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In every part of the world, the United States and the European Union continue to face a host of security challenges that threaten world stability. Because of the world’s increasingly connected and complicated nature, an abundance of opportunities exists for cooperation between the US and EU to address these issues. Together, the US and EU possess great capacities, resources, and influence that can be mobilized to tackle the most pressing contemporary global security challenges.

As allies with common interest in securing a less violent, more stable world, the US and EU must collaborate to address pressing foreign policy issues. This report aims to propose recommendations for US-led policy initiatives that involve the help of Europe within four pressing regions of the world.

AFRICA

Economic conditions are spurring violent extremism and mass migration. The US is interested in a stable Africa because if its challenges are left unaddressed, the refugee and migrant crisis will continue—with the potential to catalyze the spread of violence, to further destabilize the region, and to worsen humanitarian conditions within the area. This report focuses on integrating internally displaced persons, curbing corruption, minimizing conflict, and addressing refugee displacement and mass migration as steps to stabilize the region through Somalia, South Sudan, Nigeria, and Libya.

ASIA

China’s alarming behavior in the South China Sea has grave military, economic, and environmental implications. The US is interested in addressing Chinese aggression and disregard for international law, in order to prevent regional tensions from escalating into serious interstate conflict. This report focuses on effectively addressing this dispute through developing coordinated, multilateral intervention efforts in the area, based on relationships with the EU and other Asian nations.

LATIN AMERICA

Drug production and trafficking pose serious threats to world stability and public health. Because of proximity to the region and the effects of illegal drugs in the US, the US is interested in addressing drug production and trafficking and in mitigating instability in the region through economic development. This report focuses on reducing drug supply and demand, increasing international cooperation on drug control policy, improving law enforcement and intelligence capabilities in Colombia and Peru, and strengthening the rule of law by tackling corruption.

THE MIDDLE EAST

Failing states are causing an unprecedented
refugee and migrant crisis while also contributing to the growth of terrorist organizations. Given the massive number of people leaving the region, as well as increasing terrorist attacks, the US is interested in fully addressing the instability within the region. This report focuses on lessening the appeal of ISIS while rebuilding Iraq, strengthening counterterrorism operations in Yemen, addressing refugee spillover in Lebanon by urging international negotiations over the Syrian Civil War, and combating smuggling associated with the migrant and refugee crisis.

This report examines the strengths of these recommendations and considers risks and costs. Our goal is to present achievable adjustments to US policy that will contribute to a more stable world.
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GLOSSARY

AQIM - Al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb
AU - African Union
EU - European Union

INTERNALLY DISPLACED PERSONS (IDPs) - As it is defined, Internally Displaced Peoples are persons who have been forced to flee their homes as a result of violence, human rights violations, or natural disasters but have not crossed an internationally recognized State border.

ISIS - Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant

MIGRANT - A person who chooses to move in hopes to improve their lives by finding work, education or family reunion

NGO - Non-governmental Organization

REFUGEES - Persons fleeing armed conflict or persecution and have crossed an internationally recognized State border

SPLM - The Sudan’s People Liberation Movement

SPLM-IO - The Sudan People’s Liberation Movement-in-Opposition

SSA - Sub-Saharan Africa

UNHCR - United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

UNOCHA - United Nations Office of Humanitarian Access

US - United States
In Africa, there are over 12.5 million internally displaced people and over 4 million refugees due to violent conflict in fragile states.\(^1\) This report focuses on internally displaced peoples, refugee displacement, and migration in Somalia, South Sudan, Nigeria, and Libya, and offers recommendations for EU and US cooperation. If left unaddressed, the refugee and migrant crisis has the potential to catalyze the spread of violent extremism, to further destabilize affected regions, and to deteriorate the humanitarian conditions of these countries. As these countries become more stable, the United States and the European Union can better pursue humanitarian solutions and economic relationships with these countries.

**KENYA**

Citing national security concerns, the government of Kenya is moving to close Dadaab, the world’s largest refugee camp, located in Garissa County, Kenya. The 1991 Somali drought and Civil War prompted the international community to create Dadaab in Kenya’s northern province. Today, Dadaab houses upwards of 300,000 Somali refugees. Now, Kenya wants to shut it down and repatriate the refugees. The Uhuru Kenyatta administration is motivated by the belief that terrorist group al-Shabaab is using the camp to plan attacks in Kenya. However, there is no evidence of terrorist activity in Dadaab. Closing the camp would displace over 300,000 Somalis, pushing them into dangerous areas of Somalia and hindering the ability of non-governmental organizations and other humanitarian efforts to provide aid to refugees. We recommend that the US increases counterterrorism aid to Kenya through the Counterterrorism Partnership Fund in exchange for the continued operation of Dadaab, engages in multilateral talks focused on developing alternative solutions to Kenya’s refugee issues, and, within those talks, encourages Kenya to grant Dadaab refugees the right to work.

**NIGERIA**

Since gaining its independence in 1960, Nigeria has lost over $400 billion in oil revenue, largely due to political corruption.\(^2\) These crimes stunted the country’s growth and caused high unemployment, allowing for the rise of extremist groups like Boko Haram that are seeking power and opportunity. Additionally, Nigeria’s poor economic conditions caused over 100,000 economic migrants to move from northern Nigeria to Europe in search of economic opportunity. Since assuming office in 2015, President Muhammadu Buhari has shown his commitment to charging previous political appointees with theft and tackling corruption to develop the Nigerian economy. Thus far, President Buhari recovered $9.1 billion in stolen money and assets and will likely secure much more. We recommend that the US and the EU work together to accelerate


this process and in turn, reduce the number of migrants from Nigeria.

SOUTH SUDAN

As Africa’s newest country, South Sudan is marred by ethnic and political fragmentation since 2013. Originally beginning as political infighting between President Salva Kiir and former Vice President Riek Machar, South Sudan’s civil war became a destructive conflict resulting in over 1.6 million internally displaced persons (IDP). With President Kiir belonging to the Dinka ethnic group (largest group in South Sudan) and former VP Machar belonging to the Nuer ethnic group (second largest), the conflict caused mass ethnic cleansing from rebel groups on both sides. Throughout its three-year period, the South Sudan Civil War prompted calls for ceasefires and peace agreements, though fighting resumed shortly after. Now, South Sudan remains a fragile society with lack of trade, development, and legitimacy. The country is an arena for illicit activities that conflict with US and EU interests. To assist in alleviating humanitarian conditions in South Sudan, we recommend that the US and EU provide support to vulnerable areas in displacement camps and work to strengthen an integrative security strategy for violent conflict in the Sub-Saharan region through AFRICOM and the African Union.

LIBYA

Ever since the ousting of late Colonel Muammar Gaddafi in February 2011 by a NATO-led coalition, Libya plunged into anarchy with multiple factions competing for power. As a result of the country’s destabilization, Libya effectively became a backdoor to Europe for most African migrants. In addition, the country’s instability attracted vicious terrorist groups such as Ansar al-Sharia (ASL) and the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), which not only pose a threat to North Africa’s security but to Europe’s and the United States’ security as well. Thus, we propose that the United States and EU engage in capacity building within Libya to help create a robust and resilient Libyan government in the hope of re-establishing order and stability in the country.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We propose that the US:
1. Promotes stability and governance in South Sudan by supporting humanitarian relief and collaborating with the African Union on a regional cooperation strategy to prevent future violent conflict.
2. Encourages sustained economic development in the Nigerian local economy, along with that of the EU, through multilateral anti-corruption efforts and employment initiatives.
3. Supports alternative and sustainable solutions to address Kenya’s Somali refugee population and engage in multilateral counterterrorism initiatives with the Kenyan government.
4. Engages in civil society capacity development to create effective and sustainable local institutions.
RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Collaborate with the EU on expanding access to humanitarian and food relief in high-conflict Nuba Mountains and Blue Nile areas by supporting the World Food Program (WFP) and the United Nations Office of Humanitarian Access (UNOCHA).

2. Strengthen cooperation and governance in African Union countries by increasing regional and multilateral efforts against violent conflict and refugee displacement in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA).

BACKGROUND

The South Sudan Civil War exemplifies the devastating humanitarian consequences of conflict. Currently, South Sudan’s severe instability and political insecurity threaten the US’s trade and diplomatic relationships with the country. After South Sudan gained independence from Sudan in 2011, the country has been marred by political violence and ethnic conflict. President Salva Kiir initially led South Sudan’s ruling political party, Sudan’s People Liberation Movement, but the group soon split into the Sudan’s People Liberation Movement (SPLM) and the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement-in-Opposition (SPLM-IO). In 2013, political infighting erupted into political and ethnic violence across the country. Soldiers from the Dinka ethnic group aligned with Dinka member President Kiir (SPLM), and soldiers from the second largest ethnic group, Nuer, sided with Nuer Rebel leader and former Vice President Riek Machar (SPLM-IO).

Since the beginning of the conflict in 2013, there have been over 1.66 million Internally Displaced Persons (IDP) within the country\(^3\) and over 715,000 refugees who fled the country\(^4\). This is a humanitarian crisis that exacerbates hunger and food security issues, gender-based violence, and a loss of infrastructure.

PROPOSAL AND IMPLEMENTATION

Peace agreements between both groups have been signed, but commitments shortly

---

deteriorated afterwards. As of July 10, 2016, the conflict has resumed, leading to more deteriorating conditions in displacement camps and thwarting any hope for stability in the country. The ethnic and political conflict started a mass migration of people fleeing violence in search of safety. Now, the basic needs of displaced people must be addressed, with the most urgent needs being food aid and other humanitarian relief. While NGOs, international governments, and aid organizations are responding to the South Sudan crisis, high-conflict areas, such as the Blue Nile and the Nuba Mountains, face limited access to humanitarian aid. The US should encourage the EU to provide more financial support to these areas in order to increase access to humanitarian aid. While United Nations (UN Mission in South Sudan) and African Union Peacekeeping Forces are deployed in critical areas of the country, additional regional cooperation through the African Union and AFRICOM is necessary. The South Sudan conflict is mostly internal, but there is a high potential for a spillover effect in neighboring fragile states like the Central African Republic and the Democratic Republic of Congo. If international borders are left unprotected, the conflict could become a notable security concern to US and EU interests.

We propose a two-fold strategy that prioritizes humanitarian relief and security cooperation in South Sudan. The US should:

- Coordinate with the EU to develop sustained humanitarian aid efforts to high-risk, vulnerable eastern regions through the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs.
- Develop a long-term security cooperation strategy with the EU, AFRICOM, and the African Union for peacekeeping efforts and future conflict prevention.

