for global growth; we have a strong history of evolving to meet changing economic circumstances.

Describe steps to improve trade outcomes both at home and abroad as good **returns on investment**—in American productivity and innovation at home, and in strong economic partners abroad.

Avoid questioning the motives of your opponents; don't be afraid to say that no one claims to have all the answers on this one.

ARGUMENTS & FACTS TO HELP YOU MAKE YOUR CASE

More than ever, our economic prospects are intertwined with those of other countries.

Economic globalization—the ability of goods, money, people, and ideas to move almost anywhere on Earth faster than ever before—has dramatically changed the world economy:

- Exports and imports account for almost one-quarter of U.S. national income.
- Trade and foreign investment support one in every nine jobs.
- One-half of income worldwide is now generated by trade among nations.

More open trade has real benefits and real costs.

The 20-year consensus among experts and governments of rich and poor countries alike that open trade would benefit everyone has been called into question both in the U.S. and abroad, as have the regional and worldwide rules and systems for trade that the U.S. led in creating—the World Trade Organization and agreements such as the Doha Round of global trade talks and the North American Free Trade Agreement among Canada, Mexico, and the U.S.

• **AMERICANS HAVE BENEFITED:**

- Prices for many consumer goods have stayed steady or declined because U.S. retailers purchase products globally at lower costs. The increased flow of foreign-grown foods has dramatically increased consumer choices while holding prices steady. This has had a great deal to do with keeping U.S. inflation low.
- Many industries have also benefited from being more able to sell their products overseas, and to use cheaper materials and labor from overseas. Both workers hired in these industries and managers of successful global operations have benefited. Stockholders—more than half of the American public now holds stock or stock funds—also benefit from higher profits and share prices.

• **OTHER COUNTRIES HAVE BENEFITED:**

- From South Korea and Hong Kong in the 1970s to Malaysia and the Maldives today, focusing heavily on exports has proven a successful way for some countries to build modern economies and dramatically improve living standards for millions of their citizens.
- Poor countries that have been able to export their products freely and process their own raw materials into more lucrative manufactured goods—both aspects of trade the U.S. takes for granted—have seen significant increases in jobs and income.
- The telecommunications revolution has allowed high-technology, service, and paper-processing industries to move where wages are lower but education levels, especially English fluency, are high—and this has given major boosts to economies as diverse as Brazil, China, India, Ireland, and Israel.

• **DOWNSIDES FOR AMERICANS:**

- Cheaper labor overseas has played a significant role, but not the only one, in the recent loss of manufacturing jobs in the U.S. The U.S. economy has always had its ups and downs, creating and losing many thousands of jobs every few years. Experts have suggested that about 30 percent of the U.S. manufacturing jobs lost since 2000 moved abroad, with productivity gains and the weak economy accounting for the other 70 percent.
- Now, the technology and “creative” industries are seeing a similar migration of jobs, as companies in those fields also take advantage of innovative, educated workforces and lower costs overseas.
- Some U.S. industries have also been badly hurt by foreign competitors in the U.S.—textiles and automobiles being two well-known examples.

• **DOWNSIDES FOR OTHER COUNTRIES:**

- Just as cheaper foreign goods have harmed some American workers and firms, U.S. exports can be devastating to small producers in impoverished countries. In some West African countries, for example, it is cheaper to import U.S. cotton than to grow it locally; small

farmers with no other source of income face not just unemployment but also starvation. Mexican grain farmers have been unable to compete and have been forced off their land to seek migrant work in the U.S.

- Progress toward trade that is equally open for everyone has been uneven; poor countries' products face trade barriers that are on average four times higher than those faced by products from the U.S. and other wealthy countries. The rules are not the same for everyone—many richer countries, including the U.S., still offer subsidies on products such as beef, cotton, and sugar—but poor countries have by and large been forced to stop subsidizing their farmers.
- Some rules have negative effects that go far beyond trade—intellectual property rules keep affordable generic drugs out of the hands of HIV/AIDS patients, for example.
- Poor countries often lack rules of the road to preserve even the most basic standards for worker safety and environmental protection. This “race to the bottom” means that products we use daily are produced under conditions we would find totally unacceptable—workers held prisoner, chemicals dumped into local water supplies, activists threatened and killed if they complain.

The rules we set for trade matter, and the policy choices we make concerning trade—both at home and abroad—matter.

We can:

- Adopt a **comprehensive approach** that works all the angles—tax policy, health care, funding for technology innovation, and education—that will help create good jobs at home and do more to help workers who do lose their jobs receive unemployment benefits, health care, and retraining for new jobs.
- **Take the long view** and make sure we are investing all we need to ensure economic opportunity for ourselves and others in the years ahead; making our own education system ready to turn out the workers, entrepreneurs, and job creators of tomorrow; and offering people in poor countries a stake in their own societies and economic futures.
- Use **preventive strategies** when it seems clear that a particular region or industry will face trouble in the future.
- Look at how we are **connected to others**, and ask how our choices affect people outside the U.S., especially the poorest and most vulnerable.
- **Practice what we preach**, by offering others the same trade opportunities that we expect from them, and by paying attention to the conditions under which people in other countries make our shirts and soccer balls.

Common Critiques

& EFFECTIVE RESPONSES

15A “The poor will always be with us; there’s only so much you can do about it. ...”

Basic advice: Convey a sense of hopefulness by talking about what can be done. Emphasize effectiveness and teamwork.

“... Empowering men and women to improve their lives always makes a difference. All over the world, even in the most impoverished countries, people with vision and commitment are striving to make things better for themselves, their families, and their communities. When we **offer them a little extra help**—like better access to education and health care—**and remove impediments to economic growth**—like trade rules that make it difficult for small, poor countries to compete in the global marketplace—we empower people to **use their own energy and determination to bring about lasting changes. ...**”

“... We’ve learned a lot about how to help people help themselves. Not surprisingly, **families and communities do best when they have the right mix of tools and resources to work with**—like access to education and health care, a clean environment, the freedom to seize new economic opportunities, and basic rights like being able to participate in the decisions that affect their lives and livelihoods. **Programs that help create conditions like these can empower millions of people to lift themselves out of poverty.** We’ve seen it happen in China and India, and in now-prosperous countries like Ireland and South Korea that were poor just a generation ago. ...”

“... **Investments in education and health care pay off many times over.** For each year of schooling a girl receives, her own children are 5 to 10 percent less likely to die as infants. **Programs that provide small loans to help women start their own small businesses also have an impressive track record** of moving people and families out of poverty. If we join other countries in a concerted effort to pursue these **cost-effective strategies**, we **don’t just help change lives—we change trends.** And in an interconnected world, that works to everyone’s benefit, because everyone’s future depends on a healthy, stable, and prosperous global community. ...”

“... There’s a lot we can do about poverty and related problems. **Investments in health, for example, are incredibly effective—and have an impact on many aspects of people’s lives.** Healthy children are more likely to go to school and more able to learn. Healthy, educated adults are better able to get jobs, start businesses, and care for their families. People who have jobs and hope for the future have a stake in the stability of their societies. **Countries that no longer have to spend billions fighting preventable diseases can devote resources to educating their citizens and developing their economies. ...**”

15B **“Foreign aid just creates a cycle of dependency; lasting change only happens when people help themselves. ...”**

Basic advice: Pivot to a positive message, explaining that development assistance encourages self-sufficiency and lasting change. Emphasize effectiveness, farsightedness.

“... Development assistance is all about moving people away from dependence. Like men and women everywhere, **people living in poor countries want to be self-sufficient.** They want decent jobs and a chance to improve their own lives. **They’re already working hard to reach these goals. They don’t need ‘tough love,’ they need opportunities—to** attend school, to grow up free from chronic preventable diseases like malaria, and to enjoy the basic human rights we take for granted. When we help make these opportunities available, we’re creating more independence, not less. ...”

“... When we invest in people by increasing their access to basic education and health care, we’re helping to provide the resources they need to help themselves. **Giving people an opportunity to improve their lives is what America is all about—and we should be doing our best to make sure that our actions in the world are consistent with our fundamental values. ...”**

“... All over the world, even in the most impoverished countries, people with vision and commitment are striving to lift themselves and their societies out of poverty. **These men and women aren’t waiting for foreign aid. But when aid comes, it can provide the additional resources that families and communities need** to make real and lasting changes. ...”

“... The old saying about how ‘it’s better to teach someone to fish than to give them a fish’ still holds true. Fortunately, there’s a lot we can do to help families and communities become self-sufficient and successful. We can empower people who are eager to improve their lives by investing in programs that provide basic education and health care. We can help clear the path to economic opportunity by funding microcredit programs that offer tiny loans to poor people—mostly women—who want to start their own small businesses, and by supporting efforts to clean up corruption. **A little extra help goes a long way, when we join forces** with other countries, nonprofit organizations, and local partners to implement these cost-effective strategies. ...”

“... People need tools and opportunities to help themselves; that’s why **building schools and hospitals in impoverished communities is an investment in self-sufficiency and success. And these strategies also help poor countries to help themselves.** When we work with other nations to improve health care in the developing world, for example, responsible governments that have been spending billions of dollars fighting preventable diseases are freed up to invest in education and economic development. Our modest initial investments make their investments possible—and in an interconnected world, that pays off for everyone. ...”

15C **“Poverty has nothing to do with terrorism. The terrorists on 9/11 were all rich. ...”**

Basic advice: Paint a bigger picture, with a longer timeline, to explain the link in a way that’s not simplistic or literal. Emphasize farsightedness, connecting the dots.

“... If we want to reduce the terrorist threat in the long run, we need to ask a different and more fundamental question: Where does this kind of extremism thrive?” Extremists are a tiny minority in any society, but they are more likely to find a sympathetic audience when the majority shares some of their anger, resentment, and fatalism. They exploit frustration and indignity, no matter what the cause—be it chronic poverty, political oppression, or what feels like systematic exclusion from the benefits, privileges, and respect that other societies seem to enjoy. Even as we strike at al Qaeda militarily, we need to **join with other nations in using diplomacy, development assistance, and international pressure to strike at the conditions that terrorists exploit. ...”**

“... In the long run, dignity and hope are what give people reasons to resist the appeal of extremism. People who have a stake in the stability of their society, and a say in its future, are less likely to find fanaticism attractive or acceptable. Programs and policies that improve education and employment opportunities and that promote respect for basic human rights are important strategies in the struggle against terrorism. ...”

“... Threats to our security—like terrorism—can take root and grow in countries where hopelessness and lawlessness prevail. Programs and policies that help such countries become more stable and meet their people’s needs are not only investments in a better future for millions of vulnerable men, women, and children. They’re also investments in our own future, because **we depend on responsible, capable partners in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East to fight alongside us** against terrorism and other global security threats. ...”

15D **“The problem is corruption. It’s useless to send assistance to countries with corrupt governments that waste or siphon off most of what we give. ...”**

Basic advice: Take corruption seriously, without losing sight of common sense and common decency (there’s a lot we can do, the perfect shouldn’t be the enemy of the good, etc.). Emphasize effective solutions and doing what’s right.

“... Corruption hurts the very people we’re trying to help. That’s why both U.S. government agencies and private groups are taking steps to stop waste and make sure that assistance ends up in the hands of those who need it most. We’re monitoring how our contributions are spent, we’re pressing for anticorruption measures as part of our assistance programs, and we’re channeling funds through reliable nonprofit organizations, so much less of our aid money gets transferred directly to foreign governments. ...”

“... Corruption hurts the very people we’re trying to help. During the Cold War, we learned that using development assistance to buy the support of foreign governments often just encouraged corruption. This happens less frequently today, but when we do use aid as a signal of support for our allies, we should be building in anticorruption measures and finding other ways to encourage positive change in authoritarian governments. **Otherwise we’re back to investing in politics, instead of people. ...”**

“... We can be effective, even in imperfect situations. Yes, corruption hurts the very people we’re trying to help. That’s why government agencies and private groups are taking steps to stop waste and make sure that assistance ends up in the hands of those who need it most. But **we can’t let the actions of a few stand in the way of helping millions around the world. ...”**

“... There are more democracies today in the poorest one-quarter of the world than ever before. The overwhelming majority of people in the developing world want us to help fight corruption in their countries. We can **form partnerships with them by building anticorruption measures into our development assistance and by supporting local reformers** who are pressing for clean government. And we can work with other countries providing aid to **make sure that our own corporations aren’t party to the corruption** that hurts the very people we’re trying to help. ...”

15E **“We’re already so generous—we already do too much compared with other countries. What more do you want? The U.S. can’t do it all. ...”**

Basic advice: Offer non-guilt-based reasons why we should “look again” at what and how much we’ve been doing. Emphasize that doing what’s right is also smart, and putting our strength to great purpose.

“... Americans are a generous and caring people—and our best investments in helping others (like the Marshall Plan) have repaid themselves many times over in the form of a more peaceful, prosperous world. Now the world is more interconnected than ever, and we face important global challenges that no nation can handle alone. Other countries are stepping up to the plate. **We need to work with them and invest together in a better future for everyone. ...”**

“... We know it matters how other people live. Our hearts tell us so—and in an interconnected world, where instability in distant places can produce insecurity at home, common sense also dictates that we should help people in other countries lift themselves out of poverty. Solving global problems like hunger, illiteracy, and the spread of HIV/AIDS is in everyone’s best interests. **The question is, are we doing what we need to do to get results?** If the U.S. spent just \$50 more per American each year—about what it costs to take your family to a couple of movies—we could cut world hunger in half. Relatively modest investments like these would improve the lives of millions of men, women, and children—and pay off many times over in the form of a more peaceful, prosperous world. ...”

“... Americans want the U.S. to do its share in international efforts to solve global problems like hunger, illiteracy, and the spread of HIV/AIDS. That hasn’t changed and never will. But **because we’ve been concentrating our attention on the military aspects of America’s role in the world, we’ve lost track of the fact that our nation’s relative contribution to the relief of human suffering has fallen behind** that of other nations. Let’s get back to doing our share and inspiring others with our example. ...”

“... Americans are caring people. We give generously to nonprofit organizations that work in crisis situations around the world. But unless our private acts of generosity are combined with the kind of large-scale, sustained initiatives that only government can undertake, we may not make a lasting impact. When government does its part of the job, we can help poor countries build healthy, stable societies that are able to prevent and withstand crises. ...”

“... Development assistance is just one part of an effective strategy to help people and countries lift themselves out of poverty. Often what’s most meaningful is opening up opportunities, not contributing money. When the U.S. and other wealthy nations **negotiate trade policies that are fair and friendly to developing countries,** for example, poor people who want to improve their lives have many more opportunities to do so. When the international community comes together to **cancel the debts of impoverished countries that are committed to good government,** those countries are freed to invest in health care and education, instead of having to keep paying interest on old loans that were made to prop up yesterday’s dictators. When we **encourage international agencies like the World Bank to build environmental protections and anticorruption measures into their lending,** poor countries get more than money—they get help creating sustainable, democratic societies. **It’s important that the pieces of this picture fit together and reflect the same basic values,** or we and other nations could end up giving with one hand and taking away with the other. We can still make a difference if all these strategies aren’t in place—but we should keep working with other countries to make sure our approach is as complete and consistent as possible. ...”

15F **“The market will solve these problems. It’s about trade, not aid. ...”**

Basic advice: A responsible approach incorporates both; government also needs to do its job. Emphasize smart problem solving, doing what works, and what’s right.

“... Both trade and aid are necessary. Smart development assistance helps get impoverished countries to the point where they can enter and benefit from the global economy.

Access to global markets is critical, as are trade rules that give new players a fair chance in the competition. But like every opportunity, people need skills and resources to make the most of it. Investments in basic education and health care and in local entrepreneurship help empower people and countries to take advantage of the new economic opportunities that fair trade rules can open up. ...”