CHALLENGES AND COSTS

As an indication of governance to other nations, it is critical for South Sudan’s government and citizens to agree to a permanent peace settlement within the next year. South Sudan’s vulnerable state continues to fracture the country’s economic and political relations with the US and EU. In 2013, the US’s Africa Growth and Opportunity Act designated South Sudan an eligible country for trade benefits providing South Sudan an opportunity to continue opening and building markets. US and EU relations with South Sudan and Sub-Saharan Africa are jeopardized if the US does not address South Sudan’s internal conflict. If this policy proposal is not followed, an international intervention may be necessary. By comparison to international actors, the African Union and AFRICOM would likely have a deeper impact and greater resolve to end the conflict and foster stability.
NIGERIA
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TO MITIGATE MIGRATION

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Pressure Nigerian government to implement anti-corruption measures in government
2. Engage local governments to direct more resources to the North for employment initiatives, job creation, and infrastructure building

BACKGROUND

Political corruption in Nigeria has led to the rise of Boko Haram and the movement of people to Italy through Libya. These issues concern the US because they threaten international security and economic stability in the EU. Since 2009, Boko Haram has terrorized northern Nigeria and attacked neighboring Chad and Cameroon. Additionally, Nigerian immigration to Italy increased by 37% since 2015 with more than 70% being denied legal status because of their nationality. The concern is that despite this, immigrants stay in Italy with an “illegal status.”

The short term response to these issues are military efforts and increased border control, but the US and EU will continue to see these issues in the long run—maybe in different forms—until corruption is addressed.

Since its independence in 1960, Nigeria has lost over $400 billion in oil revenue to political corruption. Political corruption has specifically impacted the Muslim North where poverty is as high as 91%, compared to the South which averages no more than 27%. This economic disparity manifests in young Muslim men being unable to find jobs, which prohibits them from marriage, leaving them in without dignity and in a socially ambiguous position. These conditions inspired Muhammad Yusuf

to found Boko Haram in 2003 as a community development organization providing jobs and a Muslim education in his northern community. Unfortunately, following the execution of Muhammad Yusuf by the Nigerian government in 2009, the group became a full-fledged terrorist organization with over 20,000 casualties via funding from Al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM). With similar values as its founder, Boko Haram now mobilizes new members by giving them a stable income, a wife, a weapon, and a greater sense of purpose by being part of a group. Another response to poverty has been the movement of over 100,000 Northern Nigerians to Italy, through Libya, in search of economic refuge. Boko Haram and Nigerian migration is a direct result of government corruption and lack of economic opportunity in Nigeria, the north especially.

These economic issues will not be fixed until there is a political system of transparency and accountability, and a society with social mobility and infrastructure. Since assuming office in 2015, President Muhammadu Buhari has shown his commitment to addressing corruption by arresting and persecuting political appointees who are suspected of stealing government money. Thus far, President Buhari has returned $9.1 billion in stolen money and assets to the government and is likely to secure much more, but locating funds from up to 60 years ago is extremely difficult. Moving forward it is necessary for Nigeria to follow through on its anticorruption campaign and focus development on northern Nigeria.

PROPOSAL AND IMPLEMENTATION

We propose that the US, with EU joint action, pressure Nigeria to take steps towards a less corrupt government.

1) The US should discuss with Nigeria policies for preventing future corruption in the government and emphasizing enforcement of these policies. Currently, there are laws in place, such as limiting the amount of money that can be taken out of Nigeria, but weak enforcement allows people to ignore these laws with a simple bribe.

2) The US should collaborate with Nigeria to increase its focus on economic development in the North through increased financial support. In order to deter people from joining Boko Haram and migrating to Europe, this plan should emphasize:
   a. Creating jobs
   b. Job training
   c. Creating infrastructure for Muslim education
   d. Poverty alleviation

Osun Youth Empowerment Scheme (O’YES), for example, is an organization in the south of Nigeria that targets youth unemployment. Expanding organizations such as this in the North could have a huge impact. Currently, this organization is only able to accept 8 percent of its applicants, but by providing more government support, it can expand even more.\textsuperscript{18}

The US should approach these policies as a partnership between us and Nigeria. However, if Nigeria fails to make significant changes, the US can deploy public diplomacy and economic sanctions. The US can criticize corruption in Nigeria, make foreign aid contingent on their cooperation, and pressure companies that do business with Nigeria, such as Shell, to cease business until the country implements US recommendations.

CHALLENGES AND COSTS

There are several challenges to implementing this policy.

1. While increasing economic opportunities could reduce the supply of volunteers joining Boko Haram, that group often takes people by force. Since 2009, the group has kidnapped over 2,000 women and girls, who were forced into marriage or used as suicide bombers.\textsuperscript{19}

2. Boko Haram loosely translates to “Western education is a sin.”\textsuperscript{20} Therefore, having the cooperation of the US and the EU may anger Boko Haram further.

3. There is a concern that even if the US uses public diplomacy and gets Nigeria to cut down on corruption, conditions in the North will not improve.


KENYA
DADAAB REFUGEE CAMP

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Prevent Dadaab’s closure by increasing counterterrorism aid to Kenya through the Counterterrorism Partnership Fund (CTPF).
2. Encourage President Kenyatta to engage in multilateral talks to discuss alternative solutions to Kenya’s refugee issues.
3. Persuade the Kenyatta administration to grant refugees the right to work.

BACKGROUND

The US seeks a stable East Africa—one without 300,000 refugees. However, Kenya plans to shut down Dadaab, the world’s largest refugee camp, for national security reasons. Through the camp, Kenya has sheltered Somalis escaping the Somali civil war for the past 25 years. Closing Dadaab would displace over 345,000 refugees, 95 percent of whom are Somali and many of whom only know life in the camp.

The announcement to shut down Dadaab follows increased aggression from the terrorist group al-Shabaab. Since Kenya deployed its military to Somalia in 2011, al-Shabaab has attacked Nairobi’s Westgate Mall in 2013 and Garissa University in 2015. Gun and grenade attacks in Kenya have increased as well. Kenyan officials now believe al-Shabaab operates within Dadaab, calling them “hotbeds for Islamist extremism.” However, the country possesses no proof of terrorist activity within the camp.


informal economy, and democratic elections,\(^{29}\) has fostered a “subdued but tolerant society in which women are more emancipated than their sisters back in Somalia.”\(^{30}\) Dadaab’s closure would likely engender hostility towards Kenya in the refugees since they would lose access to basic resources and lack a clear and legal way to obtain them.

When Kenya threatened to close Dadaab in 2012, Kenya, Somalia, and the UNHCR negotiated a tripartite agreement regarding the repatriation of Somali refugees. Four years later, it is evident the agreement only delayed Kenya’s plans to shut the camp down. Although this is not the first time Kenya has moved to close Dadaab, it is the first time the country has dissolved its Department of Refugee Affairs,\(^{31}\) created a repatriation task force, and set aside $10 million to facilitate the repatriation process.

Thus far, UN High Commissioner for Refugees Filippo Grandi,\(^ {32}\) Nobel Prize Laureate Malala Yousafzai,\(^ {33}\) UN Secretary General Ban ki-Moon, German Prime Minister Angela Merkel, Ethiopian Prime Minister Hailemariam Desalegn, and US President Barack Obama have each urged President Kenyatta to reconsider his stance.\(^ {34}\) NGOs such as Amnesty International, Refugees International, and Human Rights Watch have condemned the plan also. However, Kenyatta has refused to abandon plans.

**PROPOSAL AND IMPLEMENTATION**

We advise the US to increase counterterrorism aid to Kenya through the Counterterrorism Partnership Fund (CTPF) on condition that Dadaab remains open. The CTPF provides funding to counterterrorism partners to promote stability in East Africa and combat regional terrorist groups, including al-Shabaab.\(^ {35}\) The Department of Defense recommends allocating $200 million to the CTPF for operations in East Africa in fiscal year 2017. We endorse their recommended amount if it is sufficient to persuade President Kenyatta. Increased CTPF is the best possible incentive given Kenya’s concern that Dadaab has become a shelter for al-Shabaab and given US interests in preventing al-Shabaab from gaining power in the region.

President Obama ought to push President Kenyatta to engage in multilateral talks in order to develop new approaches to support refugees and delay Dadaab’s closure. The two leaders’ previous partnership on counterterrorism in Kenya makes President Obama one of the best suited advocates to approach Kenyatta.\(^ {36}\) To bolster the position of the US, the closure’s opponents—Germany, Ethiopia, Somalia—should receive invitations

---

\(^ {30}\) Ibid.
\(^ {31}\) “From here to eternity” The Economist.
to the talks with Kenya. Further, the US should encourage Uganda to join the talks because of Uganda’s geographical location and its successful approach to integrating refugees into their economy.\textsuperscript{37} Uganda allows refugees the right to work and a degree of free movement. Together, these factors have allowed one-fifth of the refugees Uganda hosts to create jobs for Ugandans and other refugees.\textsuperscript{38} In contrast, Kenya requires refugees to possess pass for them to leave Dadaab\textsuperscript{39} and legally forbid refugee employment.\textsuperscript{40}

In these discussions, countries should urge Kenya to grant refugees work permits as a way of using Dadaab to Kenya’s advantage. The country continues to squander an economic asset—the refugees—by refusing to grant them the right to work. A 2010 study found that Dadaab’s inhabitants attract $14 million to surrounding areas each year.\textsuperscript{41} The same study found that refugee-run businesses within the camps have an annual turnover of about $25 million. If Kenya realizes the economic value of its refugee population, it is less likely to shut down Dadaab in the future.

**CHALLENGES AND COSTS**

Several challenges present themselves: anti-refugee sentiment in Kenya, the Kenyatta administrations public pledges, the lack of US credibility with regards to refugees, and congressional opposition to the CTPF.

A heightened level of anti-refugee sentiment among Kenyans puts pressure on President Kenyatta to act against the refugees.\textsuperscript{42} The attacks on Westgate Mall and Garissa University have engendered fear among Kenyans. Government officials redirected the citizens’ fear towards refugees when they claimed to have evidence al-Shabaab attacked from Dadaab.\textsuperscript{43} The sentiment threatens the possibility of Kenyatta reversing the plans.

Kenyatta administration’s public pledges to close Dadaab pose another challenge to our recommendations. The administration views walking back its promise as a threat to its domestic and international credibility. If Kenyatta reneges on his plan to close Dadaab, he will not want citizens to think he bowed to pressure from the West. Instead, Kenyatta may frame the threat to close Dadaab as a way of manipulating the international community into providing Kenya more resources.

The US must worry about its own credibility. Kenya has made statements accusing Western countries of neglecting their duties to the refugees.\textsuperscript{44} The West’s unwillingness to host a comparable amount of refugees undermines its ability to negotiate with Kenya.

The lack of congressional support for CTPF funding poses a challenge.\textsuperscript{45} Members of the House and Senate objected to fully fund

\textsuperscript{37} Kingsley, “Kenya tells UK to resettle refugees,” The Guardian.

\textsuperscript{38} “From here to eternity,” The Economist.


\textsuperscript{41} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{42} Curtis, “Kenya Wants To Shut Down Refugee Camp,” UN Dispatch.


\textsuperscript{44} Kingsley, “Kenya tells UK to resettle refugees,” The Guardian.

the CTPF in December 2014. The CTPF, according to Rep. Tammy Duckworth (D-IL), would allow the President “a lot of leeway that really hampers Congress’s oversight mission.”

46 Ibid.
LIBYA
MAPPING MEDITERRANEAN MIGRATION

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Promote power sharing agreements between the central Libyan government and the western militia factions in the west
2. Initiate defense capacity building to promote local and regional security
3. Engage in civil society capacity development to create effective and sustainable local institutions

BACKGROUND

Libya’s instability not only placed a humanitarian crisis on the EU’s doorstep, but it also placed a security crisis that both the US and the EU should be gravely concerned about—considering the rise of ISIL and al-Sharia in several Libyan provinces: Tripoli, Nofilia, Derna, Benghazi, and Sirte. Additionally, Libya is only about 1,000 miles away from Italy, which should make Europe even more concerned.

Following Gaddafi’s regime targeting of civilians during peaceful protests in February 2011, the United Nations Security Council (UNSCR) adopted a series of resolutions to protect Libyan civilians against the regime’s indiscriminate violence and repression. To alleviate the Libyan crisis and prevent a massive government crackdown on protesters, a coalition of NATO allies and partners intervened militarily, leading to the capture and death of Gaddafi, thus ending his 42-year regime. As a result of this newly created power vacuum, the country fell into chaos, effectively becoming a failed state due to the competition between multiple centers of powers. In addition, Libya’s destabilization transformed it into the main passageway for most African migrants seeking to relocate in Europe as well as making it a fertile ground for extremist groups. Today, the Libyan government - also known as the Tobruk government - only controls the eastern part of the country while competing against several jihadist groups as well as militias on the western front. It is imperative that the Libyan government becomes the predominant power player in Libya to re-establish stability, control the flow of African migrants to Europe,

and prevent the further rise of terrorist groups such as ISIL.

**PROPOSAL AND IMPLEMENTATION**

Libya’s stability is pivotal in mitigating the migration crisis in Europe, preventing the spread of violent extremism locally and abroad through radical groups as well as promoting stability in the North African region. To help restore stability in Libya, we recommend that the US:

1. Urge the United Nations (UN) to continue pushing forward peace efforts between the Libyan government and the following opposition groups: The Libya Dawn Militia Alliance, the Toubou Militia as well as the Tuareg forces. Such efforts would aim at creating power sharing agreements amongst the aforementioned parties in order to deescalate the violence. The reason why this approach is preferred as opposed to assisting the government overwhelm the aforementioned militias militarily, is to avoid further destabilization of the country, which would lead to more civilian casualties, a costlier and protracted internal conflict, and the creation of more extremist groups through marginalization.

2. Urge NATO and EU member states to assist the Libyan government with the necessary military and intelligence tools to build a robust defense capability so that they can contain and counteract rising terror groups, disrupt the illicit trafficking networks that put the lives of thousands of migrants going to Europe at risk, and help it maintain relative military superiority over its competitors. For example, such military and intelligence equipment would include aerial intelligence tools such as advanced radar systems to track migrants or find enemy locations, coast guards ships, additional helicopters to tighten security on the coast, and armored vehicles to reduce Libyan soldiers’ casualties while giving them a comparative advantage on the battlefield.

3. Help the Libyan government engage in civil society capacity development in order to create effective and sustainable local institutions that will help them tackle their social, economic and democratic challenges.

Our recommendation stresses on the need of a US, EU, UN and NATO multilateral approach in assisting the Libyan government with political, economic, and military means to help it face its own challenges and move towards resilience and legitimacy.

**CHALLENGES AND COSTS**

1. Political feasibility of power sharing agreements: Implementations of power sharing agreements between the Libyan government and the opposition groups would be very difficult because of the zero-sum approach that has been prominent across the region, where the trend is to physically eliminate the enemy.

2. Costs of US-EU initiatives: Any genuine capacity building effort in Libya would be prolonged and costly. Libya is a failed state and needs long-term capacity building development initiatives. Regardless of the costs, it is
in the interest of the US and the EU to take the necessary actions to help the Libyan government re-establish order. Otherwise, Libya will become a costlier and deadlier threat to the US and EU with the aggravation of the migration crisis as well as the spread of violent extremism.
GLOSSARY

- **APEC** - Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation
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China’s territorial claims within the South China Sea have resulted in an international dispute. China’s aggression and lack of respect for established international law has military, economic, and environmental concerns for the United States, the European Union, and the international community as a whole. The US must develop a unified stance with the EU and Asian nations to address the dispute multilaterally.

The Hague tribunal ruled China infringed on the UN convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) by interfering with the right of navigation, destroying the marine environment, and exploiting resources within the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) of the Philippines. China’s refusal to attend the tribunal and its denouncement of the verdict may escalate the situation. The US and EU thus far have failed to create a unified stance on the dispute. The US should empower other Asian countries involved to settle the dispute in accordance with international laws.

MILITARY

In the past two years, China has used vast dredging projects to create over 3,000 acres of island territory. These artificial islands are spread throughout the South China Sea, coming into close proximity with marine waters claimed by other Asian Nations, such as the Philippines, Brunei, and Vietnam. The artificial islands have been used to store military assets, extending China’s capacity to project power. Upon building these islands, China claims an air defense identification zone around them to prevent other nations from flying above them. These islands threaten the right to navigation in the South China Sea. This concerns the US military and the military of other nations who conduct exercises in this region. The US has national interests in the security of this sea and the security of their allies: the Philippines and Japan.

ECONOMICS

Of the $5.3 trillion in trade passing through the South China Sea annually, $1.2 trillion are with the US alone; therefore, right of navigation and stability in the region are essential to US economic interests. Moreover, China’s expanding territory includes oil and mineral deposits, fishing rights, and other resources in the sea. China’s actions threaten the stability of the economies that trade in that region, including those of the US, the EU, and other Asian nations.

ENVIRONMENT

The vast dredging project destroyed countless coral reefs, which are home to over 500

---


Executive Summary

and could put fisheries out of business. The dispute over the South China Sea concerns the US government as it can affect the health of future generations and will cause irreparable environmental damage.

Recommendations

2. Coordinate with the European Union, Australia, and other Asian Countries to assure there are no unilateral actors in the region.
3. Continue joint naval exercises in the South China Sea, but do not explicitly threaten war.
4. Consult the High Commission under the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South East Asia for a recommended settlement.
5. Create a platform for regional economic integration that includes economies across the Asia-Pacific region outside of the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) framework.
6. Encourage mechanisms in the region, such as the Coordinating Body for the Seas of East Asia (COBSEA), the Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia (PEMSEA), and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) to undertake projects to restore the environment, conserve biodiversity, and maintain a suitable level of fishing productivity of the area to meet human needs.
7. Engage in a pragmatic dialogue with China, emphasizing negative consequences of non-compliance with international maritime law: declined biodiversity, food insecurity due to depleted fishing stocks, and irreversible loss of species with medicinal benefits.
8. Support and persuade the East Asian countries to take the lead on the dispute in the South China Sea.
9. Encourage scientific cooperation between China and EU in a territory that borders the SCS. Then, propose advanced marine explorations in the SCS that serves legal purposes for building Marine Protected Zone criteria.
CHINA

SOUTH CHINA SEA: MILITARY CONCERNS

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Ratify UNCLOS.
2. Coordinate with the European Union, Australia, and other Asian countries to ensure that there are no unilateral actors in the region.
3. Continue joint naval exercises in the South China Sea, but do not explicitly threaten war.
4. Consult the High Commission under the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South East Asia for a recommended settlement.

US interests in Asia include maintaining stability in the region, protecting trade interests, and conserving the environment. Within the South China Sea, China has claimed territory through vast dredging projects and the creation of artificial islands. These islands, which are located throughout the South China Sea, house military facilities that pose a security threat to nearby countries. China is claiming historic rights to as much as 90% of the South China Sea based on the “Nine Dashed Line” [figure 1].

This claim extends to the resources within the territory including trading routes, fishing waters, oil and mineral deposits.

The islands threaten the sovereignty of countries sharing the South China Sea. China is claiming both an Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) and an air defense zone surrounding the artificial islands. This is a threat to the right to navigation and the right to fly for the international community. On at least one occasion, China has given the US military warnings for flights in proximity to Chinese-controlled islands.

The international community is concerned with the infringements on sovereign territories and the accumulation of military equipment on the artificial islands. According to the High Representative of the European Council, the EU is concerned with the possibly deployment of missiles from the artificial islands. As the United

6 R. Sutter and C. Huang, “Comparative Connections.”
States are strategic allies with the Philippines and Japan, they have national interests in the security of the South China Sea.

Under UNCLOS, 166 countries agreed to follow a set of guidelines concerning trading zones, navigation rights, and environmental protection. In 2013, China seized a reef already claimed by the Philippines. The Philippines considered China’s aggression a threat to their sovereignty and sought legal retribution. The Hague Tribunal ruled China violated the agreement by claiming territory that extends beyond the UNCLOS.

China refused to participate in the Hague Tribunal. Post-decision, they have announced they will not be following the ruling. The Hague Tribunal does not have the means to enforce this decision, but rather relies on the agreement settled in UNCLOS. The EU has a position consistent with the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South East Asia (TAC): discouraging militarization of the region, discouraging the use of threat of force, and discouraging unilateral actions. They support ASEAN-led processes to maintain a rules-based international order in the region. As China is a member of TAC, the United States should advocate for the High Council to recommend a settlement.

The United States plans to continue their naval and air force exercises in the region to maintain their right to navigation. While France supports this measure, the rest of the EU is hesitant to become involved militarily. Currently, the US is attempting to establish a Principle Security Network—an inclusive measure where countries conduct naval exercises together in the South China Sea. It is an opportunity to come together and work with all nations. An initiative such as this could prevent China from isolating themselves by encouraging them to join forces with the international community.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION

We propose that the United States should:

Ratify UNCLOS
- UNCLOS creates a right to innocent passage through and over territorial seas of coastal states, establishes an EEZ, and commits countries to protecting the marine environment surrounding their country.
- The US Chamber of Commerce, military personnel, and National Resource Defense Council are all in favor of ratifying UNCLOS.
- This would require bipartisan support gained by lobbying congress. Educating the public on the benefits of UNCLOS will draw attention to the issue, creating a platform for congress to discuss the possibility of ratifying it.