“... We’ve all observed how those who start out with the most resources are often able to make the market work for them, while those who start with less find themselves falling farther and farther behind.

Smart development assistance helps ensure that poor people and countries enter the global market with something valuable to contribute. Then we need to make sure that the rules of the global trade game aren’t stacked against them and that new small players have a fair chance in the competition. ...”

“... Let’s remember our goal: to help more countries and people become self-sufficient members of a peaceful, prosperous global community. Market forces are powerful, but they’re blind to the fates of individual countries and people. **As a decent and responsible nation, we should take steps to ensure that the market’s contribution to development is a positive one.** That means working with other nations to help impoverished people and communities get to the point where they can make the most of the market’s opportunities. It means making sure that the rules of the global marketplace aren’t stacked against poor countries and are designed to create decent jobs for workers everywhere, in industrial and developing countries alike. ...”

15G **“We invest in good performers. We can’t afford to throw our money away on every basket case. ...”**

Basic advice: Evoke the world as an interconnected system. Emphasize effectiveness, teamwork, doing what’s right and smart.

“... As a compassionate and responsible nation, we can’t ignore those who are worst off, even as we encourage continued improvement in countries that are making progress. In today’s interconnected world, it’s not possible to close our eyes or hearts to the incalculable human suffering in impoverished countries. What’s more, **leaving the poorest and most desperate nations to their own devices sets the stage for a complete collapse of government and society.** As Afghanistan and Iraq have demonstrated, such states can become havens for terrorists and criminals of all kinds, and a threat to national and global security. ...”

“... Working with other nations and international organizations, we’ve had real success in helping societies and countries rebuild after near-collapse. Think of South Korea, and more recently, East Timor. We have more to learn, but we can see where we’ve made a lasting difference by taking a comprehensive approach and by working with people who are determined to rebuild their own societies. **It requires a substantial and sustained commitment—from within the society and from the international community—but it can be done. ...”**

“... It’s important to encourage continuing improvements in countries that are making progress. But it’s also important to work with other nations to alleviate desperate, destabilizing poverty in the poorest countries. It’s often smart to help local authorities rebuild the legitimacy they need to manage threats to the health, security, and prosperity of their communities. And if military intervention becomes necessary to avert a crisis, or because a breakdown of government authority threatens to open the country to outlaws and terrorists, it’s crucial that we join experienced international organizations in making a substantial and sustained commitment to helping people get their country back on track. **We shouldn’t ever have to do it all or do it alone—but neither we nor the global community can afford an incomplete and inconsistent approach to the development challenge. ...”**

“... The world is an interconnected system—we can’t just write off some parts of it and expect the whole to be healthy and stable. It’s important to encourage continuing improvements in countries that are making progress. It’s also important to ensure that the most impoverished countries don’t fall farther and farther behind. ...”

Representative Quotes

POVERTY, DEVELOPMENT, TRADE

Kofi Annan

Secretary General
of the United Nations

“There are no islands in the world today, and there are no domestic and international diseases. We live in a global village. We live in a shrinking world. And there are many contacts between us. No one is isolated, no one can be smug and sit in his or her corner and say, ‘I’m safe because it is somewhere else.’”

Zbigniew Brzezinski

former National
Security Advisor

“I think it’s terribly important for all of us, and especially for the United States ... to try to infuse ... the process of globalization with a high moral and social content. Globalization ... is about improving the lot of the human condition, [not just about marginal advantages in business] ... and I think we as a country ... should be more identified with [the] moral, the ethical, the compassionate aspects [of globalization] ... If we just go around focusing primarily on the war on terrorism or on projecting our power or on saying that we’ll act militarily but without international consensus, then we undermine the legitimacy of our global position and we make it much more difficult for us to lead humanity to an ever more responsive awareness of our collective responsibility to make every individual life more meaningful, more purposeful, more satisfying.”

George W. Bush

43rd President of the
United States

“The deepest beliefs of our nations set the direction of our foreign policy. We value our own civil rights, so we stand for the human rights of others. We affirm the God-given dignity of every person, so we’re moved to action by poverty and oppression and famine and disease.”

Bill Clapp

Chairman and CEO,
Global Partnerships;

Dan Evans

former Washington
State Governor;

Bill Gates Sr.

Co-Chairman,

Bill and Melinda Gates
Foundation;

Bill Ruckelshaus

former Administrator,

Environmental

Protection Agency (EPA)

“[We have reached] the conclusion that the elimination [of extreme global poverty] is the single most important step we can take in realizing a better future for the United States and the world. As business leaders with broad international experience, we know that extreme poverty will never be eliminated without significant private investment. ... [H]owever, governments must create environments where private investment and personal initiative can flourish, by fostering open political and economic systems, making investments in human development and establishing rule of law. ... [O]ur government cannot solve this problem alone ... [but it] is our belief that the United States is in a unique position to galvanize the world community around this vital cause.”

"We must not let our mission be clouded by debates on which there is no debate. ... Let's have effectiveness. Let's have productivity. Let's ensure that the money is well spent. Let's ensure that programs and projects are not corrupt. Let's ensure that women are given an important place in the development process. Let's ensure that issues are locally owned. Let's use all instruments at our disposal, grants, loans, and guarantees. ... They are issues on which the principles are all agreed. These are not issues to hold up action. ... Time is not on our side. But perhaps, for once, public opinion is. ... People everywhere are beginning to recognize: that military solutions to terror are not enough ... that people must be given hope ... that we must build an inclusive global community ... that we must make globalization stand for common humanity, not for commercial brands or competitive advantage."

James Wolfensohn
President, World Bank

"[... O]ur image abroad has suffered terribly because we don't seem like we care as much about challenges abroad as we do about our challenges domestically. I don't think that's a good characterization of the American people. ..."

Lael Brainard
Senior Fellow,
Brookings Institution

"Leaders driven by short-term electoral pressure are reluctant to take on problems, the existence of which is not yet apparent and the solution of which requires a long-term time frame extending beyond the electoral cycle. They are tempted to go along with the conventional wisdom that treats economic phenomena as autonomous and self-correcting and essentially unrelated to the political process. ... Yet the great changes in history ... were driven by mankind's need for some kind of political vision and pursuit of a standard of justice. ... The industrial democracies must preserve and extend the extraordinary accomplishments that fostered globalization. But they can do so in the long run only if they endow the economic aspects of globalization with a political construction of comparable sweep and vision."

Henry Kissinger
former Secretary of State

"... distance can no longer decide who is our neighbor. We can't choose our neighbors anymore. We can't choose the benefits of globalization without some of the responsibilities, and we should remind ourselves that 'Love thy neighbor' is not advice: it is a command."

Bono
activist
and lead singer of U2

"The war on terror cannot be won unless we devote more effort to equitably sharing resources and meeting social and economic needs worldwide ... extreme poverty is linked intricately to a wider web of problems, including terrorism, economic instability and disease."

Jimmy Carter
39th President
of the United States

*Trans-Atlantic
Working Group*

German Marshall Fund

“Our governmental capacity to help build new democratic states must be as great as our capacity to destroy autocratic regimes.”

Colin L. Powell

U.S. Secretary of State

“AIDS is more devastating than any terrorist attack, any conflict or any weapon of mass destruction. It kills indiscriminately, and without mercy. As cruel as any tyrant, the virus can crush the human spirit. It is an insidious and relentless foe. AIDS shatters families, tears the fabric of societies, and undermines governments. AIDS can destroy countries and destabilize entire regions.”

Steven Radelet

*Senior Fellow, Center
for Global Development*

“A strong foreign assistance policy would clearly identify the motivations for and purposes of foreign aid, and would develop the institutional tools necessary to deliver aid more effectively. It would more fully integrate foreign assistance into a broader foreign policy that recognizes and more strategically links the full array of policies at our disposal—including trade, migration, investment, environmental stewardship and peacekeeping policies—into a powerful arsenal for engaging with countries around the world.”

Paul O'Neill

*former U.S. Secretary
of the Treasury*

“Here is what we know: all people are created equal. Given the tools and incentives for success, they will succeed, no matter who they are or where they live. Of course this is self-evident. ...”

TAB 7
ENERGY
GLOBAL WARMING

CONTENTS

16. MESSAGING RECOMMENDATIONS, HELPFUL ARGUMENTS & FACTS

A. Why America’s Energy Choices Matter 118

B. Global Warming 120

C. A 21st-Century Energy Strategy 122

17. COMMON CRITIQUES & EFFECTIVE RESPONSES

A. “What you propose would harm our economy.” 124

B. “The market will take care of this; let the private sector lead.” 125

C. “The science isn’t conclusive on global warming. You use scare tactics.” 126

D. “The international approach on global warming is unfair.” 127

E. “What you propose would restrict our choices and compromise safety.” 128

F. “Face it, oil is going to be central for a very long time.” 129

G. “You’re unrealistic... Yours are pipedream technologies.” 130

Representative Quotes 131



U.S. in the World
TALKING GLOBAL ISSUES WITH AMERICANS:
A PRACTICAL GUIDE

Note: Sources for facts and figures in this section, along with recommended sources for keeping facts and figures up to date, are available in the “Keeping Current” section of www.usintheworld.org.

MESSAGING RECOMMENDATIONS

PRIORITY REMINDERS FROM “TOP TWENTY”

2. Put your proposals and arguments in the **context of an interconnected world**.
3. Explain why your proposals are **smart/effective/pragmatic/realistic** in the context of today's world. Reference big ideas about **sound decision making, leadership, or management**.
4. Explain why your proposals are **the right thing to do**. Evoke big ideas familiar to Americans about **decent behavior**.
6. **Stress a “can-do” approach. Don't open with fear, guilt, or comments that overwhelm** listeners about the enormity and complexity of problems.
13. **Avoid jargon and acronyms.** (See “Wonk-Speak Translator”, Tab 2)
15. Use numbers sparingly and put them in context.
17. Use a **reasonable, rational** tone. **Don't attack personally** or attack motives. **Avoid partisan attacks.** **Question others' assumptions**, not their integrity.

Do

- Explain how investments in newer, cleaner, more efficient sources of energy are **wise, pragmatic, preventive steps that can produce multiple bangs for the buck** in our efforts to create a better, safer America and world.
- Establish the **choices between wasteful, polluting** energy sources and **new, more efficient, cleaner** technologies that will provide **sustainable energy** for our homes, jobs, and planet.
- Explain how our choices **affect the kind of world we will leave our children** and the health of the planet for future generations.
- When talking about corporate energy interests, **allow room in your message to praise corporations that are taking responsible steps**. One way to do this is to talk about the need for *“tough standards and accountability.”* Stress that most corporations will not volunteer to adopt the kinds of changes you are advocating.

Don't

- **Don't overpromise** about America's chances of achieving energy “independence.” In our interdependent world, no country is going to be able to become completely energy independent anytime soon.

Don't

- **Don't perpetuate the myth that the problem is merely about reducing dependence on “foreign or Middle East” oil.** This frame can lead listeners to believe that an appropriate “fix” is simply to drill more oil at home or to help develop oil resources in more “friendly” parts of the world. **Possible alternatives:** Explain how different choices would help the U.S. to **reduce our vulnerability** to the main oil-producing countries (e.g., to unstable regimes in unstable parts of the world) and would give us **greater flexibility in dealing with oil-rich countries**. These formulations open the door for you and others to explain important facts and details (e.g., why merely reducing our dependence on “foreign oil” in a global economy doesn't eliminate the U.S. economy's vulnerability to oil price shocks).
- **Don't imply that greater energy independence will allow us to “get out” of unstable regions or the Middle East.** America and the rest of the world will continue to care about the future of the Middle East and other oil-rich regions regardless of levels of oil dependence. **Possible alternatives:** (1) Explain how overdependence on oil **“limits our foreign policy options”** and forces us to make undesirable choices; and/or that (2) overdependence on oil **empowers autocratic leaders** in oil-rich countries.
- **Don't use wording that could put listeners into an “us versus them/others in the world” mindset—**especially when talking about the potential benefits of clean-energy leadership to the American economy. Such mindsets counter efforts to help Americans understand the need for a *global* transformation in energy. Try using words that create images of **America as competing in a global economy ... of our kids thriving in a global economy ... that is making a transformation to a better global energy future for everyone.**

Keep in Mind

- When you know your audience well, **you might rearrange the order in which you introduce your “gateway” arguments.** For instance, sometimes you might open with a *pragmatic* argument emphasizing how sustainable energy policies could create jobs; other times, you might begin with *aspirational or values-based* arguments about the state of the planet we will leave to our children or the opportunity to create a better world for all. In rearranging your gateway arguments, however, keep in mind that **the sequencing of arguments and frames is a hotly contested area of public opinion research.**

Common Critiques & EFFECTIVE RESPONSES

- The market will take care of this; let the private sector lead. (p. 125)
- Face it, oil is going to be central for a very long time. (p.129)
- You're unrealistic ... Yours are pipedream technologies. (p. 130)

16A WHY AMERICA'S ENERGY CHOICES MATTER

Arguments & Facts to Help You Make Your Case

Pragmatic; Investment

A national commitment to invest in newer, cleaner sources of energy—and make more efficient use of what we have—would create good new jobs and competitive industries, help clean up our environment, and improve our security. A smarter energy policy—for technologies we already have and for the development of new ones—would help build high-tech industries and create jobs; give us more flexibility in dealing with unstable or unsavory governments that control large oil flows; and improve the health of our air, water, and atmosphere.

- Industry leaders as diverse as the head of BP (the former British Petroleum), the head of Ford Motor Company, and the chief scientists for the electric power industry all agree that in this century we will see a transition away from fossil fuels such as oil, coal, and natural gas. The question is whether the U.S. will be at the forefront of the transition and reap the benefits or will trail behind and miss out.
- Just as past U.S. leaders made it a national priority to put a man on the moon, and asked the nation to help make it happen, we can make it a national priority to change our energy future—and reap the benefits in cleaner, cheaper energy and in new high-tech jobs. We have the know-how and the can-do spirit now—we need the commitment.
- Some parts of the world are already reaping the benefits. For instance, Toronto is using energy efficiency to save \$2.7 million a year and cut global warming gases by 20 percent.
- Reducing our dependence on imported oil doesn't help. With only 2 percent of world oil reserves under our control, other countries will always be able to control prices and availability—and with U.S. demand for imported oil ready to grow 50 percent over the next 10 years, we will always need more than we can produce here at home.
- The pace of technological change is making new energy options available to consumers almost faster than we can take advantage of them—the solar power industry, for example, is growing 25 percent a year.

Farsighted, Comprehensive

Stable, reliable, and affordable sources of energy are crucial to both the U.S. and global economies. Almost everything we do, at work or at home, requires flipping a switch, turning a key, charging a battery, or putting a plug in the wall. Rapid price rises and power shortages are bad for business and consumers alike. What serves us all best are the predictability and security that come from diverse energy sources.

- The energy sector provides 5 to 10 percent of our country's annual income, or gross domestic product.
- About 1 in 10 American jobs is either in the energy sector or in a field heavily dependent on energy, such as auto manufacturing or aluminum processing. The health of these industries often hinges on energy prices and availability.

- For American industries and workers, energy efficiency is vital to competitiveness. Ford and GM are having to purchase high-tech, high-efficiency engine technology from Japan for their newest models. Technologies that the U.S. pioneered in wind and solar power are now made and sold more efficiently elsewhere, where markets are growing faster—and American firms have lost market share as a result.
- Outside the U.S., other countries and peoples need reliable, affordable energy to grow their economies as well. Yet 40 percent of the world's people have no access to modern sources of energy. Energy scarcity and costs help keep their countries poor, and the whole world unstable.

What's needed is a complex, global energy transition that we can't accomplish alone but that won't happen without us. U.S. creativity led the way in developing many new energy technologies, such as fuel cells, solar power, and wind power. We're going to have to work with others to make sure that the costs of an energy transition—and its benefits—are shared by all.

- World energy use will triple by 2050, as 200 to 300 million new drivers take to Asia's roads and industry continues to grow in Asia as well as the U.S., Europe, and elsewhere.
- World production of the gases that cause global warming and pollution will also rise. To stop global warming and keep our environment healthy, we're going to have to develop clean energy at home and work with others to make it available everywhere.
- Markets and industry will lead the way in this transformation—as they already have in making buildings and appliances many times more energy efficient than they were 20 years ago. But markets need rules and standards, and markets need investment—like the initial government investments that created the earliest versions of the Internet 30 years ago, or the national highway system 50 years ago.

The energy choices we make today will determine much about the world our children inherit. In the long run, our choices about energy will be some of the most important ones we make for the health of our economy, our planet, and our children's lives. We need to connect the dots among all these concerns and look past today's narrow political or commercial interests for a strategy that meets all our long-term needs.

- We can choose to make better use of the energy technologies we have right now. We can emphasize efficient, high-powered hybrid vehicles for transportation; build new power plants that allow us to burn coal super-cleanly and efficiently; and catch up to the standards of efficiency in buildings and appliances that are already being followed in Europe and Japan.
- We can choose to lead the way in developing new energy technologies, creating jobs, and avoiding a global battle for shrinking oil resources.
- We can choose to safeguard our children's health. Upgrading power plants would prevent more than 300,000 air-pollution-related deaths every year and reduce childhood asthma rates by as much as 30 percent.
- We can choose now to take actions that will give us an insurance policy against the worst effects of global warming—or we can take our chances with a natural phenomenon that could completely alter our climate, economy, and way of life. *[See Global Warming, pages 120-121.]*

**Teamwork;
Can-do**

**Right Thing
to Do**

MESSAGING RECOMMENDATIONS

PRIORITY REMINDERS FROM “TOP TWENTY”

2. Put your proposals and arguments in the **context of an interdependent world**. Give examples of our interconnectedness.
3. Explain how your proposals are **smart/effective/pragmatic** in the context of today’s world.
4. Explain how your proposals are the **right thing to do**. Talk about what kind of country we want to be in the world, with reference to our ideals and traditions—who we strive to be as people. Talk about the **kind of world we want to leave our children**.
5. Place your specifics within the context of big, cross-cutting themes about smart and decent problem solving and behavior, e.g.: **Pragmatic. Principled. Far-sighted. Comprehensive. Trustworthy. Collaborative.**
10. **Stress a “can-do” approach**. Inspire others with your vision of what America can do, working with others, to create a safer and better world. **Don’t use fear and guilt as your entry point** to a subject.
11. **Empower listeners** by telling them what they can do and **giving them yardsticks** to evaluate policy actions and progress. (See “Engaging Citizens,” Tab 8)
12. **Avoid jargon and acronyms**. (See “Wonk-Speak Translator,” Tab 2).
16. **Use numbers sparingly and put them in context**.

Do

- Describe this as a **fixable problem**, and even as an **opportunity**.
- **Define the problem early**; prepare a **very short, simple description of the problem** that includes the words **carbon and carbon dioxide**. Talk about **“carbon pollution”** instead of vague “greenhouse gases.” Explain how **burning oil, gas, and coal** thickens the natural layer of heat-trapping gases around our planet. Giving people a simple way to conceptualize the cause of global warming is especially important: most Americans don’t know what “greenhouse gases” are and many think that global warming is connected to a thinning ozone layer.
- Focus on **what scientists agree on, not what they don’t**. Seize the debate back from uncertainty by starting with the **overwhelming consensus about what we do know**. Explain why what we know calls for **smart planning and investments that help to protect us against risks**.
- Explain how actions to address global warming—including investments in newer, cleaner, and more efficient sources of energy—can lead to **all kinds of other benefits**. (See “Why America’s Energy Choices Matter,” page 118–119.)
- Inspire and empower audiences by talking about the **exciting actions and movements already under way** to help—by cities, businesses, citizens, other countries, and the like. Combine your call for a major national commitment to meeting the challenge with descriptions of these encouraging developments.

Do

- Explain how U.S. actions on this issue **are related to big issues and questions about America’s role** in the world (see Tab 3, “America’s Role in the World”). Explain what other nations are doing to address the issue.
- Stress **American know-how and our capacity to innovate**. Remind your listeners about the power of American science and technology.
- In addressing America’s role, **emphasize the opportunities for doing better instead of how much we are to blame**. For instance, try talking about how America has risen to challenges in the past.
- Talk about the number of **constructive, bipartisan proposals** on the table that would get us back on track.

Don’t

- **Don’t use “Kyoto” as shorthand**. **Don’t make global warming about Kyoto per se**. Talk about what actions would help to get America on track toward joining with others in seeking effective global solutions.
- **Don’t start by trying to scare people with the scale of the problem, images of floods, and other extreme weather events**. These will lead most people either to think that the problem is too big to do anything about or to think only of policies that will help us to adapt to climate changes, not prevent them. Try some Do’s above first before talking about the scale of the challenge.

Keep in Mind

- **When choosing between the terms “global warming” and “climate change,” keep in mind that neither one is perfect**. “Global warming” is preferred by many leading advocates because the term is now more familiar to more citizens, whereas “climate change” is sometimes confused with changes in the seasons. But during harsh winters, “global warming” advocates have become the butt of jokes by those who either don’t understand the science or seek to discredit it.
- A possible alternative is to develop phrases that combine **global warming** with **climate disruption**—e.g., “small amounts of global warming are expected to produce different kinds of climate disruptions, from extreme heat to extreme cold, torrential downpours to big snowstorms. ... “By slowing down global warming, we might head off some of the most serious potential disruptions.”

Common Critiques & EFFECTIVE RESPONSES

- The market will take care of this. (p. 125)
- The science isn’t conclusive on global warming. (p. 126)
- What you propose would harm our economy. (p. 124)
- The international approach on this is unfair. (p. 127)
- What you propose will restrict our choices. (p. 128)
- Yours are pipedream technologies. (p. 130)

16B GLOBAL WARMING

Arguments & Facts to Help You Make Your Case

Farsighted

Global warming is a problem that we still have time to solve. But we need immediate action and a long-term plan to slow it down and prevent it from getting out of hand.

Global warming is happening because the natural insulation in our atmosphere that protects us from outer space and keeps Earth's temperature in balance is getting too dense. This is happening primarily because the way we currently produce energy—to generate electricity, heat our homes, and power our cars—creates too much carbon dioxide and other invisible gases that float up into our atmosphere and thicken Earth's natural insulation, throwing off the planet's built-in thermostat. When we created an energy system last century based on burning oil, gas, and coal, we didn't know that the pollution from these fuels would be harmful to Earth's health. Now we do. Scientists tell us that the carbon pollution and other heat-trapping gases we emit today will linger in the atmosphere until our grandchildren are adults—so the sooner we act, the more likely we can get a handle on the problem.

- According to a global panel of 2,000 leading scientists, average temperatures will rise worldwide 2 to 10 degrees during this century. That will make Boston feel as hot as New York, New York seem like Washington, and Washington feel like Atlanta.
- U.S. and global leaders as diverse as California governor Arnold Schwarzenegger and UK prime minister Tony Blair—who has pledged to cut UK emissions of global warming gases 60 percent in 50 years—are committed to action.
- Solutions are within reach: Germany has already reduced its global warming gases by 19 percent from 1990 levels. Denmark now gets 20 percent of its electricity from wind, and the UK will get 10 percent by 2010.

Teamwork

Global warming is a challenge for business, government, and individuals alike.

Global warming will make the world a vastly different place for our children and grandchildren. It affects governments that must plan for floods, droughts, crop and even has the Pentagon worried—because of its potential to heighten uncertainty and costs.

- Global warming will create serious changes in weather patterns, not make the world one giant beach. Effects like the melting of glaciers and changes in winds and ocean currents (e.g., the Gulf Stream) could make some areas much colder, some drier, and others wetter. This could mean massive disruptions for agriculture, industry—and thus ultimately for all people globally. Just one heat wave across Europe in the summer of 2003 claimed 21,000 lives.
- Global warming has already contributed to crop failures, shrinking glaciers, and earlier “springtimes” for plants and birds. Scientists predict that it could cause the loss of up to 37 percent of the world's species by 2050.
- Global warming is a challenge for business, government, and individuals alike. Global warming will make the world a vastly different place for our children and grandchildren. It affects governments that must plan for floods, droughts, crop **failures, or even—for some island nations—entire countries simply disappearing. It affects business—and** even has the Pentagon worried—because of its potential to heighten uncertainty and costs.

Technology gives us exciting new options—if we are farsighted enough to pursue them.

The way to slow and reverse global warming is to reduce the use of fuels that emit carbon when burned. We have energy technologies available now—and more being developed—that will help fight global warming and meet our need for safe, reliable, affordable energy. What's more, commercializing and exporting these technologies will create new high-tech jobs for Americans.

- Change can happen fast—consider that 100 years ago our grandparents were feeding horses instead of fueling cars, and shoveling coal for furnaces instead of adjusting thermostats.
- Technologies already available are encouraging. Natural gas burns twice as cleanly as coal. Hybrid technologies that double gas mileage have gone from auto-show rarities in 2001 to availability in cars, trucks, SUVs, and even luxury vehicles by 2005. The number of hybrids on the road is increasing every year. Wind power is the fastest-growing source of energy around the world.

The future is not yet written. We can do it. We can do something about global warming—just as we have reduced air pollution in American cities and helped lead the global fight against pollution that was depleting Earth's ozone layer. But we need U.S. leadership, and we need a partnership between government and business.

- We know what we have to do. Experts and leaders from both parties agree that a successful strategy will involve a cap on how much carbon pollution the U.S. emits every year, and market-based trading to make that cap as efficient as possible.
- We know market-based trading can work. More than 10 years ago, President George H. W. Bush and Congress created a plan to let companies trade rights to emit the chemicals that cause acid rain, which dramatically lowered the costs involved in beating the problem.
- Even earlier, President Reagan and Congress recognized the need to join other countries in taking action to close the atmosphere's ozone hole. The treaty the U.S. and 180 other nations signed has helped reverse the hole's growth even faster than scientists predicted.
- Major corporations are already taking innovative steps to reduce global-warming-related pollution. Dupont has reduced its emissions by 67 percent since 1990, and its cumulative energy-related improvements have already saved the company \$2 billion. BP has cut emissions by 20 percent since 1990; they spent \$20 million doing it and saved the company \$650 million. Others could do the same—but are waiting for a strong signal from the U.S. government.

But America can't do it alone. It's up to the U.S. to get a handle on our share of total global warming—currently, it's 25 percent. But just a few countries cutting emissions won't make much difference. We have the technology and the know-how to help other countries cut their emissions, and our industry has the innovation and drive to shape a generation of cleaner homes, cars, and factories. But though European and other countries have started working together to fight global warming, the U.S. chose to walk away from international negotiations and has since done nothing to stop adding fumes to the atmosphere. If we don't want to pass the buck to our children and grandchildren, we need to get started. Within the two decades, the fast-growing economies of China and India will produce more carbon pollution than the U.S. With its strong technological advantages, the U.S. should see this as a business opportunity to get started now to build and market the technology that these developing countries will need to do their part in fighting pollution. And we can't expect them, or other countries with growing economies, to do their share if we, with all our resources and technology, haven't done ours.

Farsighted

Can-do

Teamwork

MESSAGING RECOMMENDATIONS

PRIORITY REMINDERS FROM “TOP TWENTY”

3. Explain how your proposals are **smart/effective/pragmatic** in the context of today’s interconnected world.
4. Explain how your proposals are the **right thing to do**. Talk about what kind of country we want to be in the world, with reference to our ideals and traditions—who we strive to be as people.
5. Place your specifics within the context of big, cross-cutting themes about smart and decent problem solving and behavior, e.g.: **Pragmatic. Principled. Far-sighted. Comprehensive. Trustworthy. Collaborative.**
10. **Stress a “can-do” approach.** Inspire others with your vision of what America can do, working with others, to create a safer and better world. **Don’t use fear and guilt as your entry point** to a subject.
11. **Empower listeners** by telling them **what they can do** and **giving them yardsticks** to evaluate policy actions and progress. (See “Engaging Citizens,” Tab 8)
12. **Avoid jargon and acronyms.** (See “Wonk-Speak Translator,” Tab 2).
16. **Use numbers sparingly and put them into context.**
17. Use **reasonable, rational** tone. **Don’t attack personally** or attack the motives of those you disagree with. **Question their assumptions**, not their integrity.

Do

- Establish the **choices between wasteful, polluting** energy sources and **new, more efficient, cleaner** technologies that will provide **sustainable energy** for our homes, jobs, and planet.
- Emphasize **common sense steps we can take today** (e.g., energy efficiency and fuel efficiency) to do better. Explain how investments in newer, cleaner, more efficient sources of energy are **wise, pragmatic, preventive steps that can produce multiple bangs for the buck** in our efforts to create a better, safer America and world.
- Talk about the **transition** we need to make, and what we can do now to **hurry the future**.
- Inspire and empower audiences by talking about the **exciting actions and movements already under way** to help—by cities, businesses, citizens, other countries, etc. Combine your call for a major national commitment to the challenge with descriptions of these encouraging developments.
- Talk about the **exciting changes in markets that are already happening—the technologies that already exist. Explain why incentives are necessary** to encourage more widespread use of these technologies and even greater advances.
- Set a new standard in the listeners’ minds by talking about striving for **“super-efficient power plants”** and **“super-clean coal technologies.”** Explain how we can do better than what is currently billed as “efficient and clean.”

Do

- Stress **American know-how and our capacity to innovate**. Remind your listeners of the power of American science and technology.

Don’t

- **Don’t overpromise** about America’s chances of achieving energy “independence.”
- **Don’t use vague words like “renewables”** without fleshing them out with clear examples.
- **Don’t perpetuate the myth that the problem is merely about reducing dependence on “foreign or Middle East” oil. Possible alternatives:** Explain how different choices would help us to **reduce our vulnerability** to the main oil-producing countries (e.g., to unstable regimes in unstable parts of the world) and give the U.S. **greater flexibility in dealing with oil-rich countries**.
- **Don’t imply that greater energy independence will allow us to “get out” of unstable regions or the Middle East. Possible alternatives:** (1) Explain how overdependence on oil **“limits our foreign policy options”** and forces us to make undesirable choices; and/or that (2) overdependence on oil **empowers autocratic leaders** in oil-rich countries.
- **Don’t use wording that could put listeners into an “us versus them/others in the world” mindset.** Try using words that create images of **America as competing in a global economy ... of our kids thriving in a global economy ... that is making a transformation to a better global energy future for everyone**.
- **Don’t** lead off with the theme of “sacrifice.”

Keep in Mind

- The popular catch phrases “energy security” and “energy independence” can have unintended effects. “Energy security” risks leaving people in a military or war-on-terrorism mindset; “energy independence” risks overpromising. One possible alternative is the term **“sustainable energy,”** which has proven popular with both citizen and decision-maker audiences and encourages thinking about the future and the efficient use of resources. If you use the term, define it early because it is inherently vague.
- Be prepared to talk about the costs involved in investments to make the **transition**.