Coordinate with the European Union to ensure there are no unilateral actors in the region.
- The US and EU should empower ASEAN countries to take the lead on

addressing this issue.

- As the EU is focused on Brexit and a refugee crisis, they cannot afford to be as active in the South China Sea. Working with Asian countries by training military personnel, conducting joint naval exercises, or sending peace keepers is in the EU's interest. It will cost the EU less to take on these initiatives than to have an unstable economy in the South China Sea.

Continue joint naval exercises in the South China Sea, but do not explicitly threaten war.

- The US should continue to run joint naval exercises in the South China Sea with our high capability allies, such as Australia, Japan, and France. This will assert right to navigation by convincing China to back down.

- The US should continue to pursue the Principle Security Network, as it is inclusive and would discourage China from isolating itself.

Consult the High Commission under TAC for a recommended settlement.

- The Treaty would provide a legal framework to approach a recommended settlement. This could then be negotiated by other nations. It would also encourage Asian countries to take the lead on addressing China's behavior in regards to the issue.

COSTS AND CHALLENGES

The US has failed to ratify the UNCLOS based on concerns of losing sovereignty to the international community. This sends the message to China that the US holds themselves accountable to the same laws they are enforcing. It is argued the US is already following the treaty and therefore do not need to sign it. However, if the US is currently abiding by the law, it would require fewer changes and costs to implement. This creates further challenges because agreement between Democrats and Republicans will be essential for UNCLOS to be ratified in congress. It may not be politically feasible to ratify UNCLOS unless China is seen as more or a threat or groups begin to lobby their congressmen.

China could consider the naval exercises a threat to its territory and start a war. It does not benefit the US to do joint naval exercises with China under the Principle Security Network if China is threatening to use force to keep its islands. Moreover, this measure could backfire if China feels threatened by the involvement other nations in the South China Sea. However, it is likely China will accept the invitation as a means of saving face in the international community. The Principle Security Network would have limited costs as the US is already conducting joint exercises in the region.

If China is currently ignoring the Hague Tribunal, it is unlikely China will consider another legal measure seriously. Without a means of enforcement, the rulings on the case are ineffective. The US must find a means of enforcing the tribunal without overextending its military or overreaching its boundaries. This will require communication between the US, the EU, and other Asian countries to create a unified action plan.
RECOMMENDATION

Create a platform for regional economic integration that includes Asia-Pacific countries outside of the TPP framework.

BACKGROUND

The US economic strategy in the Asian Pacific has been guided by 1) growth and jobs, 2) upholding and updating the rules of the international economic order, and 3) supporting America’s long-term presence in the region. Since the start of Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), the US has promoted regional economic integration with other member countries. One recent effort was TPP, a free trade deal between US, Canada, and ten countries in the Asian-Pacific region. Countries in proximity to China that have favorable trading with the West include Japan, South Korea, Malaysia, Brunei, Vietnam, and Singapore. TPP was established to balance China’s economic mass with its neighbors’ needs. However, due to the current political climate, and in order to ensure America’s long-term presence in the region, efforts for economic integration outside of the TPP should be amplified. China’s reclamation of the South China Sea and construction of artificial islands is an economic strategy meant to establish a 200-mile EEZ that redefines the established international law. This EEZ allows China to maintain influence in its neighboring countries, which could damage the regional economy, as it negatively impacts free trade and local countries’ economic autonomy. Ultimately, the EEZ makes it expensive for American and European ships to navigate alternative routes.

The South China Sea contributes to growth and jobs by connecting markets in East Asia with those in the Middle East and Europe. It is estimated that half of all commercial shipping passes through the South China Sea, amounting to $5.3 trillion annually, $1.2 trillion with the US specifically. The South China Sea is rich in resources, accounting for over ten percent of the world’s fisheries production, and contains oil, natural gas, and mineral deposits beneath the seabed. It is estimated that one third of

global crude oil and over half of global liquefied natural gas passes through the South China Sea annually.15

The 1973 creation of the UNCLOS spurred the creation of many international treaties due to their strategic importance in maintain stability in the region. UNCLOS helps define territorial claims to maritime waters and economic rights within them.16 The ASEAN and China also agreed upon multilateral risk reduction and confidence-building measures in the 2002 Declaration on the Conduct of Parties in the South China Sea (DOC).17 These treaties have been violated by China, as their reclamation and construction threatens the rules of the international economic order.18 The Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP) in 2012 was an attempt to offer a TPP alternative that excluded the US and included China. Many would agree that the RCEP and TPP could join goals to establish an Asia Pacific free zone, but the TPP and RCEP are different.

PROPOSAL AND IMPLEMENTATIONS

1. Urge EU and US collaboration to create a platform for regional economic integration that includes economies across the Asia-Pacific region. This will allow China’s neighbors to leverage US and EU economies and shift the balance of trade from China without actively moving against that regional power, giving China’s neighbors more economic and political freedom. This will be achieved by following the TPP framework and implementing policies that:
   - Increase comprehensive market accessibility among China’s neighboring countries by eliminating or reducing tariffs on goods that the West exports, but China does not, and on non-Chinese goods that the West has a high interest in.
   - Promote the development of production, supply chains, and seamless trade to enhance efficiency and raise living standards that will help facilitate cross-border integration.
   - Address the development of the digital economy and the small state-owned enterprises within the Asian Pacific region.
   - Include trade elements that ensure trade capacity building in order to allow all economies within the region to engage in such trade agreements.

With the recent Brexit vote’s negative effect on EU and UK economies, Europe does not have the political oxygen to spare in the stifling process of creating new trading policies with China’s neighbors. This does not mean that the EU is uninterested; if it can be involved with only a small amount of political energy, it is likely to do so. Therefore, the US should urge the EU to participate in these programs because EU connectivity around the world could make a difference.

CHALLENGES AND COSTS

The current TPP will have to pay the cost of establishing a platform of economic integration in the Asia Pacific region. The APEC forum that has also aimed for regional economic integration in the Asia-Pacific region would be
a great asset to raise funds, as APEC is a venue for foreign ministers from around the region to discuss trade and investment liberalization and capacity building. Additionally, for many years US companies have faced barriers in the trade practice both at and behind the Asia Pacific countries’ border. Consequently, it is important to establish this trust among governments and companies through group interaction. Many might argue that establishing these policies would be redundant to the RCEP. However, the RCEP lacks provisions on issues such as labor, food safety, and the environment.
CHINA

ADDRESSING THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT CRISIS

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Encourage mechanisms in the region, such as COBSEA, PEMSEA, and ASEAN, to undertake projects to restore the environment, conserve biodiversity, and maintain a suitable level of fishing productivity of the area to meet human needs.

2. Engage in a pragmatic dialogue with China, emphasizing negative consequences of non-compliance with international maritime law: declined biodiversity, food insecurity due to depleted fishing stocks, and irreversible loss of species with medicinal benefits.

3. Support and persuade the East Asian countries to take the lead on the dispute in the South China Sea.

4. Encourage scientific cooperation between China and EU in a territory that borders the SCS. Then, propose advanced marine explorations in the SCS that serves legal purposes for building Marine Protected Zone criteria.

BACKGROUND

As a major maritime power, the United States has national interest in peacefully resolving the South China Sea crisis, in accordance with long-established principles of international law. As the US and EU member states are both parties to TAC, they have an obligation to de-escalate regional conflict. The US recognizes the commonly shared responsibility to protect our ocean against the threats of overfishing, marine pollution, and ocean acidification.

Over the last two years, China destroyed more than 40 square miles of coral reefs in the process of creating new islands, going against their agreement to protect ecosystems under UNCLOS.\(^1\) China’s dredging, land reclamation, and construction of artificial islands in the South China Sea created an ecological and geopolitical crisis.\(^2\) The United States has a vested interest in protecting the marine environment of the South China Sea.

The US and its allies have a powerful interest in access to marine ecosystems worldwide, including the ones in the South China Sea that

---

\(^{1}\) Ibid.
could supply potential medicines for future generations. Southeast Asia has more marine biodiversity than anywhere else in the world, with more than 500 species that have the potential to be used for medicinal purposes (see Figure 2). It is estimated that only ten percent of marine species in the region have been identified and described. This degree of biodiversity is tremendous and needs to be protected. Currently, China's island-building spree created an environmental crisis by exacerbating the destruction of the marine environment. In this regard, China not only threatens the sovereign rights of other nations, but also the health of future generations.

Tuna fisheries play a significant role in food security in the South China Sea region and worldwide, breed 40 percent of the world's tuna. Many regional countries enjoyed unhindered access to fishing in the South China Sea prior to China's territorial claims. Overall, fisheries are a multibillion dollar industry. These facts underscore the necessity of the US to act according to our national interests by protecting the marine environment and open access to marine fishing.

Currently, cooperation in the South China Sea takes place through the UNEP Programme COBSEA and PEMSEA. COBSEA is responsible for implementing the Action Plan for the Protection and Sustainable Development of the Seas of East Asia, which provides a comprehensive strategy to protect the environment. PEMSEA, which includes coastal states, aims to protect coral reefs, to prevent overfishing, to improve water quality, and to create greater preparedness for natural disasters and the effects of climate change.

PROPOSAL AND IMPLEMENTATION

We urge the US to launch a three-fold regional stability strategy focused on marine environment protection and inclusive capacity building for nations in the South China Sea:

- Increased focus on developing regional coordination initiatives, such as COBSEA, PEMSEA, ASEAN. US-EU collaboration on trade agreements, or UNEP. These networks can pursue various projects to restore the environment, conserve biodiversity, and to maintain a suitable level of fishing productivity of the area to meet human needs. By strengthening the mechanisms, existing coping mechanisms and multilateral initiatives under the COBSEA or PEMSEA can reach the full potentials of mitigating negative effects on food and addressing the vulnerability of the marine ecosystem in the South China Sea. At the same time, the US should coordinate with the European Commission's Directorate General (DG) for Trade in promoting trade with Asian countries. This in turn will lead to more economic stability among the South China Sea claimants.
- Engage in a pragmatic dialogue with China, emphasizing negative consequences of non-compliance with

---

21 “Biodiversity of Southeast Asian Coral Reefs.”
23 “Action Plan for the Protection and Sustainable Development of the Marine and Coastal Areas of the East Asian Region,” UNEP

international maritime law: declined biodiversity, food insecurity due to depleted fishing stocks, and irreversible loss of species with medicinal benefits.