Common Critiques & EFFECTIVE RESPONSES

- The market will take care of this. (p. 125)
- What you propose would harm our economy. (p.124)
- What you propose will restrict our choices. (p. 128)
- Face it, oil will be in our future for a very long time. (p. 129)
- Yours are pipedream technologies. (p. 130)

16C **A 21ST-CENTURY ENERGY STRATEGY**

Arguments & Facts to Help You
Make Your Case

Can-do

We need a national plan to jump-start us toward a smarter energy policy—for our security, for our economy, and for our environment. If we use the wealth, innovation, and can-do spirit with which we are blessed, our energy future can be safer, cleaner, and more prosperous. But if we continue as we are, we will be vulnerable to energy price shocks, instability in the Middle East and elsewhere, and greater damage to our health and environment from pollution and global warming.

- A smarter energy policy uses existing technology to build better versions of today's cars and trucks. Transportation accounts for 2/3 of the oil we consume and for hundreds of thousands of American jobs; the alternatives are real. U.S. manufacturers are committed to meeting meet a 43-miles-per-gallon standard for cars sold in Europe by 2010. China has announced plans for a mileage standard higher than ours.
- A smarter energy policy will use existing technology that can make new power plants 30 to 60 percent more efficient—so that we can stop endangering our children's health with dirty plants that send money up the smokestack.
- A smarter energy policy will encourage the use of the technology we already have to build smart buildings that emit no pollution.
- A smarter energy policy will put in place an insurance policy against global warming by beginning to make modest restrictions on the emissions that cause it.
- And a smarter energy policy will hurry the future—by ensuring investment in the next generation of technologies for alternative fuels and engines. They're moving forward, but won't become commercially viable without an investment of money from the U.S. government that shows this country is committed to a better energy future.

Common Sense

The global energy transition is already under way. The question is not whether we will have new innovative technologies such as cars that run on hydrogen and homes that run on solar power; it is when we will have them, and whether the U.S. will lead this change, and U.S. business will profit from it, or whether U.S. citizens and businesses alike will be left behind.

- The pace of technological change is speeding up. Hybrid cars, trucks, and SUVs are coming to market faster than anyone thought possible just a few years ago; and vehicles that no one thought Americans would buy now have months-long waiting lists.
- Across the U.S., exciting things are happening—The U.S. wind industry in 2003 became the world's No. 2 leader in new wind installations, just after Germany. Some 13 states now require that a certain amount of their electricity comes from renewable energy, with Minnesota, New Mexico, and Texas among the leaders.
- Sweden and France have pledged to cut their emissions of greenhouse gases in half by 2050; other European countries have already made substantial cuts. Soon all European

Union member countries, including four of the world's seven largest economies, will be participating in emissions trading to create further reductions.

- Research on hydrogen fuel cells, which cleanly burn hydrogen generated from almost any source of energy, is already yielding prototype auto engines, air-conditioning units, and even power sources for laptop computers. The U.S. Department of Energy says fuel cell technology could generate 750,000 new jobs by 2030.
- Wind power is now the fastest-growing source of energy worldwide. The costs of wind power, solar power, and other alternative technologies are dropping fast enough to begin to make them competitive with oil and coal.
- Americans pioneered many of the new energy technologies—but because there has been little demand for them at home, U.S. firms are now lagging behind. Twenty years ago, U.S. firms had 80 percent of the fuel cell market, but they now have just 20 percent—right when this technology is hitting the big time.

Government and industry must work together to make it happen—like every previous transformation.

We can't let short-term special interests blind us to our long-term needs. Our government has successfully helped nurture new industries and encourage new technologies—from microchips to airbags—that wouldn't have been possible otherwise. This kind of joint government–business investment will also create jobs and spur economic growth.

- International oil giant BP says that its cut of almost 20 percent in greenhouse gas emissions has actually saved it more than \$600 million in just three years. Aluminum producer Alcoa expects to save \$100 million through energy efficiency between now and 2006.
- The high-tech industry shows just how much difference a small government investment can make. Microchips dropped 95 percent in price, becoming affordable for business and home computers, in 6 years—because the U.S. government made big purchases of them, giving their makers the incentive and resources to keep innovating.
- Where the U.S. is not investing in new technologies, other countries are capturing growing markets. Japan has passed the U.S. to top global sales of solar-powered energy cells, and the top sellers of wind turbines in the U.S. are Danish, not American firms.

The result will be a win-win-win situation—for our economy, for the environment, and for future generations.

- Implementing new technologies—in transportation and construction as well as power plants themselves—will create and sustain good high-tech jobs, just as the computer revolution created the high-tech industries. Experts believe that a full energy transition could generate more than 3.3 million new jobs over 10 years.
- Cleaning up old power plants would help the environment. It would also save lives currently lost to respiratory illnesses caused by air pollution—as many or more lives every year as are saved by laws that convince more Americans to wear seat belts.
- Matching Europe and China in auto fuel efficiency by lifting our average to 40 miles per gallon by 2012 would save almost as much oil *every day* as we imported from Saudi Arabia in 2001. We can do that with the hybrid cars, trucks, and SUVs now beginning to be sold.

Teamwork

Effectiveness

Common Critiques

& EFFECTIVE RESPONSES

17A “What you propose—like binding international agreements—would harm our economy. We need to phase in sensible policies that keep our economy strong. ...”

Basic advice: By focusing on the feasibility and benefits of thinking big about this challenge, make that the sensible, responsible thing to do. Emphasize farsightedness, can-do.

“... We support sensible, farsighted measures that keep our kids, our planet, and our economy healthy. Joining other nations in efforts to develop cleaner, more efficient energy systems is a pragmatic and preventive strategy to increase our energy security, stimulate the growth of new industries and jobs, and combat global warming. ...”

“... We Americans are a can-do, solution-oriented people. American-run businesses operating in countries that have adopted rules to combat global warming are already developing innovative strategies to meet those requirements and to thrive in a new energy economy. Yet here at home, we refuse to adopt the energy-efficiency requirements and incentives that would stimulate innovation, help this country prosper in the energy economy of the future, and leave our children and grandchildren a healthier global environment. ...”

“... If ever there was a country equipped to play a leading role in the global transition to a cleaner, more efficient energy system—and a healthier global environment—it’s the United States. America’s economic advantage lies in innovation, and in the development of new technologies and industries. New clean-energy industries can create the new revenue and new jobs we need to prosper in the 21st century. Experts believe that a full energy transition could generate more than 3.3 million new jobs over 10 years. ...”

“... Clean-energy technologies are some of the fastest-growing markets in the world, creating billions of dollars in revenue and hundreds of thousands of jobs. Americans pioneered many of the new energy technologies; now our clean-energy sector is lagging behind, while countries that have committed themselves to reducing their role in global warming are enjoying new global markets. Of course the U.S. should plan carefully for the transition to new energy technologies. But we can’t let narrow, short-term political and commercial interests stand in the way of our making the long-term shifts that will enable us to compete and thrive in tomorrow’s energy economy. ...”

17B **“The market will take care of this; let the private sector lead. The last thing we need is more costly regulations and more government bets on dubious technologies. ...”**

Basic advice: A responsible approach incorporates both; government needs to do its job too. Emphasize farsightedness, can-do, doing what's right and smart.

“... Putting America at the cutting edge of the global energy transition will require the combined efforts of government and business—just as **it took both to put the U.S. at the cutting edge of space exploration, medical research, and microtechnology.** Providing the right incentives and signals for business is the government's job. **When the government does its job, we get an effective partnership that produces impressive results, including the creation of dynamic new industries** that employ hundreds of thousands of American workers. But when the government fails to do its job, we get markets guided by short-term commercial interests that don't meet our long-term economic or environmental needs. ...”

“... **Businesses need predictability and stability to thrive. The corporate sector won't make major changes** for the sake of public health and safety or to protect the environment **unless it gets strong signals from the U.S. government** that it should do so. When the government establishes and upholds high standards and provides incentives for change, businesses are encouraged to innovate—which creates good new jobs and more competitive industries. **Many corporate leaders are asking the government for the clear signals and supportive conditions** that would encourage them to invest in the development of new clean energy technologies and energy-efficient products. ...”

“... Government incentives and investments have helped to bring many new industries to life, from microchips to airbags. Now, **government subsidies for oil, gas, and nuclear energy are helping to maintain the status quo.** If clean-energy technologies and industries received the same kind of subsidies and incentives—like renewable energy tax credits—we'd soon have a dynamic new energy market. ...”

“... **The market is a great motivator, for good and ill.** It motivates some to work hard and invent new products that serve important purposes or enhance our quality of life. It motivates others to dump toxic wastes in the nearest stream rather than dispose of them properly. **If we're to get an energy market that meets our long-term economic, environmental, and security needs, our government needs to set high standards for accountability and create incentives for responsible corporate behavior,** without constraining innovation and flexibility. Markets are good for a lot of things, but almost never in isolation from other sources of wisdom and direction. ...”

“... America's energy choices are among the most critical we must make, because they affect so many aspects of our lives. They're central to the American and global economies, to national and international security, and to the health of the planet's environment. Our energy choices will determine much about the world that our children and grandchildren inherit from us. There's a lot at stake in getting our energy choices right. **Those choices are too important and their effects are too lasting to be left in the hands of corporations. ...”**

17C **“The science isn’t conclusive on global warming. ... [“Your predictions are just scare tactics—like that movie *The Day After Tomorrow*. ...”]**

Basic advice: Focus on what we do know, and show that it’s enough to act on. Emphasize farsightedness, doing what’s right and smart.

“... Let’s start with what we do know. We know that the planet is warming, and we know that burning oil and other fossil fuels contributes to global warming by creating a heat-trapping blanket of carbon dioxide around the earth. We know that the rise in average global temperatures has already caused dangerous and costly climate disruptions around the world—heat waves, extreme cold, heavy precipitation—and that more disruptions are likely in the future. And we know that if we act soon to reduce the use of fuels that emit carbon dioxide when they’re burned—like oil, gas, and coal—we can greatly reduce the effects of global warming. **What more do we need to know before we act? ...”**

“... Most of our actions are based on the probability of an outcome, not absolute certainty. If nine doctors tell you that you’ll live longer if you take a certain medicine and one doctor disagrees, the wise course is to take your medicine....We still have a lot to learn about who cancer strikes and why. But we don’t wait to take the steps that are available to prevent and combat it. ...”

“... We only have one Earth, and one atmosphere. If we “wait and see” on global warming, **it’s like conducting an enormous experiment, with potentially dangerous and irreversible consequences—especially for our children and grandchildren.** Why would we want to do that, when we know what steps we can take to cut our risks? ...”

“... With long-term challenges like global warming, “an ounce of prevention is worth a pound a cure.” The longer we delay, the harder this problem is going to be to solve—for us, and for future generations. ... Getting started today is like taking **out insurance—a smart and responsible thing to do. ...”**

“... Don’t be fooled by attempts to use the call for “more science” as an excuse for inaction, or as a cover for pursuing policies and practices that the majority of scientists already oppose. We can’t afford to let narrow, short-term interests undermine **the robust consensus that has developed in the scientific community** on the long-term danger of climate change. ...”

“... The Pentagon is treating global warming as a reality. So do major international insurance companies and some farsighted energy companies. **These public- and private-sector leaders aren’t known for being pushovers—they’re hard-headed risk analysts, and the science is conclusive enough for them. ...”**

“... Movies like *The Day After Tomorrow* are fiction; climate change is real. Think of the movie as a wake-up call that shows us we’re being much too casual about the consequences of tampering with Earth’s atmosphere. **You don’t have to subscribe to the movie’s worst-case scenario to see that we should be doing more, and faster, to shift to a clean energy.** We know what to do. What are we waiting for? ...”

17D **“The international approach on this is unfair; it excludes the biggest future sources of the problem, like China. ...”**

***Basic advice:** Signing on to the Kyoto treaty is less important than making progress on global warming; show how U.S. behavior can help or hinder the pursuit of that bigger goal. Emphasize farsightedness, doing what’s right and smart, teamwork.*

“... The problems caused by global warming are real, and solving them is as important for the United States as it is for the world. By acting first, the U.S. and other rich countries that are most responsible for global warming—because they burn the most oil, gas, and coal—can **set a powerful example for others to follow.** By committing themselves to developing alternative energy sources, technologically advanced countries like the United States can **create new jobs and industries at home while jump-starting the international effort to slow global warming and influencing the energy choices of less advanced countries that are on the brink of making big new energy investments.** It’s a smart and responsible strategy. In fact, the U.S. signed on to this strategy during negotiations on the international treaty that addresses global warming. Then the U.S. changed its tune and walked away, while others honored those terms, ratified the treaty, and got to work implementing it. ...”

“... No country can afford to ignore global warming; it’s a problem that literally affects the entire globe. But the U.S. can’t make a very persuasive case for getting other countries on board if it continues to pursue an energy policy that’s bad for the environment. America’s refusal to help stop this threat that deeply concerns other nations has also driven **a wedge between the U.S. and the rest of the world.** Our friends may be less likely to help us now, because we haven’t been willing to help them face one of the global dangers they’re most worried about. We need to **start connecting the dots between our energy choices, the health of the global environment, and national and global security.** ...”

“... The most unfair thing of all would be to pass the buck to future generations—our children and grandchildren. Decades from now, they will read about the environmental challenges that faced their parents and grandparents at the start of the 21st century. **It will either be a tale of courageous and farsighted action, or one of incomprehensible neglect and irresponsibility.** Let’s make sure they don’t wonder why we stood by and did nothing. ...”

“... Global warming is a shared problem that the U.S. needs to face in partnership with many other nations. Let’s work together to shape a new agreement that’s responsible and more to our liking, instead of sitting on the sidelines while important international efforts get under way without us. In the U.S., **there’s bipartisan political support and strong public support** for getting back on track—and no excuse for doing nothing. ...”

17E **“What you propose will restrict our transportation choices—and make cars much less safe for our kids. ...”**

Basic advice: Show that there's no reason to delay, and every reason to get moving on producing cleaner-running vehicles. Emphasize can-do, farsightedness.

“... Of course our kids' health and safety should be the standard. We should demand cleaner-running cars that **protect our children from the life-shortening effects of air pollution, the severe climate disruptions** brought on by global warming, and the **economic vulnerability** that comes from America's dependence on oil. And we should demand well-designed cars that protect children from harm on the highway. Right now, **we have the technical ingenuity to do both**, if government and industry work together to make it a priority. **Let's not sacrifice our children's and the planet's future for short-term gain. ...”**

“... We have the technical ingenuity, right now, to build cleaner cars and still make sure that consumers have choice, performance, and safety. We can put better engines in today's safety-conscious cars, cut the carbon dioxide emissions that contribute to global warming, and save money in the long run. In Europe, where governments are serious about addressing global warming, U.S. car companies are moving quickly to meet higher fuel-efficiency standards without sacrificing safety. What are we waiting for in the U.S.? ...”

“... History teaches us that big companies often use these kinds of arguments to block important health and safety regulations—and that their arguments are usually wrong. Remember how Detroit resisted when the government wanted to put seat belts in every car? Implementing new fuel-efficient technologies will make our transportation sector more competitive globally, create new jobs here at home, and contribute to a healthier environment. There's no reason to delay putting cleaner engines in our safety-conscious cars and trucks, and every reason to get going. ...”

“... It makes sense to start America's move toward a smart energy future in the transportation sector, because we get so much bang for our buck there. Cars and trucks use two-thirds of our oil and account for one-third of our contribution to the blanket of carbon dioxide over the earth that causes global warming. Lifting our average fuel efficiency to 40 miles per gallon by 2012 would save almost as much oil every day as we imported from Saudi Arabia in all of 2001. The hybrid cars and SUVs now being sold already achieve that level of fuel efficiency, without sacrificing safety. And someone who buys one of these cars will save thousands of dollars on gas over the life of the car. It's a win-win situation. ...”

17F **“Face it, oil is our future. We should reduce our dependence on Middle East oil and replace it with oil from friendly countries and environmentally sensitive drilling. ...”**

Basic advice: Take back the themes of “freedom” and “future” to frame your arguments. Emphasize farsightedness, can-do.

“... As long as we’re overly dependent on oil, no matter where it comes from, our economy will be vulnerable to oil shocks and our relationships with other nations will be distorted by our energy needs. Air pollution will increase and rates of childhood asthma will continue to rise, while global warming accelerates. **Let’s free our future from the grip of oil with a bold new energy strategy.** A national commitment to invest in newer, cleaner sources of energy—and make more efficient use of what we have—would create good new jobs and competitive industries here at home, help clean up the global environment, and improve our security. ...”

“... Oil was the foundation of a wonderful 20th-century energy system that made much of today’s world possible. But now we’re in the 21st-century, and our dependence on an energy system based on oil has become environmentally harmful, economically stifling, and politically destabilizing. **Oil is our past, not our future.** The global transition away from oil has already started. Here’s the choice: **We can help lead in creating a better global energy future, or we can hold things back. And holding back progress has never been the American way. ...”**

“... We know how important it is to diversify our personal investments when we’re planning a sound financial future. **We need to diversify our energy ‘portfolio’**—to give our government more choices for engaging with other countries; to encourage businesses to create new clean-energy jobs and industries; and to give consumers more choices for energy sources and products. ...”

“... Oil is a shaky foundation on which to build our energy future. Two-thirds of the world’s oil supply is in the Middle East. **Even if we didn’t get a drop of oil ourselves from that region, a disruption there could undermine the economies of major U.S. trading partners** like Europe and Japan and hurt the global economy, on which our own prosperity depends. Upheavals in the oil market over the past 30 years have cost the U.S. economy \$7 trillion. Reducing our dependence on oil is a smart and responsible strategy. ...”

“... Clean, sustainable energy alternatives like solar, hydrogen, and wind power are already taking hold around the world—just like the automobile pushed out the horse-and-buggy a century ago. **We won’t end our dependence on oil overnight;** we need transitional strategies like conservation, improving fuel efficiency, using super-clean coal technologies, and building super-efficient power plants. **But using this as an excuse for inaction or worse—**for deepening our reliance on oil and risking the destruction of irreplaceable wilderness by drilling—**is irresponsible and shortsighted. ...”**

“... There’s no need to cling to old technologies like oil when clean-energy technologies, like hydrogen and solar power, are growing fast around the world. These innovative technologies are creating billions of dollars in revenue and hundreds of thousands of jobs—all while contributing to a healthier global environment. **Americans pioneered many of the new energy technologies, but now we’re lagging behind** because we haven’t invested in innovation and the development of new industries here at home. If we **apply our traditional American ingenuity and can-do spirit to the challenge,** we can help speed up the global transition to a clean-energy future that’s better for us and for everyone. ...”

17G **“You’re unrealistic and oppose all the sensible measures. Yours are pipedream technologies. ...”**

Basic advice: Talk about America as an innovator, combining vision and pragmatism. Emphasize farsightedness, can-do.

“... No one can look at the history of American innovation and say this is beyond our capacity.

Time and again, Americans have proven they have the know-how to solve challenging problems and to create new opportunities. **Of course we need to take interim steps—**like increasing conservation, improving energy efficiency, and using super-clean coal technologies and building super-efficient power plants. **But the important thing is to get going,** to apply our ingenuity and can-do spirit to speeding up the development of clean-energy sources that can replace oil. ...”

“... A different energy future is already within reach. It’s a future where a major portion of our **electric power comes from clean, cost-effective sources;** where we drive cars that give us the same comfort and safety we enjoy today, but with much **better fuel economy** and less pollution; **where we’re less dependent** on an energy source that’s controlled by other nations; and **where we’ve joined the international community in a team effort** to combat global warming. **Nothing in this vision is beyond the capacity of our country to achieve,** if government, business, and citizens work together to address the challenge. ...”

“... The global energy transition is already under way. Hybrid cars and trucks are selling faster than anyone thought possible just a few years ago. Wind power is the world’s fastest-growing source of energy, and the costs of alternative energy sources like wind and solar power are starting to be competitive with oil and coal. European countries concerned about global warming have already substantially cut the heat-trapping carbon dioxide produced by their transportation and business sectors. Citizens in towns and municipalities all over the U.S. and Europe are coming together to tackle global warming in their own way, even when their governments dither. **We know it can be done because it’s already happening. ...”**

“... The real question is whether we will bring vision and foresight to this challenge or settle for more of the same. Just as past leaders made it a national priority to put a man on the moon and asked citizens to help make it happen, we can make it a national priority to change our energy future—and reap the benefits in cleaner, cheaper energy and new high-tech jobs. We have the know-how and the can-do spirit—now we need the commitment. ...”

“... Many of America’s corporate leaders are pushing for the United States to invest in the development of clean-energy technologies, because they see businesses in other countries preparing to take the lead in the inevitable global transition from oil to wind power, solar power, and hydrogen. **These hard-headed CEOs—not known for having “pipedreams”—want the U.S. to share in the revenues and jobs** that will be created by a new energy economy. ...”

Representative Quotes

ENERGY, GLOBAL WARMING

"Energy is the linchpin of our economic future—in the U.S. and throughout the world. The stability of global markets, the capacity of developing countries to meet the aspirations of their growing populations, the health of the Earth's environmental systems, and our children's future quality of life—all will be affected by how we produce and use energy. Much is at stake in getting it right."

"Energy issues challenge us to think long term—in time scales that require considerable foresight, competent planning, and the ability to adapt and regroup when things don't turn out as planned. Decisions we make now will have a lasting impact. Consider, for example, that most power plants are built to last for 40 years or more. Buildings and homes often last fifty to two hundred years or more (350 where I live in historic Lexington, MA!); major appliances inside our homes, such as heating systems or refrigerators, will last seven to twenty years."

"Technology and innovation move us forward as people on earth. Environmentally benign fuel cells ... for [American space missions] ... may be the next great innovation to power our cars and our homes. A concerted public and private effort will make huge reductions in global climate change impacts for our nation and our world. All we need is the will."

"Renewable energy is far more abundant than fossil fuels are, and modern technology makes it possible to turn the energy of sunlight, wind, biomass, and ocean currents into useful energy forms such as electricity and hydrogen. An age of oil was inconceivable at the dawn of the 20th century—until the invention of oil drilling, refining, internal combustion engines, etc. So too with renewables in the 21st century. ... The dominant economies of the 21st century will be those that are at the forefront of a new energy system—inventing and building fuel cells, wind turbines, hydrogen pipelines, solar cells, etc. Already, renewable energy markets are growing at 20–30 percent per year, creating billions of dollars of revenues and hundreds of thousands of jobs."

"Energy is fundamental to U.S. domestic prosperity and national security. In fact, the complexities between energy and U.S. national interests have drawn tighter over time. The advent of globalization, the growing gap between rich and poor, the war on terrorism, and the need to safeguard the earth's environment are all intertwined with energy concerns ... Yet the current debate about U.S. energy policy is mainly about tax breaks for expanded production, access to public lands, and nuances of electricity regulation—difficult issues all, but inadequate for the larger challenges. ... The staleness of the policy dialogue reflects a failure to recognize the importance of energy to the issues it affects. ... What is needed is a purposeful, strategic energy policy, not a grab bag drawn from interest-group wish lists."

The Energy Future Coalition

Bud Ris

*former Executive Director,
Union of Concerned
Scientists*

George David

*Chairman,
United Technologies*

Christopher Flavin

*President,
Worldwatch Institute*

Timothy Wirth

*President of the UN
Foundation;*

C. Boyden Gray

*Partner at Wilmer, Cutler
& Pickering;*

John Podesta

*President of the Center for
American Progress*

Dr. H. Fisk Johnson
Chairman, SC Johnson

"Over the next decade we can reduce greenhouse gases in real terms, not illusionary ones. As a privately held family company, I will tell you we will not abdicate our ethical responsibility to the environment."

Elliot Richardson
headed four cabinet
departments and served
Presidents Eisenhower,
Nixon, Ford, and Carter

"It would be hard to imagine a more striking disparity than that between the world community's low-keyed response to [international scientific] projections [on global warming] and its agitated reactions to remote risks of far less harm. ... Optimism toward the possible outcomes of future research cannot justify this ostrichlike behavior. ... Our ties to other people, though attenuated by distance and time, never completely disappear. We are, to quote John Donne ... "involved in mankind." ... It is natural that we should feel a sense of responsibility toward grandchildren and great-grandchildren not yet born. And since the descendants of every human being now alive will suffer from consequences of interaction that we disregard now, does it not follow that we must act now?"

Walter Cronkite
former CBS Evening
News anchorman

"Scientists are beginning to understand climate as a complex interactive system that is affected by everything from the emission of greenhouse gases, to deforestation, to the condition of Arctic and Antarctic glaciers. ... One thing we have to keep in mind: While these might only be worst-case scenarios, many of the conditions and processes scientists think might trigger them already are present or under way. Global warming is at least as important an issue as gay marriage or the rising cost of Social Security. This is an issue that cannot, and must not, be ignored any longer."

Sir Phillip Watts
Chairman,
Royal Dutch/Shell

"Making greenhouse gas reduction integral to our business processes will allow us to create value in a world where carbon emissions have a cost, as well as fulfilling our responsibilities to society. An important step is working with those who share this vision to develop commercial technologies, methods and products for reducing our own and our customers' greenhouse gas emissions."

John McCain
Senator from Arizona

"Global warming is a serious threat. There is overwhelming evidence that increasing amounts of carbon dioxide [and other gases] are heating up the Earth's climate and that inaction could be disastrous. ... [I]n this case, doing what will earn respect and support around the world is also in our own best environmental and economic interests and is the right thing to do. Even if, despite all the evidence, one chooses to remain a skeptic on climate change, taking action today—as an insurance policy—is the only wise course of action. As the mercury rises, so does the need for a creative solution."

"[The overwhelming majority of atmospheric scientists around the world and our own National Academy of Sciences are in essential agreement on the facts of global warming and the significant contribution of human activity to that trend. Suggesting otherwise may be good domestic politics, but it is not playing square with the American people. ... To my mind, to oppose environmental protection is not to be truly conservative. To put short-term financial gain ahead of the long-term health of the environment is a fundamentally radical policy, as well as being unethical. ... [I]t was the leadership of the United States, both at home and abroad, that helped move the world through positive and cooperative engagement to new levels of environmental commitment and achievement. We need to find that road again; it is the only path to a sustainable future for humanity."

Russell E. Train

*former environmental
official under Presidents
Nixon and Ford and
president of World Wildlife
Fund–U.S.*

"Keep in mind that it was the American government that put a man on the moon. It was the American government that built the interstate highway system. And it was the American government that invented the Internet and created the electronics revolution. American companies are the best in the world at finding solutions to problems. The energy issue is one where the American government must step up to the plate."

Michael Shellenberger

*Executive Director,
Breakthrough Institute*

"I want to put a better engine in your SUV, not take it away."

Deb Callahan

*President, League of
Conservation Voters*

TAB 8
ENGAGING CITIZENS

CONTENTS

18. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Yardsticks to Help Citizens Evaluate U.S. Policy and Actions	136
B. Talking About What Citizens Can Do	138
Representative Quotes	140

DETACHABLE SUMMARY CARDS



U.S. in the World

TALKING GLOBAL ISSUES WITH AMERICANS:
A PRACTICAL GUIDE

Note: Sources for facts and figures in this section, along with recommended sources for keeping facts and figures up to date, are available in the “Keeping Current” section of www.usintheworld.org.

18A **YARDSTICKS TO HELP CITIZENS EVALUATE U.S. POLICY AND ACTIONS**

Recommendations

Polling and focus groups confirm the anecdotal impression of many experts that Americans care about how their country acts in the world. In fact, many Americans are **eager to discuss international affairs but lack the confidence to do so**. Their lack of confidence is only partly due to a lack of knowledge. Citizens may also doubt their ability to assess and evaluate foreign policy information, which is typically treated in the media and in other forums as the domain of experts. This may inhibit citizens from seeking out information in the first place. By helping citizens understand that they can use some familiar, basic principles to take the measure of foreign policy proposals and initiatives, **you can equip them to engage more confidently and deeply with global issues**.

Here are some “yardsticks”—questions and tests—that citizens can use to think through foreign policy choices, sort out the positions taken by elected officials or candidates, and frame and express their own views on America’s global role. **These yardsticks rely on widely shared ideas about smart decision making and principled behavior**—the sorts of “big ideas” that were introduced in the “Top 20 Recommendations” (Tab 2) and have been highlighted throughout this guide. These are questions and standards that we might apply to decision making in our own communities and lives. And these are questions that we have the right to expect people in leadership positions—whether in government, business, the nonprofit sector, or the media—to ask about the decisions this country faces.

Are we making the right choices to get results in an increasingly interconnected world?

- Are we **looking at the big picture** and taking a **comprehensive** approach?
- Are we **using all the tools we have available**—diplomatic, economic, cultural, military—and doing all we can to keep these tools effective?
- Are we learning from experience and **doing what’s been shown to work**?

Are we building (and keeping) the kinds of teams and relationships with others that we need to solve problems effectively in today’s world?

- Have we shown **respect for the views and concerns of others**, and cultivated the **trust** on which future collaborations can be based?
- **Have we inspired others to get involved and do their share?**
- **Are we supporting and strengthening the international institutions that facilitate cooperation and can help get the job done?**

Are we taking the long view? Are we making the choices that will leave the world a better, safer place for our children and grandchildren?

- Are we making **appropriate trade-offs** between short-term and long-term interests?
- Are we acting now to **head off problems** that will threaten us in the long run?
- Are we considering and **planning for the long-range consequences** of our actions?
- When we must compromise, will the long-range benefits for us and the **world outweigh the costs**?

Are our policies and actions consistent with what America stands for?

- Are we **setting a good example**?
- Are we doing our best to **practice what we preach and play fair** as a member of the global community?
- Are we **keeping our promises**?

How do you go about encouraging and empowering citizens to ask—and answer—such questions? In some situations, you might want to pose questions yourself as a way of engaging your audience in this process. In a less direct fashion, if you frame your arguments with the big ideas highlighted in this guide, you will automatically be showing how these kinds of yardsticks can be used to evaluate foreign policy. And by keeping your language plain and familiar, you will also reinforce the notion that all citizens are entitled to ask questions and reach conclusions about international affairs.

When you put yardsticks like these in citizens' hands, you reassure them that they can make informed judgments about America's role in the world, and that their own moral compass and common sense are legitimate tools to use.

18B TALKING ABOUT WHAT CITIZENS CAN DO

Recommendations

Communicators who talk with citizen audiences about global issues and America's role in addressing them routinely report that "people want to know what they can do." Yet **when it comes to foreign policy issues, citizens often have no idea how to keep fully informed, let alone how to make a difference.** Showing how citizens' groups have made a difference in the past or are having an impact now—by sharing success stories with your audience—is an important part of overcoming this obstacle. It's also helpful to offer a variety of options for involvement—some as easy as a click of the mouse—and to tailor those options to activities in which listeners already participate.