- Support and encourage the East Asian countries in South China Sea to take the lead on this dispute. The U.S should partner with the EU to serve facilitating roles, which would address China’s claims of their illegitimate involvement, and decrease the costs of being involved both financially and politically. Multilaterally, both the EU and the US can empower ASEAN to take the lead on adoption of a regional code of conduct with investigations into Marine Protected Zone Declarations.

- Engage in scientific cooperation between China and US-EU in a territory that borders the SCS with the intention of building trust in marine explorations. Then, propose advanced marine explorations that will cover the entire SCS that serves the legal purposes for building Marine Protected Zone criteria.

- The U.S should serve a facilitating role, and encourage the EU to do the same; this would minimize criticisms that US is overreaching and decrease both the financial and political costs of being involved. Multilaterally, both the EU and the US can empower ASEAN to take the lead on adoption of a regional code of conduct with investigations into Marine Protected Zone Declarations. Within the US, Congress and the American population must be convinced that the crisis needs to be addressed to gain bipartisan support. This support is necessary for funding to be directed towards this issue.

CHALLENGES AND COSTS

The challenge of implementing this policy lies in the funding and leadership of South China Sea intergovernmental organizations such as COBSEA, PEMSEA, or UNEP itself. It would be a heavy financial burden for the nations along the South China Sea that are developing states to meet the contribution to fund biodiversity restoration from the damages caused by China’s artificial island buildings. Historically speaking, most projects under the organizations have met with lots of difficulties due to lack of political and financial commitment from its participating states. It is still noteworthy to keep in mind the challenges in terms of seeking political support.

Encouraging and mediating a dialogue involving China may be difficult as China does not always recognize US legitimacy in the South China Sea.

China could question our intention of having bilateral scientific cooperation.

---

CHINA
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GLOSSARY

CAIC - Commission Against Impunity and Corruption
Carsi - Central America Regional Security Initiative
Copolad - Cooperation Programme on Drugs Policies with European Union
Dgdevco - European Union Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development
DTO - Drug Trafficking Organization
Eeas - Delegations from the European Union External Action Service
Iddnr - International Dialogue on Drug and Narcotics Regulation
NCPC - New Criminal Procedure Code
NGO - Nongovernmental Organization
NP - National Police
Oas - Organization of American States
PPO - Public Prosecutor’s Office
TOC - Transnational Organized Crime
UNODC - United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
USAID - United States Agency for International Development
In the 1960s, the United States shaped international drug policy by targeting the production of drugs at the source, creating incentives for international cooperation on drug control, and combating both illicit drug networks and the flow of drugs in transit. However, over the last few decades, these initial policies have not held up, instead leading to a public health crisis, mass incarceration, corruption, and black market-fueled violence. Governments are calling for a new approach, and reforms in some countries have spurred unprecedented momentum for change.

This momentum presents an opportunity to improve international drug policy to address current challenges. We recommend the US engages the EU in a multilateral partnership that empowers producer and transit countries to address drug and narcotic trafficking by:

1. Implementing domestic efforts in the US and EU to reduce demand for illicit drugs in consumer markets.
2. Engaging with Latin American partner countries to create development initiatives that provide alternative, legal opportunities for employment.
3. Increasing international cooperation on the regulation of narcotics and drugs through a multilateral task force between the US, EU, and Latin American countries.
4. Building partner capacities in Colombia and Peru.
5. Strengthening governmental institutions within the judicial sector of Mexico and Peru.
LATIN AMERICA
REDUCING DEMAND AND SUPPLY OF ILLICIT DRUGS

RECOMMENDATION

Establish a partnership with the European Union to reduce demand for illicit drugs in consumer markets and simultaneously enable producer and transit countries to reduce supply of illicit drugs.

BACKGROUND

A common interest of the US and EU is to reduce the demand for drugs and mitigate the health and social impacts of drug consumption. Other policy interests are the regional stability of Latin America and the containment of drug-trafficking organizations that thrive due to their role as suppliers of illicit drugs. This calls for a comprehensive approach to international drug control that focuses on both demand and supply reduction.

Illicit drug consumption in the United States and Europe contribute to violence in drug-trafficking countries. It also harms public health and jeopardizes economic progress by generating high health costs, lowering student academic performance, and increasing unemployment, crime, and lost productivity.¹ The US considers illicit drugs a threat to national security. The core goal of contemporary US international drug control efforts is to reduce the supply of illicit drugs, with the expectation that lower quantities in illicit drug markets will drive up prices and make drug consumption unaffordable for consumers.

US involvement in Latin American drug control policies places great focus on supply-side control efforts.² These actions include source-country control, interdiction, and domestic enforcement, but have largely failed to suppress the production and transit of illicit drugs.³ For example, from 2000 to 2005, the United States provided $3.8 billion in subsidies to the Colombian government in its fight against illicit drug producers and traffickers. However, the availability of drugs in consumer markets did not decrease significantly.⁴

³ C. Peter Rydell and Susan S. Everingham, Controlling Cocaine: Supply Versus Demand Programs, Vol. 331 (Rand Corporation, 1994).
⁴ Daniel Mejía and Pascual Restrepo, The War on Illegal Drugs in
remained consistent for two reasons: first, because drug cultivation, production, and trafficking hubs are able to shift from one country to another; and second, because the constant demand for illicit narcotics in consumer markets drives the supply for narcotics in producer and transit countries. Not only has the illegality of the narcotics failed in controlling their supply, it has also empowered criminal organizations by effectively giving them exclusive rights over a multibillion dollar market.⁵

Most international drug control policies place an overwhelming focus on suppressing the supply of illicit drugs, though economists suggest that targeting demand would be more effective.⁶ For example, a 1994 study showed that money spent on treatment of cocaine addiction, which targets demand, has a higher payoff than money spent on interdiction, which targets supply, in reducing illicit drug use.⁷ However, prisoner rehabilitation, job creation, and treatment for addiction are among the first programs countries cut when they face fiscal constraints. Front-line enforcement, in contrast, seems to enjoy unrestricted funding.⁸

POLICY PROPOSAL AND IMPLEMENTATION

We propose the United States establishes a partnership with the European Union to reduce the demand for illicit drugs in consumer markets and simultaneously empower producer and transit countries with alternative development measures to reduce the supply of illicit drugs.

DEMAND-SIDE POLICY APPROACH

We propose that the US urges the EU to mobilize public health agencies—the US Office of the Surgeon General and EU Directorate General for Food and Health Safety, respectively—in order to create a bilateral drug health committee tasked with the goal of reducing the demand for illicit drugs in consumer markets. This committee would take charge of the following tasks:

- Formulating, executing, and monitoring initiatives aimed at understanding drug consumption trends.
- Creating health care facilities to treat drug addiction. In this regard, the EU and US should follow Switzerland’s model of drug harm reduction policies, which treated addiction and greatly reduced drug-related crime and deaths.⁹
- Conducting public health campaigns aimed at discouraging illicit drug consumption.

SUPPLY-SIDE POLICY APPROACH

We recommend the US pools resources from the US Agency for International Development (USAID). We also recommend that the US encourages the EU to do the same with the EU Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development (DGDEVCO). We urge the US and EU to use these resources to create a joint development committee tasked with the goal of reducing the supply of illicit drugs through economic and technical support, as well as allowing greater drug control policy autonomy for producer and transit countries. These measures include:

- Implementing alternative crop production programs designed to reduce farmers’

⁵ Tom Wainwright, Narconomics: How to Run a Drug Cartel (United States-Public Affairs., 2016), p. 7.
⁶ Ibid., p. 6.
⁸ Wainwright, Narconomics: How to Run a Drug Cartel.
dependence on illicit cultivation by making legal crops more profitable. Mexican growers, in response to price shocks following the implementation of North Atlantic Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), started growing more marijuana and opium as legal crop prices plummeted.\textsuperscript{10} This suggests that an increase in the profitability of legal crops—such as corn, bananas, and coffee—could reduce the supply of illicit drugs. This measure would require providing agricultural subsidies to producer countries.

-Providing broader economic and technical assistance for economic development in Latin America in order to foster economic opportunity and decrease the incentives to engage in illicit drug activities. This economic assistance would take the form of education and legal income generation programs to increase participation in the legal economy.

-Giving partner countries in the supply chain greater decision-making in designing their own policy approach, given local conditions, constraints, and opportunities. Bolivia’s cooperative coca reduction program allows registered coca farmers to plant no more than approximately one-third the size of a football field. The results of this policy have been long-term coca cultivation reduction, decreased levels of violence, and greater ability to distinguish between Bolivians who rely on coca cultivation for traditional, cultural, and legal uses and those who grow the crop for illicit purposes.\textsuperscript{11}

Bolivia’s success in decreasing coca cultivation through cooperative coca reduction programs underscores the importance of empowering partner countries and their local actors in pursuing their own drug control strategies.

CHALLENGES AND COSTS

Policies designed to deemphasize the role of law enforcement efforts in disrupting illicit drug supply chains can expect opposition from interest groups that currently benefit from high defense and law enforcement expenditures.

Similarly, policies designed to make alternative crops more profitable in illicit-drug producing countries can expect opposition from subsidized agricultural producers in drug consuming countries. This is because they might view subsidies for alternative crops in developing countries as a threat to the competitive advantage of agricultural exporters in developed countries.


LATIN AMERICA
INCREASING INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN DRUG CONTROL POLICY

RECOMMENDATION

Promote engagement and cooperation among states with liberalized drug regulation regimes through the creation of a multilateral taskforce between the US, EU, and Latin American countries.

BACKGROUND

The US and EU share an interest in countering the challenges posed by drug trafficking. There is a changing drug control paradigm in the world, marked by the shift from prohibitionist policies to some legalization and regulated markets. Cannabis legalization in jurisdictions such as Colorado, Oregon, and Washington brought much attention to the regulation issue in the United States. In Latin America, Uruguay is the preeminent nation to control and regulate the cannabis market and will serve as a global example for decision-makers contemplating drug policy liberalization. In Europe, the Netherlands decriminalized cannabis decades ago and Spain has permitted the cultivation of cannabis, but prohibits private for-profit cannabis enterprises.

The aforementioned states are leading the shift toward drug control liberalization and their outcomes will undoubtedly influence the drug control policy decisions of the future. While most states with liberalized drug control have only recently adopted such policies, it is worth evaluating these outcomes.

PROPOSAL AND IMPLEMENTATION

We propose that the United States initiates, jointly with the European Union External Action Service (EEAS), an International Dialogue on Drug and Narcotics Regulation (IDDNR) with Latin American nations on drug control policies.