Urge citizens to start getting involved on the basis of the knowledge, skills, and interests they already have, and then to encourage their community institutions—churches, mosques, and synagogues; schools and colleges; chambers of commerce and labor unions; city councils and professional associations—**to get involved too.** Here are some specific ideas:

Talk about Citizen Success Stories

Citizens can do a lot to move things in the right direction. Some of the most significant and unexpected policy changes of recent years have been made because private citizens, acting both alone and in groups, have lifted their voices and demanded change. For instance:

- A dedicated group of anti-landmine activists—veterans' groups, peace activists, human rights experts, and antipoverty groups—actually won the Nobel Peace Prize for their leadership in pressing 146 world governments (though not the U.S.) to sign a treaty banning these weapons.
- The debt relief that has lifted the burden of billions of dollars in debt payments from poor countries—enabling them to send millions more children to school, build new clinics and hospitals, and provide clean drinking water—is the fruit of the cooperative grassroots initiative of millions of people around the world, who together acted on an idea from the Bible—that the millennium should be a Jubilee Year, when debts are forgiven.
- An unlikely coalition of conservative and liberal religious groups, celebrities, medical professionals, antipoverty campaigners, and gay activists has succeeded in raising U.S. awareness of the world's AIDS crisis—and tripling the amount the U.S. is spending on fighting global AIDS.

Encourage Citizens to Learn More

- Read the international pages in your local newspaper; check out foreign news sources on the Web and at the library.
- Visit the Web sites of the NGOs and religious and cultural groups that you support; many offer to send you free news and updates about their global activities.
- Find opportunities to feature speakers and start discussions on global issues and America's role at your school, house of worship, or club.

Explain How to Build Connections with the World

- Host a foreign student, businessperson, or exchange visitor. Join a welcome group for newcomers to the U.S. in your workplace, school, or community—or start one. Explore “Sister City” or twin relationships for your town, place of worship, school, or business. Participate in a professional exchange program that shares information and experience across borders—common in medicine, teaching, and other fields.
- Volunteer abroad. Whether it’s a two-year commitment to the Peace Corps or a two-week religious work camp, there are many ways that you can BE the America you want to see in the world.
- Learn a foreign language. Encourage your children to do the same, and urge local schools, colleges, and adult education programs to offer language instruction.
- Help children experience the world’s rich diversity—through languages, foods, art and cultural exhibits, and foreign books and movies.
- Encourage your children to make exchanges and study abroad a part of their education and preparation for life in a global society. Think about traveling abroad to see other cultures for yourself, or help your family enjoy the many immigrant cultures you can experience in the ethnic enclaves of America’s cities.

Explain How Much Citizens’ Choices Count

- Be an informed consumer. For instance, learn about organic and “fair-trade” coffee, find out which fish are in abundant supply in our oceans, make travel plans through eco-friendly Web sites, buy recycled paper and wood products from sustainably harvested forests, think about buying a hybrid electric car, and look for “no sweat” imports from factories that meet global labor standards. What you buy, what you ask your office to buy or ask your favorite stores to carry—all can make a big difference.
- Your charitable donations also count. Nonprofit groups doing cutting-edge work around the world, and making regular people’s voices heard, depend on contributions.

Emphasize How Much Citizens’ Voices Count

- Share your thinking with family, friends, and community members; chances are, they’re also wondering about these issues.
- Join or volunteer with nonprofit organizations, whose size and resources can magnify your voice. Go to their Web sites, where it is often possible to send a letter to decision makers and your elected officials with the click of a mouse.
- Get in touch with newspapers, magazines, and TV and radio stations. Ask them to provide the kinds of coverage you need to be informed about the world. Write letters or submit op-ed pieces on issues you care about. Local voices matter to them.
- Learn what positions your elected officials take on international issues—visit their Web sites, read their newsletters, and pay attention to their media coverage.
- Let elected officials know your views. Because they don’t expect to hear from constituents on most international issues, your voice—especially handwritten letters—can make a difference.
- Get involved with your local government—attend hearings and meetings, and find out what positions your community is taking on energy, the environment, poverty, and other global issues that also hit close to home.
- Vote.

Representative Quotes

ENGAGING CITIZENS

Abraham Lincoln

16th President of the
United States

“Public sentiment is everything. With public sentiment nothing can fail; without it, nothing can succeed. Consequently, he who molds public sentiment goes deeper than he who enacts statutes or pronounces decisions. He makes statutes or decisions possible or impossible to be executed.”

Princeton Lyman

Senior Fellow, Council
on Foreign Relations

“There are no ordinary citizens. ... When Congressmen and women come home to their districts, it is important that they hear from citizens from all walks of life, not just the most rich and influential. Go to those meetings and talk about our global role. Members of Congress tell me that rarely happens. Join some of the many citizen organizations that work on behalf of a better world, that improve the human condition abroad as well as at home. Write to your hometown paper when you feel it is being biased or misinforming you. Vote and get as many people as possible to vote.”

Michael Gelobter

Executive Director,
Redefining Progress

“Take a deeper look at where your community is going. Will children be able to walk to school and to parks? Is your commute going to get longer? Will housing and food be more or less affordable in the future? Will there be room for open space and nature in your region twenty years from now? These are all things you can influence with your neighbors in local forums.”

Michael Hirsh

Senior Editor,
Newsweek

“[U.S.] presidents of the twenty-first century will be tempted to sacrifice distant threats to immediate political goals at home—to demonize the UN, for instance, in order to neutralize [fears] of a loss of sovereignty, or to scapegoat our own brainchildren, new institutions like the World Trade Organization. They must resist this temptation, but only a greater awareness by the American public—a shift of mind-set that would turn such “nonvoting” issues as UN dues or arms control into “voting” issues—can ensure that they do so.”

Robert Hunter

former U.S.
Ambassador to NATO

“Most of all, each of us can live our lives as Americans always have at times of trial: championing democratic values; putting down prejudice, including against Muslim U.S. citizens; and using every chance offered to say to the powerful that this power must be tempered with purpose rooted in the most fundamental of our freedoms.”

TOP 20, ENGAGING CITIZENS (TABS 2 & 8)

6. TOP 20 RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Start by signaling to your listeners what an issue is “about.” Invoke big, cross-cutting ideas.
2. Put your proposals and arguments in the context of an interconnected world.
3. Explain why your proposals are smart/effective/pragmatic/realistic in the context of today’s world.
4. Explain why your proposals are the right thing to do.
5. Provide context for problems; explain which actions (by whom) are most important to their solution.
6. Stress a “can-do” approach. Don’t open with fear, guilt, or comments that overwhelm.
7. When appropriate, cite examples of other countries (and NGOs) that are working alongside the U.S.
8. Cite examples of what works and offer success stories.
9. Empower listeners by telling them what they can do; give yardsticks to evaluate policy/actions.
10. Determine in advance your 3 or 4 most important “gateway” messages.
11. Don’t be afraid to repeat yourself.
12. In radio and television interviews, talk with your audience of citizens—not to the reporter.
13. Avoid jargon and acronyms.
14. Use analogies, metaphors, and comparisons from daily life.
15. Use numbers sparingly and put them in context.
16. Be sincere and honest at all times. And be yourself.
17. Use a reasonable, rational tone. Don’t attack personally. Question assumptions, not motives or integrity.
18. Show both the benefits of approaches you propose and the costs of alternatives.
19. Don’t repeat opponents’ position, bad questions, or misconceptions. Bridge to your big ideas and frames.
20. Keep asking tough questions about communications choices and talking with peers about decisions.

18A. YARDSTICKS TO HELP CITIZENS EVALUATE POLICIES & ACTIONS

Are we making the right choices to get results in an increasingly interconnected world?

- Are we looking at the big picture and taking a comprehensive approach?
- Are we using all the tools we have available—diplomatic, economic, cultural, military—and doing all we can to keep these tools effective?
- Are we learning from experience and doing what’s been shown to work?

Are we building (and keeping) the kinds of teams and relationships with others that we need to solve problems effectively in today’s world?

- Have we shown respect for the views and concerns of others, and cultivated the trust on which future collaborations can be based?
- Have we inspired others to get involved and do their share?
- Are we supporting/strengthening the international institutions that facilitate cooperation and can get the job done?

Are we taking the long view? Are we making the choices that will leave the world a better, safer place for our children and grandchildren?

- Are we making appropriate trade-offs between short-term and long-term interests?
- Are we acting now to head off problems that will threaten us in the long run?
- Are we considering and planning for the long-range consequences of our actions?
- When we must compromise, will the long-range benefits for us and the world outweigh the costs?

Are our policies and actions consistent with what America stands for?

- Are we setting a good example?
- Are we doing our best to practice what we preach and play fair as a member of the global community?
- Are we keeping our promises?

18B. WHAT CITIZENS CAN DO TO MAKE A DIFFERENCE

Citizens can do a lot to move things in the right direction:

- Significant policy changes have been made because private citizens, acting alone and in groups, have lifted voices and demanded change. E.g.:
 - Anti-landmine activists won the Nobel Peace Prize for helping to create a treaty banning these weapons.
 - Millions joined around the world to bring debt relief to poor countries saddled with debt; people acted on a biblical idea—the millennium should be a Jubilee Year, when debts are forgiven.
 - A coalition of conservative and liberal religious groups, celebrities, doctors, antipoverty campaigners, gay activists, and others raised awareness about AIDS—and helped triple U.S. spending on fighting global AIDS.

One way to get involved—learn more and help others learn more about the issues:

- Read the international pages in your local newspaper; check out foreign news sources on the Web / at the library.
- Visit Web sites of NGOs and of religious and cultural groups that you support; many will send free news.
- Feature speakers and start discussions on global issues and America's role at schools, houses of worship, clubs.

Another way to contribute—help to build connections with the world:

- Host a foreign student, businessperson, or exchange visitor.
- Join a welcome group for newcomers to the U.S. in your workplace, school, or community—or start one.
- Look into “Sister City” or twin relationships for your town, faith community, school, hospital, business.
- Volunteer abroad. Whether it's a two-year commitment to the Peace Corps or a two-week religious work camp, there are many ways that you can BE the America you want to see in the world.
- Participate in a professional exchange program that shares information and experience across borders.
- Learn a foreign language, and encourage your kids to. Urge local schools and adult education to offer languages.
- Help children experience the world's rich diversity—through languages, foods, art and cultural exhibits, and foreign books and movies. Help your family enjoy immigrant cultures in the ethnic enclaves of America's cities.
- Encourage children to make exchanges / study abroad part of education and preparation for life in a global society.
- Travel abroad to see other cultures for yourself.

Be an informed consumer—what people buy matters:

- What you buy, what you ask your office to buy, what you ask stores to carry—it all makes a big difference. Learn about organic and “fair-trade” coffee, find out which fish are in abundant supply in our oceans, make travel plans through eco-friendly Web sites, buy recycled paper and wood products from sustainably harvested forests, think about buying a hybrid electric car, and look for “no sweat” imports from factories that meet global labor standards.
- Your charitable donations also count. Nonprofit groups doing cutting-edge work around the world, and making regular people's voices heard, depend on contributions to pay for much or all of their work.

Your voice counts—there are many ways to make it heard:

- Share your thinking with family, friends, and community members; they're also wondering about these issues.
- Join or volunteer with nonprofit organizations, whose size and resources can magnify your voice. Go to their Web sites, where it's often possible to send letters to decision makers with the click of a mouse.
- Get in touch with newspapers, magazines, and TV and radio stations. Ask them to provide the coverage you need to be informed about the world. Write letters or submit op-ed pieces on issues you care about. Local voices matter.
- Learn what positions your elected officials take on international issues—visit their Web sites, read their newsletters, and pay attention to their media coverage.
- Let elected officials know your views. Because politicians don't expect to hear from their constituents on most international issues, your voice—especially handwritten letters and office visits—can make a difference.
- Get involved with your local government—attend hearings and meetings, and find out what positions your community is taking on energy, the environment, poverty, and other global issues that also hit close to home. Consider joining a committee or running for office.
- Vote.

AMERICA'S ROLE, INT'L COOPERATION (TABS 3 & 4)

Below are **shorthand reminders** of arguments in the guide (with responses to common critiques under the red-highlighted phrases). Please use them selectively and consult the guide for elaboration.

8A. HOW AMERICA ACTS TOWARD THE REST OF THE WORLD MATTERS BECAUSE:

- Our world is increasingly interconnected—we need other nations, and they need us, to build a better future.
- What happens abroad affects our security, our jobs, our health, and our way of life.
- What we do has a profound effect on how others around the world live.
- How we act affects what we can accomplish, and how much of the burden others are willing to share.

8B. AMERICA IS AT ITS BEST AS A NATION WHEN WE:

- See the world as it is and respond with farsighted leadership to prepare for tomorrow's challenges today.
- Unite with others around shared values, when we honor the same values we cherish and try to promote at home.
- Act as if we understand that to make the world we want for ourselves, we need others and they need us.
- Build structures and habits of cooperation with others.

10A. THE U.S. NEEDS TO BE A LEADER IN BUILDING INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION BECAUSE:

- In an interconnected world, we need partners to make progress on common challenges.
- Cooperation is a common sense tool; real people getting things done.
- The benefits of cooperation clearly outweigh the costs.
- Bringing others together for the common good is the American way.

10B. INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION CAN WORK BETTER IF WE RECOGNIZE THAT:

- All institutions need periodic retooling, and we have had important success with international organizations.
- Successful partnership is a two-way street.
- We can judge actions by whether they bring us closer to our goals and make successful cooperation more likely.

10C. WHAT THE WORLD THINKS OF US MATTERS:

- In a interdependent world, we need the respect and support of others to safeguard our security, face common challenges, and show that our priorities have merit.
- It's the American way to be respected and admired, not just feared.
- When others fear the effect we have on their lives, the results affect us too.
- The rest of the world is an audience, watching to see if our deeds match our words.

9A. "WE SPEND TOO MUCH ABROAD. DOMESTIC NEEDS COME FIRST."

- We all share one planet. We need other nations, and they need us, to build a better future.
- In an interconnected system, the well-being of any part depends on the health of the whole, and vice versa.
- What happens abroad affects our security, our jobs, our health, and our way of life.
- If we invest in solving global problems early—we save both lives and money.

9B. "SOFT ISSUES ARE NICE, BUT SECURITY/SURVIVAL ISSUES COME FIRST."

- A smart security policy needs a smart foreign policy that looks at the big picture and connects the dots.
- Defining security too narrowly misses important opportunities to help make the world a safer place.
- Smart problem solvers look at causes as well as symptoms. We can't afford tunnel vision or shortsightedness.
- We can fight terrorism without abandoning our goal of building a more hopeful, peaceful, and prosperous world.
- Our ability to rally countries depends much on our willingness to pursue shared global interests, not just U.S. ones.

9C. "NO COUNTRY IS PERFECT. AMERICA IS A BENIGN SUPERPOWER."

- We're honoring our traditions and inspiring others when we ask whether America can do better.
- Americans want the U.S. to do its share. But we've been concentrating on the military aspects of America's role and lost track that our nation's relative contribution to the relief of human suffering has fallen behind that of other nations.
- The U.S. can't have a lasting impact unless our private acts of generosity are combined with the large-scale, sustained initiatives that only government can undertake.

9D. "THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS AN 'INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY.'"

- We're already living in a global neighborhood. The challenge now is to turn it into a global community.
- We could act as if the rest of the world doesn't exist, but that's not the American way.
- You all know people who've turned their backs on their community, and their lives seem the poorer for it.

9E. "PEACE IS BEST ACHIEVED THROUGH STRENGTH."

- The real question is, are we doing everything we can to help make the world more peaceful?
- Strength means using every muscle you have—diplomatic, economic, and moral as well as military.
- Just because we have a big military hammer doesn't mean every problem is a nail.
- Making force the centerpiece is like asking our military to bear the entire burden of the U.S. global role.
- Shared problems need to be addressed through a shared commitment by many nations.