An international dialogue will create a platform for states with liberalized drug policies and will allow for discussions about the further development of these regulatory regimes. Facilitating dialogue on issues of drug control

---

policy and bolstering trilateral relations between the United States, EU, and Latin America are important steps for advancing common interests tied to drug control policy including, but not limited to, drug trafficking and organized crime. As drug control liberalization continues to evolve in states around the world, a coordinated dialogue will ease the flow of information regarding current states’ regulatory regimes.

The EEAS, launched January 1, 2011, plays important diplomatic, trade, and development functions with global partners as the EU’s diplomatic arm. Furthermore, the EEAS runs 139 EU Delegations and Offices worldwide, representing the EU and its citizens globally through foreign policy, as well as producing analyses and reporting on policies and developments in host countries. Uruguay, the United States, and the EU currently have European Union Delegations. Existing EU-Latin American cooperation in the fight against drugs only allows for bilateral dialogue that focuses on issues of drug eradication, organized crime, and law enforcement. A dialogue aligned with the drug policy paradigm shift, and which includes important actors like transit and supplier countries and international demand markets, is long overdue. Therefore, further discussion and research on policy responses in the post-prohibition age is imperative for informed drug control policymaking.

Many opponents who cannot conceive of the idea of drug legalization will criticize the coordination of a dialogue with the purpose of producing material knowledge surrounding drug control liberalization. For this reason, the dialogue neither suggests nor endorses the notion that states should adopt drug control liberalization or that drug control liberalization is desirable or necessary. The dialogue seeks to establish a a coordinated, multilateral platform for discussion, learning, and synthesis that produces research and informs drug policy liberalization research and policy. Other challenges to the establishment of a dialogue are the financial and human capital necessary for coordinating the taskforce needed to host the inaugural IDDNR. EU delegation states will have dues and financial pledges to fund the IDDNR.
RECOMMENDATION

Address security challenges by building partner capacities in law enforcement, intelligence, and military agencies in Colombia and Peru.

BACKGROUND

It is in the United States’ interest to disrupt and eliminate drug trafficking before it reaches US borders. Lack of security and weak institutions in Latin America has allowed drug traffickers to push a significant amount of illicit drugs to the US market. In order to meet these challenges, the US needs to work alongside its Latin American partners and focus efforts on reforming the security sector, with a specific focus on law enforcement, intelligence, and military agencies. Collaborative action will allow Latin American countries—specifically, Mexico, Colombia and Peru—to move towards self-reliance, transparency, good governance, and crime prevention.16

In recent years, the prominence of drug trafficking, especially cocaine, has grown dramatically. According to the US Drug Enforcement Administration, 90 percent of the cocaine seized in the United States originates from Colombia.17 Drug traffickers transport cocaine through the Central American corridor before it ends up at the Mexico-US border. This illustrates the connectedness of drug trafficking networks.

Since 2000, the United States and Colombia have worked to eliminate drug trafficking networks, which has decreased cocaine cultivation by 50 percent. However, the crime level did not decrease in Colombia or across Latin America. In fact, the crime rate increased significantly. According to an Insight Crime report of 2015, Mexico reported 17,055 people killed only in the first 11 months of 2015.18 Corruption and lack of transparency in the states of Latin America is widespread, which enables criminals to buy off authorities when caught with illicit goods. It is impossible to eliminate this problem by focusing on only one country. The US needs a holistic, multilateral, and well-planned approach to drug trafficking in order to place Latin American...

security forces in a place to maintain the security of their citizens and prevent future violence.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- We recommend the United States continue Plan Colombia and expand on it. This particular plan succeeded in reducing cocaine cultivation by 50 percent. However, since 2008, anticipated nationalization of counternarcotic efforts and US budget cuts have led to sustained reductions in assistance. We urge the US build upon Plan Colombia and expand the initiative to the rest of the Latin American countries via multilateral approach. This will keep Latin America under pressure and prevent the bubble effect of drug trafficking.

- We urge the US to revisit the International Criminal Investigative Training Program (ICITAP), which was established in 1986 for the purpose of addressing development and training needs of foreign law enforcement. This training included intelligence gathering, case studies, crime scene analysis, biometrics, and record archiving. The training helped to prevent crimes and will serve the US well if it revisits the plan and expands it.

COSTS AND CHALLENGES

Eradicating drugs from the region will decrease employment rates. Many Latin Americans who make a living from the production of drugs will lose their jobs. Their new unemployment may lead to criminal activities. The United States needs to prepare alternative plans for those farmers who engage in cultivating drugs. Introducing alternative crops, opening small business, and establishing vocational institutions serve as potential examples.
**RECOMMENDATION**

Strengthen governmental institutions by creating a Commission Against Crime and Impunity (CAIC) in Mexico and Peru.

**BACKGROUND**

The US and EU have an interest in strengthening the rule of law in Latin America. Corruption and impunity contribute to instability and weak institutions in Latin America, which allow for drug trafficking to flourish. The US must address these issues in order to ensure stability in our neighboring Western Hemisphere countries. We witnessed two remarkable trends in the Americas in 2015: the uncovering of grand corruption networks and the mass mobilization of citizens against corruption. Three members of Honduras’s elite Rosenthal clan were charged with money laundering and Guatemala’s president was jailed for reportedly taking bribes.\(^9\) Even the most powerful figures found they could no longer rely on their cash and connections to protect them.\(^10\) Now governments need to ensure real and systemic reform, starting with the judiciary sector. Mexico and Peru, two key countries of interest, have indicated openness to systemic reform.

Mexico into the US market has remained a top US priority for decades. Violence and criminality have overwhelmed Mexico’s law enforcement and judicial institutions, with record numbers of arrests rarely resulting in successful convictions. US support for those efforts has increased significantly as a result of the development and implementation of the Mérida Initiative, a bilateral partnership launched in 2007 for which Congress appropriated nearly $2.5 billion from FY2008 to FY2015.\(^21\)

Peru remains the world’s top producer of cocaine and is the second largest cultivator of coca, with an estimated 46,500 hectares under cultivation as of 2014.\(^22\) The majority of cocaine produced in Peru goes to South American countries for domestic consumption or for onward shipment to Europe, the United States, East Asia, Mexico, and Africa. President Ollanta Humala’s administration has dedicated substantial resources to implement Peru’s 2012-2016 counter narcotics strategy, but corruption
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Countering the movement of illegal drugs from


\(^10\) Ibid.


remains a serious concern. In a September 2015 poll, 79 percent of respondents said they lacked confidence in the judiciary system.\textsuperscript{23}

Both Mexico and Peru are instituting changes in their legal and judicial systems. Mexico has until June 2016 to replace its trial procedures in federal and state courts, moving from a closed-door process based on written arguments presented to a judge to an adversarial public trial system with oral arguments and the presumption of innocence.\textsuperscript{24} The judiciary system in Peru is switching to the New Criminal Procedure Code (NCP), which transitions the legal system from an inquisitorial to an accusatory system.\textsuperscript{25} This transition involves the judge moving from an investigative role to a neutral role.

PROPOSAL AND IMPLEMENTATION

We recommend the US support the establishment of a Commission against Impunity and Corruption (CAIC) in Mexico and Peru. The CAIC will be an independent, international body designed to support the Public Prosecutor’s Office (PPO), the National Police (NP), and other State institutions in the investigation of cases dealing with Transnational Crime Organizations (TOC), political corruption, and drug trafficking. The CAIC will operate under the principles of independence, autonomy, professionalism, neutrality, and transparency. The CAIC will address its objective by:

1. Investigating the existence of TOC groups and identifying the structures of these illegal groups (including the links between such groups and state officials) as well as their activities, operating modalities, and sources of financing.

2. Building capacity through joint investigations and trial preparations with PPO investigators and prosecutors.

3. Assisting the Governments of Mexico and Peru in their legal and judicial transitions to more open and transparent systems.

Mexico City, Mexico and Lima, Peru will house the CAIC. The CAIC will be located within the PPO of each country. The CAIC will have full authority to operate on cases within the federal court systems of both Mexico and Peru. In order to maintain autonomy, international donors need to fund the CAIC. We urge the US to fund this initiative and to appeal to the EU and other allies to do the same. Finally, the US must oversee the creation of CAIC in order to ensure its founding principles are followed.

CHALLENGES AND COSTS

CAIC’s principal challenge will be to create favorable conditions for productive collaboration with the PPO, the judiciary, and Congress in Mexico and Peru.\textsuperscript{26} These institutions will feel threatened by the outside presence CAIC imposes. The success of CAIC will also depend on factors surrounding leadership roles in these institutions, factors such as who hold the office of the attorney general and which party holds a majority in Congress. The leaders in power will either work cooperatively with CAIC or ensure it is ineffective. The CAIC is an independent body separate from the governments of Mexico and Peru. Ultimately, the CAIC must understand the complex political dynamic of Mexico and Peru and develop strategies that will realistically respond to the difficulties of maneuvering in fragile environments.

\textsuperscript{23} ibid.
\textsuperscript{24} Transparency.org, "Transparency International.
\textsuperscript{25} ibid.
Additionally, CAIC will need to solely rely on international donors for funding. The organizations CAIC needs to receive support from include: the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNDOC), Organization of American States (OAS), Central America Regional Security Initiative (CARI), the Mérida Initiative, the Cooperation Programme on Drug Policies with the EU, and human rights NGOs. Civil society organizations will play a large part in lobbying the international community to provide full political and financial support for CAIC.
FIGURE 1
Supply side efforts to curb drug trafficking decrease the supply of drugs (S1), decreasing the quantity supplied (Q1) but also increasing the equilibrium price of drugs, leading to higher illicit drug revenues. Since drug demand is inelastic, drug prices increase by a higher percentage than quantities supplied decrease.

FIGURE 2
Demand side efforts to lower illicit drug consumption decrease demand (D1), decreasing both the quantity of drugs demanded (Q1) and the equilibrium price of drugs (P1), leading to lower illicit drug revenues.

27 RT Burns, William H. Sackley, and David L. Sollars. "Illicit Drugs and Economics: Examples for the Principles Classroom." Journal of Economics and Finance Education 6, no. 2 (2007): 75-86. This model assumes an inelastic demand for drugs, perfect competition, and drug legality. The purpose of the appendix is to show in simple terms the different effects that supply and demand control policies have on drug consumption and revenue. Demand-side policies are the most effective as they manage to reduce both consumption and revenues of illicit drugs.
GLOSSARY

AQAP - Al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula
DOD - Department of Defense
FMF - Foreign Military Financing
Gulf Nations - Arab nations situated on the Persian Gulf Coast
Hezbollah - Iran-backed terrorist group operating in Southern Lebanon
IMF - International Monetary Fund
ISIS - Islamic State of Iraq and Syria
Jabhat al-Nusra - Offshoot of Al-Qaeda operating in Syria
Peshmerga - Iraqi Kurdish fighters in Northern Iraq
ROYG - Republic of Yemen Government
R2P - Responsibility to Protect: UN Policy that says state sovereignty can be violated if a state fails to protect its citizens from genocide, ethnic cleansing, crimes against humanity, and war crimes
Since 2013, the states of Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, and Yemen have failed. Many are wracked by insurgency. There are increasing concerns regarding terrorism, human trafficking, and the migrant and refugee crisis.

In Iraq, terrorist groups are flourishing due in part to weak borders. Young men from across the Middle East, North Africa, and Europe are traveling to Iraq to join the self-proclaimed Islamic State of Iraq and Syria.

Yemen's geopolitical climate has not only exacerbated tensions between Iran and Saudi Arabia, but has also allowed for the expansion of terrorist activity and operations by Al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) within the region. Yemen is an important US interest due to its proximity to Saudi Arabia, a key US ally and oil trading partner, and its potential for cooperation with US counterterrorism efforts.

Since the start of the conflict in Syria, over one million people have fled from Syria to southern Lebanon. Lebanon does not have a strong enough infrastructure to accommodate the massive flow of refugees.

Migrant smuggling across the Mediterranean is a major concern to the European Union and, by extension, to the United States. Large groups of people from Africa and the Middle East are traveling to Europe via the Mediterranean, commonly through Turkey to Greece. They pose a critical threat to the security of the West due to potential connections with international crime organizations and terrorist groups, as well as bringing further instability to neighboring regions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Develop stronger capacity building initiatives within the failing states of Syria, Afghanistan, and Iraq, from which people are leaving. Persuade Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Kuwait, and Iran to stop funding rebel groups within Iraq and Syria.

Promote a unified Iraq by continuing to broker negotiations between the Iraqi Central government and the de facto government of the Iraqi Kurdistan Region.

Resume the disbursement of funds from the Friends of Yemen, a multilateral forum of 24 countries that has pledged about $8 billion, to contribute to Yemen's development and to foster economic security.
RECOMMENDATIONS

- Promote a unified Iraq by continuing to broker negotiations between the Iraqi Central government and the de facto government of the Iraqi Kurdistan Region.
- Increase the export of Iraqi oil as to provide economic stimulation to the country. Integrate Iraq back into the international community, especially in the Gulf region.

BACKGROUND

The Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) poses a threat to the national security of the United States because of its international reach and its disregard for human life. Since the inception of the ISIS, young Muslim men from across the Middle East and Europe have flocked to join the terrorist organization. The self-proclaimed Islamic State effectively erased the borders between Iraq and Syria. The terrorist organization does not recognize the Iraqi government and operates as an autonomous state.

Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, the leader of ISIS, effectively carries out terrorist attacks from Iraq and Syria against the United States, the European Union, and their allies. The US, working alongside Iraq, combats ISIS and stabilizes Iraq’s infrastructure by focusing on maintaining a unified and federal Iraq. This supports increases in production and export of oil resources as well as Iraq’s strategic independence and regional integration.

An immediate concern of the United States is promoting a unified and federal Iraq. The United States has been successful in creating meaningful dialogue between the de facto government of Iraqi Kurdistan Region and the Iraqi central government in Baghdad. However, there is much more work to be done. Many Iraqi youth still join ISIS because of the economic incentives provided to them. It is essential that the revenue made from Iraqi oil is distributed effectively to stimulate the economy. This economic productivity will deter people from joining the Islamic State.

Another US concern is increasing and expanding the oil production in Iraq. The United States

believes that the key to stability in Iraq lies in its hydrocarbon industry. US-Iraq relations have improved due to shared interests in increasing Iraq’s oil exports. This meant the creation of an oil pipeline from the Basra oil fields to the Arabian Gulf, Red Sea, and Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{3} ISIS jeopardizes relations between the US and Iraq because they occupy Iraqi oil fields and profit from them.\textsuperscript{4}

Iraq’s weak government and loose borders make it the perfect stage for non-state actors, foreign governments, and terrorist groups to partake in illicit activities. The United States, working alongside Iraq, is trying to integrate the country back into the international community.\textsuperscript{5} The United States actively promotes Iraqi independence by exporting American goods to Iraq. The Iraqi government recently secured the city of Fallujah from the Islamic State. Iraq is slowly on its way to defeating ISIS.\textsuperscript{6}

PROPOSAL AND IMPLEMENTATION

We propose that the US:
- Modify the Foreign Military Financing (FMF) program to promote Iraqi unification by providing grants for the acquisition of NATO defense equipment, services, and training. This promotes the security of the U.S. and its allies by contributing to regional and global stability and containing transnational threats, including terrorism and trafficking in narcotics, weapons, and persons.\textsuperscript{7}
- Continue to broker talks between the Iraqi central government and the de facto Iraqi Kurdistan regional government regarding oil exports. Iraq now produces oil at the same capacity as Iran.\textsuperscript{8} A dispute between the Iraqi central government and the Kurds could completely disrupt its progression. Mutual agreements on oil between the Iraqi government and the Kurdish government will incentivize them to push ISIS out of the country.
- Refer back to the Strategic Framework Agreement for a Relationship of Friendship and Cooperation between the United States of America and the Republic of Iraq, in order to sponsor Iraq’s integration back into the international community.\textsuperscript{9}

CHALLENGES AND COSTS

To clamp down on ISIS, it is essential that the United States aid the Iraqi central government and the Iraqi Kurdistan regional government. The US must operate with their partners in Iraq discretely, so that US presence is minimal. The Iraqi central government can solve the ISIS problem with tools that the US gives them. The costs for the United States are minimal in these recommendations.

The modification to the Foreign Military

\textsuperscript{3} McGurk “US Policy Towards Iraq,” US Department of State Diplomacy in Action.
\textsuperscript{5} McGurk “US Policy Towards Iraq,” US Department of State Diplomacy in Action.
Financing program would provide NATO assets and training to the Iraqi central government and Iraqi Kurdistan regional government to combat ISIS. The implementation of the FMF program would cause no American lives to be lost. In order to maintain mutual agreements between the Iraqi central government and the Iraqi Kurdistan regional government, the US must be willing to be their mediator as to not cripple their oil industry. The United States must also support Iraq’s integration back into the international community. The US must understand that the future of Iraq and the presence of ISIS in the region will greatly impede on stabilizing Iraq.
RECOMMENDATIONS

- Extend USAID’s three-year Yemen strategy with ROYG, and expand it into a UN mission or initiative to focus on employment, education, healthcare, agricultural programs, and transparency within the government.
- Resume the disbursement of funds from the Friends of Yemen, a multilateral forum of 24 countries have pledged about $8 billion to contribute to Yemen’s development and to foster economic security. Continue reducing in the allocation of funds for security assistance through the DOD’s Section 1206 and Foreign Military Financing (FMF) programs in Yemen.

BACKGROUND

US interests in Yemen primarily lie in countering the continued threat of AQAP and its strong presence in Yemen, establishing AQAP as Al Qaeda’s most active affiliate. AQAP’s presence and expansion has placed Yemen at the forefront of counterterrorism operations for US policy. Yemen, mired in political, social and economic instability, triggered the expansion of AQAP.

Following the Arab Spring of 2011, Former President Ali Abdullah Saleh’s 33-year regime transferred power to Vice President Abed Rabbo Mansour Hadi.10 Al-Hadi’s ascension to power revived societal rifts that stemmed from Al-Hadi’s rule, such as with the Houthis, a Zaydi Shiite group from Northern Yemen. The Houthis gained control over vast territory in Yemen, including the capital, Sana’a, and key military bases and port facilities.11 Meanwhile, Yemen also suffers from a number of economic challenges: water scarcity, oil depletion, food insecurity, and high unemployment rates.

The fighting between the Houthis and the Republic of Yemen Government (ROYG) created a political vacuum that allowed AQAP to gain a larger following. AQAP, capitalizing on political instability and economic insecurity, created a militant “state within a state,” particularly in the south of Yemen.12

Yemen is of vital importance to US policymakers due to its geopolitical, strategic location. Yemen straddles the border of Saudi Arabia, a key US ally and major oil producer, and the Bab al Mandab Strait, “through which commercial oil tankers carry an estimated 3.4 million barrels”

11 Ibid.
per day.\textsuperscript{13} Yemen’s coastline borders the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden, which is across from the Horn of Africa, an area of Somali-based piracy.\textsuperscript{14} AQAP gained a large following from Yemenis and economic migrants from Somalia, Ethiopia and Eritrea, positioning the group as a regional recruiter for terrorist operations.

Major players in Yemen’s crisis include: Saudi Arabia, which has organized coalitions with the US, UK, and France to target the Houthis, and Iran, which has provided the Houthis with military support and arms.\textsuperscript{15} The Yemen conflict begs the attention of US policymakers because it is a proxy war between Iran and Saudi Arabia, and constitutes breeding ground for AQAP’s terrorist and militant operations. It also poses a humanitarian crisis. As a result of current political instability in Yemen, the US suspended aid and military contributions to Yemen.

PROPOSAL AND IMPLEMENTATION

While countering AQAP directly would be most beneficial in advancing U.S. counterterrorism operations and goals, we also propose countering the source of the rise of AQAP, namely political, economic and social instability in Yemen.

We propose that the US:
- Extend USAID’s three-year Yemen strategy with ROYG, and expand it into a UN mission or initiative to focus on employment, education, healthcare, agricultural programs, and transparency within the government. By expanding this strategy through the UN, the US will increase contributors to such services, thereby reducing the costs of contribution through the collective security framework of the UN. Also, since both Saudi Arabia and Iran belong to the UN, approval of such a mission could initiate peace talks between the two states.
- Resume the disbursement of funds from the Friends of Yemen, a multilateral forum of 24 countries have pledged about $8 billion to contribute to Yemen’s development and to foster economic security. The IMF or World Bank should monitor this disbursement of funds, its allocation towards substantial projects and not solely cash assistance. Achieving greater transparency within the ROYG should be a priority, while adding a humanitarian facet to these funds.
- Continue reducing the allocation of funds for security assistance through the DOD’s Section 1206 and Foreign Military Financing (FMF) programs in Yemen. Section 1206 aid boosts Yemen’s air force capacities, special operations units, border control monitoring, and coast guard forces. The FMF program provides grants for the “acquisition of US defense equipment, services and training, which promotes US national security.”\textsuperscript{16} While essential, military support should be reduced to discourage people from viewing the US as a military aggressor, especially after the multiple drone strikes the US aided in conducting. The US should allocate funds for intelligence gathering and contributions to Saudi Arabia, who would bear the brunt of military operations.