- The force of our example will often be more important than the example of our force.
- There's a difference between power and authority.
- Much of the world now sees us as a bully. That isn't strength.

9F. "YOU SEE THE WORLD THE WAY YOU WANT IT TO BE, NOT HOW IT REALLY IS."

- Leaders who see the world as it really is understand that we're more effective when we work with others.
- Let's apply the lessons we've learned from other challenging times.
- A simplistic "us-versus-them" view of the world can become a self-fulfilling prophecy.
- The reality is that most of today's big global challenges simply can't be managed by any one nation, no matter how strong. We need allies and partners more, not less, in difficult times.

9G. "TERRORISM IS A NEW BALLGAME. WE CAN'T RELY ON THE OLD STRATEGIES ANYMORE."

- A smart strategy will be comprehensive, drawing on both time-tested approaches and new ones.
- The key question is how best to protect American lives. We've been most effective working with others..
- The real question is: Are we doing everything we can to reduce the threat of global terrorism?
- The threat of terrorism is too complex to handle with any single instrument. We're neglecting important tools
- Overreliance on military strategy risks winning battles while losing the long-term struggle for hearts and minds.

11A. "AMERICA MUST NOT COMPROMISE ITS SOVEREIGNTY/FLEXIBILITY."

- The real question is, how can we accomplish what needs to get done?
- In an increasingly interconnected world, we succeed or fail together.
- America has maintained a position of global strength not by staying out of international agreements but by helping to shape them. Experience shows that in the long run, cooperation gives us greater influence and flexibility.
- Sharing innovative solutions and inspiring international teamwork is the American way.
- For other countries to follow rules, we must follow them too. "Do unto others" = common sense/common decency.

11B. "WE CAN'T ENTRUST DECISIONS ABOUT U.S. SECURITY TO OTHERS."

- We would have plenty of support from others and international law for acting in self-defense.
- The choice is always ours; we should base it on a realistic assessment of how best to achieve our security goals.
- The fact is that today's top national security challenges can only be managed effectively through partnerships.
- Partnerships can't thrive without consultation and mutual respect.
- When we use military force in cooperation with other countries, our actions are more likely to be seen as legitimate—which helps us achieve our goals in the short run and makes us safer in the long run.
- If we expect others to honor these constraints, we need to practice what we preach.

11C. "WE'RE NOT OPPOSED TO ALL TREATIES ... JUST THE BAD ONES."

- When a treaty's benefits outweigh the costs—that's what makes a treaty worth signing.
- Just like laws here at home, treaties are imperfect. But we don't give up on having laws; we make them better ...
- When the U.S. walks away from imperfect treaties without trying for improvements, we undermine progress.
- Don't let the perfect be the enemy of the good.

11D. "INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS/BUREAUCRACIES ARE INEFFICIENT."

- All institutions need periodic retooling and updating. So, too, international organizations face new challenges.
- Americans are doers and fixers. We have a proud history of bringing nations together for the common good. Let's work with other nations to strengthen and equip our international organizations to meet today's challenges.
- The UN can point to real successes in the areas of global health and hunger, conflict resolution and peacebuilding, arms control and human rights—all on an annual budget that's less than Arkansas spends in a year.
- Reforms are under way, but members also need to commit to providing resources UN agencies need to do the job.

11E. "BEING RESENTED FOR BEING NO. 1 GOES WITH THE TERRITORY."

- Fluctuations in global opinion have much to do with the content, style, and tone of U.S. foreign policy.
- You've seen it in your workplaces and on the sports field: some leaders are trusted and admired; others aren't. The difference is in how the person leads. We know which teams stick together and accomplish more.
- Most people around the world still like Americans. But they worry when the U.S. seems indifferent to others' needs and concerns ... determined to do what it wants, when it wants, regardless of the impact on others.
- Policymaking that consistently ignores other countries' needs, interests, and advice undermines trust and respect.
- Countries that fear the effects of our actions are understandably much less likely to work with us.
- The tiny minority that hates America draws strength from mistrust/resentment that larger numbers feel.

11F. "LEADERSHIP IS NOT A POPULARITY CONTEST."

- We need other countries, and they need us.
- The U.S. is in the global spotlight so often, with the rest of the world as our audience. Their opinion matters.
- We know that what goes around, comes around: When we respect and consider the priorities of others, even if we ultimately disagree, we earn trust and sow the seeds of future partnerships working for a safer, better world.
- If we unnecessarily antagonize allies and undermine trust and respect ... it affects our ability to build needed teams.
- Americans want their country to be respected and trusted, not feared. They understand the Golden Rule.

TERRORISM, SPREAD OF DEADLY WEAPONS (TAB 5)

Below are **shorthand reminders** of arguments in the guide (with responses to common critiques under the red-highlighted phrases). Please use them selectively and consult the guide for elaboration.

12A. BLOCKING THE THREAT POSED BY TERRORISTS REQUIRES A COMPREHENSIVE, LONG-TERM STRATEGY:

- Terrorists with a global reach take full advantage of all the ways our world is interconnected—we need strong antiterrorist partnerships to fight back.
- A smart strategy against terrorism will be comprehensive, to focus on preventing attacks.
- Our strategy must be long-term, seeking to win back the global audience terrorists have gained for their actions.

12B. THE THREAT OF DEADLY NUCLEAR, CHEMICAL, AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS IS REAL, BUT WE HAVE POWERFUL TOOLS TO CONTROL THOSE WEAPONS AND PREVENT THEM FROM BEING MADE:

- We should do everything we can—and there is a great deal we can do—to prevent deadly weapons from reaching the hands of terrorists or hostile governments.
- A smart effort to prevent these weapons' spread and use will use our resources and know-how to make weapons materials and capabilities secure.
- We can take a comprehensive approach that enforces rules against these weapons, makes them harder to get, and safeguards our citizens in case they are used.
- This approach has a history of success.

12C. WORKING WITH PARTNERS, AND INTERNATIONAL TREATIES, INSPECTIONS AND INSTITUTIONS ARE KEY TO PREVENTING THE SPREAD OF DEADLY WEAPONS BECAUSE:

- Global teamwork to limit the spread of these weapons works.
- Teamwork lets us respond and adapt to meet new challenges successfully.
- New technologies and support for inspections are making teamwork an even more effective option.
- The team only functions if its biggest partner—the U.S.—does its part.

13A. “WHY SHOULD WE ABSORB THE FIRST BLOW?” (SEE ALSO 13B)

- We cannot wait until danger is upon us. But of all strategies, attacking another country first is potentially riskiest.
- International law recognizes that a nation does not need to be attacked to take lawful action in self-defense.
- We've been most effective against terrorists when we've worked with other countries to destroy terrorist networks, not just a single camp or training site. Any strategy that unnecessarily antagonizes other nations weakens our alliances when we need them most.
- If the world begins to see the U.S. as a loner unwilling to work with others, we may lose the trust and cooperation of other nations on a wide range of critical global problems.

13B. “WE HAVE NO CHOICE BUT TO PREVENT THROUGH MILITARY PREEMPTION.”

- Keeping preemption as the last-resort option it always has been makes sense. What doesn't is moving this option from the margins to the center of national security policy.
- In extreme circumstances, we may not have time to seek support from others before using force. We would have plenty of support from others and international law for acting preemptively in self-defense.
- Announcing that we will use force whenever and wherever we choose—without regard to what others think or the rules we ask others to follow—may hurt us more than it hurts those seeking to harm us. It sets a dangerous precedent, with unintended consequences.
- A smart strategy against global terrorism will be comprehensive, not one-dimensional. The threat of terrorism is too complex to handle with excessive reliance on a single blunt instrument, like military force.
- Global terrorist networks take advantage an interconnected world. We need networked partnerships to fight back.
- It's unfair to ask our armed forces to bear the entire burden of the struggle against terrorism when vital tasks of prevention and reconstruction call for other strategies and resources.

13C. “NEW THREATS REQUIRE NEW MEANS.”

- The question is: Are we doing all we can? We can't forgo any effective tool—diplomatic, economic, or military.
- Our interlocking system of int'l agreements has scored many successes. Let's strengthen this proven network.
- Treaties alone won't stop the problem. But internationally, just as at home, we get results when we combine a good legal system with smart prevention and reliable enforcement.
- The basic mathematics of security hasn't changed. A trickle of weapons is easier to contain than a flood.
- If we need to make an exception to rules because of an immediate threat, we should go back afterward to improve arrangements. We might exceed speed limits in an emergency, but we still need rules of the road.

13D. “WE SHOULD BE ABLE TO DEVELOP ANY WEAPONS WE NEED.”

- The key question is whether a weapon protects American lives. You can't nuke a network or extremist ideology.
- If we insist on new nuclear weapons, it will increase their value in others' eyes—which could lead to a new arms race and put more weapons/materials into circulation.

- A “do as I say, not as I do” policy undermines trust in U.S. leadership, weakens the entire system of agreements.
- Global teamwork to control the spread of weapons works—but only when the U.S., does its part.
- We never want to use nuclear weapons again or see others do so. It’s important to preserve that taboo.
- When the U.S. signed the treaty to curb the spread of nuclear weapons, we made a solemn commitment to reduce our stocks of nuclear weapons, not increase them. ... Let’s keep our promise and lead by our example.

13E. “PROLIFERATION IS INEVITABLE.”

- History shows that global teamwork to limit the spread of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons works. When we use the full array of tools at our disposal, and share the burden with other nations, the odds are on our side.
- International agreements have succeeded in limiting the spread of nuclear weapons to a handful of nations and encouraged several nations to give up their plans. Cooperation on chemical weapons has led to the destruction of millions of tons of chemical agents.
- There’s much more to do, and in some areas we’re moving too slowly. But we can build on these successes.
- We can and should help to strengthen int’l rules and mechanisms. We can also support impartial int’l institutions.
- We can get serious about prevention. We can increase our investment in proven, cooperative programs to help other countries do a better job of guarding their stockpiles of weapons and materials.
- We can play an active role in international diplomatic efforts to help resolve regional conflicts.
- We can set a good example by significantly reducing the role of nuclear weapons in our own security policies. That would reduce the attractiveness and acceptability of these weapons in the eyes of other nations.

13F. “VERIFICATION DOESN’T WORK.”

- The prospects for effective international monitoring are better than ever, thanks to new technologies and a new, shared understanding of the risks.
- We know we need tougher international agreements that call for more intrusive inspections and more reliable enforcement. With stronger U.S. involvement, we could make real progress on this critical front.
- The question is: Are we doing all we can to shape and abide by the tough new inspection and enforcement provisions that are needed to stop cheating in its tracks?
- Negotiations to strengthen the international agreement on biological weapons broke down because the U.S. refused to allow biological weapons inspections on its turf. This means that there are no inspections at all. When the U.S. doesn’t do its part, the force of int’l law is weakened and others may be tempted to break the rules.
- For the past 50 years, the U.S. has wisely taken the lead in shaping international laws and verification procedures designed to control the spread of deadly weapons. The system isn’t perfect, but it has kept the problem down to a trickle rather than a flood. Let’s keep improving the system, so it works even better.

13G. “ONLY AMERICA CAN PREVENT PROLIFERATION. WE MUST DO IT OUR WAY.”

- There’s a lot that can be done to prevent the spread of deadly weapons—but almost none of it can be done by the U.S. alone. Shared problems like the spread of weapons need to be addressed through shared commitment and action by many nations. Fortunately, many countries share our concern about the problem.
- A “my way or the highway” approach discourages others from standing with us, and it sets a bad example.
- It’s more important to do things in a way that works than it is to do things “our way.” We should ask questions about effectiveness—will going it alone produce lasting results or create new dynamics and dangers? We should ask about costs and consequences—what are the long-term risks of losing the trust and respect of other nations?
- Our preferred strategy should be respectful, collaborative, and consistent with what America stands for—like keeping our promises and trying to practice what we preach.
- Almost 50 years ago, the U.S. knew there was strength in numbers and led to create a system of international agreements that has limited the spread of nuclear weapons to a handful of countries. We improved the agreements as we went along. That same kind of team leadership, by persuasion and example, is what’s needed today.
- Working with other nations, we can strengthen the time-tested system of int’l agreements. We can join diplomatic efforts to reduce regional tensions that prompt countries to seek military dominance. We can share intelligence. We can support the int’l agencies that work to relieve conditions that terrorists exploit. We can enlarge our successful partnership with Russia to lock down its stocks of weapons. We can build habits of consultation/collaboration with others, so if threats or force are needed to address violations, they will enjoy int’l backing.

13H. “WHAT DO YOU PROPOSE WE DO WHEN COUNTRIES BREAK INTERNATIONAL RULES?”

- Cheating cannot and must not be ignored. Our response should demonstrate that we’re serious about enforcing rules consistently. But we’ll be most effective in the long run if we keep commonsense considerations in mind:
 - Cheating is a threat that no nation, even one as powerful as the U.S., can handle alone.
 - Because we need strong partnerships to counter this threat, we should develop strategies in consultation with other nations—and when the U.S. takes the lead, we should do so in a way that inspires others to follow.
 - Cheating is a complex threat, likely to respond best to comprehensive strategies that combine carrots and sticks and use the full range of tools—diplomatic, economic, and military—available to the U.S. and other nations.
 - International organizations like the UN’s International Atomic Energy Agency play a key role, doing things we can’t.
 - We need to learn from each episode of cheating ... use lessons to strengthen time-tested network of int’l laws.
- Fortunately, many nations are concerned about this problem, and experience shows we can get results when we work together to enforce the international laws that discourage the spread of deadly weapons.

POVERTY, DEVELOPMENT, NATION BUILDING (TAB 6)

Below are **shorthand reminders** of arguments in the guide (with responses to common critiques under the red-highlighted phrases). Please use them selectively and consult the guide for elaboration.

14A. IT MATTERS THAT PEOPLE AROUND THE WORLD MAKE PROGRESS OUT OF POVERTY AND INDIGNITY:

- How other people live affects us, and how we live affects them.
- For our economy to grow, the world economy must grow—which requires investing in people.
- Our health and security are tied to the fates of people far away.
- Americans share with others the desire to live by values like justice, opportunity, and dignity.

14B. WE CAN EFFECTIVELY HELP PEOPLE AND COUNTRIES LIFT THEMSELVES OUT OF POVERTY BY:

- Working with the people we're trying to empower to foster long-term, comprehensive progress.
- Promoting education to give people the tools they can use to pursue their own success.
- Improving health where even basic human survival is in question.
- Promoting economic empowerment to spread opportunity.
- Supporting people and governments that are fighting for open government and against corruption.

14C. IT'S SMART FOR THE U.S. TO HELP STRUGGLING NATIONS REBUILD THEMSELVES BECAUSE:

- When governments are destroyed by war or simply collapse, threats to health, security, and prosperity extend far beyond their borders.
- Nations are built by their own citizens—with the support and resources of other countries and organizations; it's not effective or smart for the U.S. to go it alone.
- The international community has a track record, though imperfect, of helping societies lift themselves back up.

15A. "THE POOR WILL ALWAYS BE WITH US ... THERE'S ONLY SO MUCH WE CAN DO."

- Empowering people to improve their lives always makes a difference. When we offer a little extra help and remove impediments, we empower people to use their energy and determination to bring about lasting changes.
- We've learned a lot about how to help people help themselves. Families and communities do best when they have the right mix of tools and resources to work with—like access to education and health care, a clean environment, the freedom to seize new economic opportunities, and basic rights.
- Programs that help create conditions like these can empower millions of people to lift themselves out of poverty. We've seen it in China and India, and countries like Ireland and South Korea that were poor just a generation ago.
- There's a lot we can do. Investments in education and health care pay off many times over. Investments in health are incredibly effective. Programs that provide small loans have an impressive track record.
- If we join other countries in a concerted effort to pursue these cost-effective strategies, we don't just help change lives—we change trends. And in an interconnected world, that works to everyone's benefit.