CHALLENGES AND COSTS

The above recommendations reduce fiscal costs; however, other costs may be incurred.

For the reduction of Section 1206 and FMF

14 Ibid.
16 "Yemen DOD Should Improve Accuracy of Data," United States Government Accountability Office.
funds, the US will no longer be at the forefront of heavy military operations and thus will not target terrorism head-on. Nevertheless, by reducing Section 1206 and FMF funds, US military, government, and civilian casualties would remain minimal—even if the conflict escalated.

Main challenges to the UN initiative include gaining approval from UN Security Council members, length of the approval process, length of the implementation process, and monitoring measures. In terms of the Friends of Yemen forum, increasing ROYG’s transparency and the methods it entails will be a challenge. Despite the costs associated with these recommendations, “the cost of doing nothing is potentially far greater,” Secretary Clinton stated.17

LEBANON

REFUGEE SPILLOVER

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Persuade Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Kuwait, and Iran to stop funding rebel groups within Iraq and Syria.

BACKGROUND

Refugee spillover into Lebanon poses direct security risks to US allies and threatens vital US interests in Europe and the Gulf nations, especially Israel and Saudi Arabia. Due to Syria’s ongoing civil war, more than one million people have fled to Lebanon—and currently, about one of every five people in Lebanon are Syrian refugees. The Syrian refugees have severely hindered Lebanon’s economy, weakened its political system, and threatened its security. Europe’s proximity to the Middle East makes migration control and counterterrorism measures European priorities. A key US ally, Saudi Arabia has received terrorist threats from ISIS. Lebanon has suffered casualties and chaos from ISIS’s counterattacks against Hezbollah, the Lebanese-based Shi’a political party and military group. Israel has issued warnings to Hezbollah, following revelation of Hezbollah’s military capabilities.

The flow of refugees into Lebanon affects their economy and political system. Refugee spillover is blamed for pushing an additional 200 million Lebanese into poverty. Lebanon’s public debt comprised 148.7 percent of its GDP in 2015 due to increasing humanitarian costs. Lebanon’s government suffers from political gridlock between Hezbollah and anti-Syrian parties. Hezbollah, backed by Iran, supports the Assad Regime while anti-Syrian parties, supported by Saudi Arabia, embrace the West.

Refugee spillover worsened preexisting

23 Ibid.
ideological and geographic issues in Lebanon, raising more concerns about security. Hezbollah continues to battle with ISIS and Jabhat al-Nusra—an anti-Assad, Syrian-based, Sunni militia group—in Lebanon. Weapons smuggling and violence have increased across the Syrian-Lebanese border because of Hezbollah’s involvement in the Syrian war. The influx of refugees has exacerbated infightings among Sunni and Shi’a groups in local communities. 

PROPOSAL AND IMPLEMENTATION

We propose the US:

- Mitigate Syrian refugee spillover into Lebanon, by urging US-EU negotiations with Russia, Iran, and Gulf nations.

These negotiations should aim to curtail military and financial support for Assad and anti-Assad rebels, respectively. The US should emphasize that external financial and military supports from third parties encourage opposing sides to continue fighting. Recent terrorist attacks in Turkey, France, US, Saudi Arabia and Germany show that nations can face terrorist attacks due to involvement in Syria. The US and the EU should persuade Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates (UAE), Qatar, and Kuwait to cut down their assistance to the Syrian Civil War. Additionally, the US should revive their broken diplomatic ties with Iran as first steps to mitigate the war.

The US may incorporate trade incentives to advance talks on this proposal with Iran. Also, the US and EU should continue to seek more cooperation with Russia by strengthening their joint-partnership efforts against ISIS. This partnership may improve relations among the US, EU, and Russia.

CHALLENGES AND COSTS

Proposed negotiation efforts will come at no additional costs because the US already plays a major negotiating role in mitigating the Syrian Civil War. It may be difficult to persuade Gulf nations to improve diplomatic representation, initiate trade talks, and develop cultural ties with Iran. Saudi Arabia and Iran consider their contributions to the Lebanese Armed Forces (LAF) and Hezbollah, respectively, as key factors in fostering their individual interests.

In order to mitigate the Syrian Civil War, the US would need to acknowledge and discourage Saudi Arabia and Iran’s use of Lebanon as a stage for their proxy war in the negotiations. This criticism may strain US relations with Saudi Arabia. We believe that through joint efforts with the EU, the US will strengthen its negotiations with the Gulf nations. With Russia’s recent commitment to partnership, the US and EU may be able to persuade Iran to curtail its support.

26 Spillover from the Conflict in Syria, n.d.
27 Ibid.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Continue supporting current EU anti-smuggling policy through NATO.
Increase monitoring capacity used in current EU anti-smuggling initiatives.
Incentivize people to stay within their home countries.

BACKGROUND

The US is interested in global stability. At the same time, the world is facing the worst migration and refugee crisis since the end of WWII—creating a major threat to this stability. In 2015, 65 million people were forcibly displaced in the world-with over 21 million registered refugees. Within the Middle East, the countries contributing most to the crisis are Syria, Iraq, and Afghanistan. Almost 5 million Syrian refugees are registered with the UN—a statistic that does not include those who are now legally considered migrants. It is estimated that half of the country’s population has left.

Currently, Europe’s biggest concern is migration because of how drastically their infrastructure is being pressured. As we have seen with Brexit, tensions around Europe over migration are at an all-time high—and if we do not address the crisis, the US will face an uncertain future as the European Union starts to dissolve and instability from failing states moves to Europe.

The number of refugees and migrants being displaced around the world is unfathomable. Huge groups of unmonitored people are moving across the sea, with little to lose. As they move through Turkey to Greece, they pose a serious threat to European and Middle Eastern stability, to the world economy, and also to the security of the United States. They are accused of draining resources from nearby areas that are already trying to provide for their own citizens. Finally, given the Paris terrorist attacks in late 2015, people are skeptical of ties between refugees and terrorist organizations.

The world is losing a critical generation of doctors, scientists, teachers, artists, and world changers. Refugee and migrant children often do not have access to education, while employment opportunities for any refugees are nearly nonexistent. Most refugees live in camps in Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq, Egypt and North Africa, where they can be waiting for months or years. The big question the US and the EU must ask themselves is: when these conflicts are over, to where will the refugees and migrants go back? More importantly, with what skills?

Before any policies can be made, the US needs to better understand the situation. The US cannot address migrant smuggling or human trafficking without having a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of what the problems are. These concepts, as well as the terms ‘migrant’ and ‘refugee,’ have become conflated, which confuses politicians and the public. While there has been recent debate over whether using different terms actually makes a difference, the reality is that international law relies on this distinction in order to prioritize where aid and attention are directed.

While smuggling means taking people across borders illegally, trafficking means that people are being taken against their will and placed into situations of exploitation, typically in forced labor or prostitution. Smuggling can become trafficking easily, but trafficking by organized crime is not the principal source of the crisis in the Mediterranean. A refugee is protected under international law, as someone who is fleeing “armed conflict or persecution,” but migrants are not because they have made the choice to move “mainly to improve their lives by finding work or in some cases for education, family reunion, or other reasons.” According to the Dublin Regulation, if refugees do not stay in the country where they are placed and granted asylum, they lose refugee status and then become migrants.

PROPOSAL AND IMPLEMENTATION

We propose that the US:
- Continues support to current EU anti-smuggling policy through NATO. The most significant European anti-smuggling initiative is ‘Operation Sophia,’ also called ‘EUNAVFOR Med,’ and was established on May 18, 2015 by the EU Council. Through this operation, Europol and NATO are scanning the seas and investigating human trafficking routes. As they search and seize vessels suspected of trafficking, they are able to find smuggling operations and conduct rescue missions. Since February 2016, there are 3 NATO ships assisting in the Aegean Sea through Maritime Group 2.

39 Ibid.
• Increases monitoring capacity used in current EU anti-smuggling initiatives. In order to accomplish this, the US must give greater military priority to the Mediterranean, by recognizing that activity in this area will catalyze further instability in the world. To help share costs, we propose that the US pushes for a Reverse Berlin Plus agreement. This would ensure that NATO could borrow EU assets when they lack capacity in the area—making the EU-NATO relationship more reciprocal.

• Incentivizes people to stay within their home countries. The US must take the lead in developing stronger capacity building initiatives within the failing states from which people are leaving. This should include smart development programs that are based on the collaboration of public, private, and nonprofit groups. The US should encourage these long-term rebuilding initiatives to be created with the local community in mind.

In order to accomplish this, the US should allocate the same amount of aid going into the area, if not more. The Joint Action Plan is not enough, though it was created with the same rationale of trying to establish capacity building initiatives. Activated on November 29, 2015, it set up a system in which the EU is paying Turkey to keep refugees and migrants within their borders; therefore trying to interrupt the migrant flows.41

CHALLENGES AND COSTS


The US is currently in a political climate that is turning inwards and denouncing refugees and migrants as terrorists, while also trying to cut back on unnecessary spending. As such, it will be difficult to get the public to recognize that trying to confront this crisis is a national security interest. Because we live on the other side of the Atlantic, we are desensitized to how important this crisis is and what the implications of a failing European Union really are.

The costs of continuing and expanding support to current EU anti-smuggling policy can be covered if the US shifts military priority toward the Mediterranean, as well as by sending diplomats to push for a Reverse Berlin Plus agreement. By shifting military priority, the US will be recognizing that it will not just take intervention in armed conflicts to stop the migration and refugee crisis. Rather, by addressing the crisis from all sides and taking into consideration all roots of the problem, the US and EU will be able to seriously discourage and curb current migration patterns.

The costs of creating and implementing smart development programs in order to incentivize people to stay in their home countries can be mostly covered if the US encourages collaboration between the public, private, and nonprofit sectors. Already, private groups like IDEO are compiling ideas and finding funds to rebuild the Middle East through “expanding education opportunities.”42 Last year, USAID contributed $65 million to the UN World Food Program to assist with providing food to Syrians within Syria, Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan, and Egypt.43 The Gates Foundation also gave

$500,000 to the International Rescue Committee “to respond to the immediate emergency needs of migrants and refugees arriving in Europe.” 44 While all of these groups are making important contributions to resolving the refugee and migration crisis, none are deliberately coordinated—though all would benefit by pooling resources and therefore creating a bigger impact. To gain more support, this proposal can also be framed as the Rebuilding component of R2P. In rebuilding the Middle East, the US will be preventing future conflicts and starting to get failing states back toward stable peace, away from instability.
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