15B. "FOREIGN AID JUST CREATES DEPENDENCY."

- Development assistance is all about moving people away from dependence. Like men and women everywhere, people in poor countries want to be self-sufficient. They want decent jobs, a chance to improve their lives. They're already working hard. When we make opportunities available, we're creating more independence, not less.
- Giving people an opportunity to improve their lives is what America is all about—and we should be doing our best to make sure that our actions in the world are consistent with our fundamental values.
- People around the world with vision and commitment are striving to lift themselves and societies out of poverty. When aid comes, it can provide the extra resources that families and communities need to make lasting changes.
- The old adage "it's better to teach someone to fish than to give them a fish" still holds. Fortunately, there's a lot we can do to help families and communities become self-sufficient and successful.
- A little extra help goes a long way, when we join forces with other countries, nonprofit organizations, and local partners to implement these cost-effective strategies.
- People need tools and opportunities to help themselves; we're talking about investments in self-sufficiency and success. These strategies also help poor countries to help themselves.

15C. "POVERTY HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH TERRORISM."

- If we want to reduce the terrorist threat in the long run, we need to ask a more fundamental question: "Where does this kind of extremism thrive?" As we strike at al Qaeda militarily, we need to join with other nations in using diplomacy, development assistance, and international pressure to strike at the conditions that terrorists exploit.
- People who have a stake in the stability of their society, and a say in its future, are less likely to find fanaticism attractive or acceptable.
- "Threats to our security—like terrorism—can take root and grow in countries where hopelessness and lawlessness prevail.
- Programs and policies that help such countries become more stable and meet their people's needs are not only investments in a better future for millions of vulnerable men, women, and children. They're also investments in our own future, because we depend on responsible, capable partners in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East to fight alongside us against terrorism and other global security threats."

15D. “THE PROBLEM IS CORRUPTION.”

- Corruption hurts the very people we’re trying to help. That’s why both U.S. government agencies and private groups are taking steps to stop waste and make sure that assistance ends up in the hands of those who need it most.
- During the Cold War, we learned that using development assistance to buy the support of foreign governments often just encouraged corruption. This happens less frequently today, but when we do use aid as a signal of support for our allies, we should be building in anticorruption measures and finding other ways to encourage positive change in authoritarian governments. Otherwise we’re back to investing in politics, instead of people.
- We can be effective, even in imperfect situations. We can’t let the actions of a few stand in the way of helping millions around the world.
- There are more democracies today in the poorest one-quarter of the world than ever before. The overwhelming majority of people in the developing world want us to help fight corruption in their countries. We can form partnerships with them by building anticorruption measures into our development assistance and by supporting local reformers.
- And we can work with other countries providing aid to make sure that our own corporations aren’t party to the corruption that hurts the very people we’re trying to help.

15E. “WE’RE ALREADY SO GENEROUS. THE U.S. CAN’T DO IT ALL.”

- Americans are a generous and caring people—and our best investments in helping others have been repaid many times over in the form of a more peaceful, prosperous world.
- We know it matters how other people live. Our hearts tell us so—and in an interconnected world, common sense tells us that solving global problems like hunger, illiteracy, and the spread of HIV/AIDS is in everyone’s interest.
- The question is, Are we doing what we need to do to get results? If the U.S. spent just \$50 more per American each year, we could cut world hunger in half. Relatively modest investments would improve the lives of millions of men, women, and children—and pay off many times over in the form of a more peaceful, prosperous world.
- Americans want the U.S. to do its share. ... But we’ve been concentrating our attention on the military aspects of America’s role in the world, and we’ve lost track of the fact that our nation’s relative contribution to the relief of human suffering has fallen behind that of other nations.
- Americans are caring and generous people. But unless our private acts of generosity are combined with the kind of large-scale, sustained initiatives that only government can undertake, we may not make a lasting impact.
- Development assistance is just one part of an effective strategy to help others help themselves. Often what’s most meaningful is opening up opportunities, not contributing money: Trade policies that are fair and friendly to developing countries ... Canceling the debts of impoverished countries that are committed to good government ... Encouraging international agencies like the World Bank to build environmental protections and anticorruption measure into their lending ... It’s important that the pieces of this picture fit together and reflect the same basic values, or we and other nations could end up giving with one hand and taking away with the other.

15F. “THE MARKET WILL SOLVE THESE PROBLEMS—TRADE, NOT AID.”

- Both trade and aid are necessary. Smart development assistance helps get impoverished countries to the point where they can participate in and benefit from the global economy.
- We’ve all observed how those who start out with the most resources are often able to make the market work for them, while those who start with less can fall farther and farther behind.
- Let’s remember our goal: to help more countries and people become self-sufficient members of a peaceful, prosperous global community. Market forces are powerful, but they’re blind to the fates of individual countries and people. As a decent and responsible nation, we should take steps to ensure that the market’s contribution to development is a positive one.
- That means working with other nations to help impoverished people and communities get to the point where they can make the most of the market’s opportunities. It means making sure that the rules of the global marketplace aren’t stacked against poor countries ... That new small players have a fair chance in the competition ... That rules are designed to create decent jobs for workers everywhere.

15G. “WE INVEST IN GOOD PERFORMERS, NOT EVERY BASKET CASE.”

- As a compassionate and responsible nation, we can’t ignore those who are the worst off, even as we encourage continued improvement in countries that are making progress. In today’s interconnected world, it’s not possible to close our eyes or hearts to the incalculable human suffering.
- Leaving the poorest and most desperate nations to their own devices sets the stage for a complete collapse of government and society. Such states can become havens for terrorists and criminals of all kinds.
- Working with other nations and international organizations, we’ve had real success in helping societies and countries rebuild after near-collapse. Think of South Korea, and more recently, East Timor. It requires a substantial and sustained commitment, but it can be done.
- We shouldn’t ever have to do it all or do it alone—but neither we nor the global community can afford an incomplete and inconsistent approach to the development challenge.
- The world is an interconnected system—we can’t write off some parts and expect the whole to be healthy and stable.

ENERGY, GLOBAL WARMING (TAB 7)

Below are **shorthand reminders** of arguments in the guide (with responses to common critiques under the red-highlighted phrases). Please use them selectively and consult the guide for elaboration.

16A. OUR ENERGY CHOICES MATTER BECAUSE:

- A national commitment to invest in newer, cleaner, more efficient sources of energy would create good new jobs, help our environment, and improve our security.
- Stable, reliable, affordable sources of energy are crucial to both the U.S. and world economies.
- What's needed is a complex, global energy transition that we can't do alone but that won't happen without us.
- Our energy choices today will determine much about the world our children inherit.

16B. GLOBAL WARMING IS AN IMPORTANT PROBLEM, AND SOLUTIONS ARE AT HAND:

- Global warming is a problem that we still have time to solve. But we need immediate action and a long-term plan to slow it down and prevent it from getting out of hand.
- It is a challenge for business, government, and individuals alike.
- The future is not yet written. We can respond—with technologies, innovation, and a can-do spirit.
- We must work with other nations to solve the problem.

16C. WE CAN SPEED UP PROGRESS TOWARD A BETTER ENERGY FUTURE:

- We need a national plan to jump-start a smarter energy policy—for our security, economy, and environment.
- Global energy transformation is happening, and American ingenuity and technology should be on board.
- Government and industry must work together to make it happen.
- The result will be a win-win for our economy, our environment, our security—and for future generations.

17A. "WHAT YOU PROPOSE WOULD HARM OUR ECONOMY."

- We support sensible, farsighted measures that keep our kids, our planet, and our economy healthy. Joining other nations in efforts to develop cleaner, more efficient energy systems is a pragmatic and preventive strategy to increase our energy security, stimulate the growth of new industries and jobs, and combat global warming.
- We are a can-do, solution-oriented people. Yet we're not adopting the requirements/incentives to stimulate innovation, help this country prosper in the energy economy of the future, leave our kids a healthier environment.
- If ever a country was equipped to lead in the global transition to a cleaner, more efficient energy system—and a healthier global environment—it's the U.S. America's economic advantage lies in innovation.
- New clean-energy industries can create the new revenue and new jobs we need to prosper in the 21st-century. Experts believe that a full energy transition could create more than 3.3 million new jobs over 10 years.
- Clean-energy technologies are among the fastest-growing world markets. Americans pioneered many of the new energy technologies, but our clean-energy sector is lagging. We can't let narrow, short-term interests stand in the way of long-term shifts that could enable us to compete and thrive in tomorrow's energy economy.

17B. "THE MARKET WILL TAKE CARE OF THIS; LET THE PRIVATE SECTOR LEAD."

- Putting America at the cutting edge of the global energy transition will require the combined efforts of government and business—as it did with space exploration, medical research, and microtechnology.
- Providing the right incentives and signals for business is the government's job. When the government does its job, we get partnerships that address our long-term needs and that can produce dynamic new industries that employ American workers. When it doesn't, we get markets guided by short-term commercial interests.
- Businesses need predictability and stability. Many corporate leaders are asking the government for clear signals and supportive conditions that would encourage them to invest in new, clean energy technologies and products.
- Government incentives/investments have brought new industries to life, from microchips to airbags. Subsidies for oil, gas, and nuclear energy help maintain the status quo. If clean-energy technologies got the same treatment, we'd soon have a dynamic new energy market.
- Energy choices are too important and their effects are too lasting to be left in the hands of corporations.

17C. "THE SCIENCE ISN'T CONCLUSIVE ON GLOBAL WARMING. YOU USE SCARE TACTICS."

- Let's start with what we do know: We know the planet is warming, that burning oil and other fossil fuels contributes to global warming by creating a heat-trapping blanket of carbon dioxide around Earth... That the rise in average global temperatures has already caused dangerous/costly climate disruptions... That if we act soon, we can greatly reduce the future effects of global warming. What more do we need to know before we act?
- Most of our actions are based on the probability of an outcome, not on absolute certainty. If nine doctors tell you that you'll live longer if you take a medicine and one doctor disagrees, the wise course is to take your medicine.
- We only have one Earth, and one atmosphere. A "wait and see" approach is like conducting an enormous experiment, with potentially dangerous and irreversible consequences for our children and grandchildren.
- With long-term challenges like global warming, "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound a cure." The longer we delay, the harder this problem is going to be to solve. It's like taking out insurance—smart and responsible.
- Don't be fooled by attempts to use the call for "more science" as an excuse for inaction. We can't afford to let narrow, short-term interests undermine the robust scientific consensus on the long-term danger of climate change.

- The Pentagon treats global warming as real. So do major int'l insurance and farsighted energy companies. These public- and private-sector leaders are hard-headed risk analysts, and the science is conclusive enough for them.
- Movies like *The Day After Tomorrow* are fiction; climate change is real. Think of the movie as a wake-up call about being too casual in tampering with Earth's atmosphere.

17D. "THE INTERNATIONAL APPROACH ON GLOBAL WARMING IS UNFAIR."

- Solving global warming is as important for the U.S. as it is for the world. By acting first, the U.S. and other rich countries most responsible for global warming can set a powerful example for others to follow.
- In the process, we can create new jobs/industries at home while jump-starting the int'l effort to slow global warming and influencing the energy choices of less advanced countries on the brink of new energy investments.
- In fact, the U.S. signed on to this strategy during negotiations on the int'l treaty on global warming. Then the U.S. changed its tune and walked away, while other nations honored terms, ratified the treaty, and got to work.
- The U.S. can't persuade other countries to get on board if it continues to pursue an energy policy that's bad for the environment. America's refusal to do more has also driven a wedge between the U.S. and the rest of the world.
- We need to connect the dots between our energy choices, the global environment, and national and global security.
- The most unfair thing of all would be to pass the buck to future generations. It will either be a tale of courageous and farsighted action, or one of incomprehensible neglect and irresponsibility.
- Let's work together to shape a new agreement that's more to our liking, instead of sitting on the sidelines. There's bipartisan political support and strong public support for getting back on track, and no excuse for doing nothing.

17E. "WHAT YOU PROPOSE WOULD RESTRICT OUR CHOICES AND COMPROMISE SAFETY."

- Of course our kids' health and safety should be the standard. We should demand cleaner-running cars that protect kids from air pollution, the severe climate disruptions brought on by global warming, and the economic vulnerability that comes from America's dependence on oil. And we should demand well-designed cars that protect us from harm on the highway. We have the technical ingenuity to do both.
- Right now, we have the technical ingenuity to build cleaner cars and still ensure that consumers have choice, performance, and safety. We can put better engines in today's safety-conscious cars, cut the carbon dioxide emissions that contribute to global warming, and save money in the long run.
- History teaches us that big companies often use these kinds of arguments to block important health and safety regulations—and that their arguments are usually wrong.
- It makes sense to start America's move toward a smart energy future in the transportation sector, where we get so much bang for our buck. Cars/trucks use 2/3 of our oil and account for 1/3 of our contribution to the blanket of carbon dioxide over Earth. Lifting average fuel efficiency to 40 mpg by 2012 would save almost as much oil every day as we imported from Saudi Arabia in all of 2001. Hybrids already achieve that level of fuel efficiency, without sacrificing safety. Hybrid owners save thousands of dollars on gas over the life of the car. It's a win-win situation.

17F. "FACE IT, OIL IS GOING TO BE CENTRAL FOR A VERY LONG TIME."

- As long as we're overly dependent on oil, no matter where it comes from, our economy will be vulnerable. Let's free our future from the grip of oil with a bold new energy strategy.
- Oil was the foundation of a wonderful 20th-century energy system. But our dependence on oil has become environmentally harmful, economically stifling, and politically destabilizing. Oil is our past, not our future.
- The global transition away from oil has already started. Here's the choice: We can help lead in creating a better global energy future, or we can hold things back—not the American way.
- We diversify personal investments when planning a sound financial future; let's diversify our energy "portfolio."
- Oil is a shaky foundation for the future; 2/3 of the world's oil supply is in the Middle East. Even if we didn't get a drop of oil from that region, a disruption there can still hurt the global economy, which hurts ours.
- Clean, sustainable energy alternatives are already taking hold around the world—just like the automobile pushed out the horse-and-buggy a century ago. We won't end dependence on oil overnight; we need transitional strategies. But using this as an excuse for inaction is irresponsible and shortsighted.
- Americans pioneered new energy technologies, but now we're lagging. If we apply American ingenuity and can-do spirit, we can speed up the global transition to a clean-energy future that's better for us and for everyone.

17G. "YOU'RE UNREALISTIC. ... YOURS ARE PIPEDREAM TECHNOLOGIES."

- No one can look at the history of American innovation and say this is beyond our capacity. Of course we need to take interim steps. But the important thing is to apply our ingenuity and can-do spirit to speeding up the transition.
- A different energy future is within reach. Nothing in this vision is beyond our capacity to achieve, if government, business, and citizens work together.
- We know it can be done because it's already happening. Hybrids are selling faster than expected. ... Wind power is the world's fastest-growing energy source. ... Costs of wind/solar are becoming competitive with oil/coal.
- Just as past leaders made it a national priority to put a man on the moon and asked citizens to help make it happen, we can make it a national priority to change our energy future—and reap the benefits in cleaner, cheaper energy and new high-tech jobs. We have the know-how and can-do spirit—now we need the commitment.
- Many U.S. corporate leaders are pushing the U.S. to invest in clean-energy technologies because they see other countries preparing to take the lead in the inevitable global transition. These hard-headed CEOs—not known for having "pipedreams"—want the U.S. to share in the revenues/jobs that will be created by a new energy economy.