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The U.S. and E.U. face security challenges that threaten global trade and political stability. Combined with worsening climate conditions, these challenges may impede international development efforts in conflict-ridden countries. In this era of technological advancement and increasing connectivity, the U.S. and E.U. bear great responsibilities to address root causes of poverty and extremism. This report proposes policy initiatives pertaining to U.S. security interests in Latin America, Asia, Africa, and the Middle East.

**Latin America**

The implementation of 2016 Colombian Peace Accord addresses key U.S. interests in Colombia. The agreement aims to demobilize guerrilla groups, eliminate illegal coca production, reduce the supply of illicit drugs to U.S. markets, and address internal displacements in Colombia. However, the agreement requires additional U.S. investment in infrastructure, agricultural sustainability, and education to consolidate Colombia’s peace efforts.

**Africa**

The lack of reliable governance in Somalia is a security concern for the U.S. and E.U. Weak institutions and environmental challenges have fueled violent extremism and humanitarian crises in Somalia. This report examines three contributing factors to political instability that jeopardize U.S. strategic interests in Somalia.

**Asia**

China’s One Belt, One Road (OBOR) initiative facilitates economic growth in Asia that may benefit the U.S. economy. However, OBOR bears negative security, economic, and environmental implications that jeopardize U.S.’ diplomatic influence in Asian countries. To advance U.S.’ interests in Asia, the U.S. must strengthen its outreach efforts to tighten relationships with Asian allies and non-allies.

**Middle East**

Political instability in the Middle East threatens U.S. and international security. Weak institutions in Iraq and Yemen emboldens terrorist groups to wreak havoc, while Iran’s volatile nuclear plans destabilizes political dynamics in the continent. The U.S. must strengthen its counterterrorism efforts in the region to protect the U.S. homeland.

This report evaluates our recommendations and considers their risks and benefits. We aim to present practical adjustments to U.S. policy that will address security challenges around the world.
# Table of Contents

## Latin America

- Executive Summary (Colombia) ................................................................. 10
- U.S. Support for the Peace Accord ............................................................... 11
- Infrastructure Investment and Addressing the Natural Resource Trap ................. 14
- Sustainability in Indigenous Communities .................................................... 16
- Education as a Prevention Policy to Reduce Rebel Group Participation .................. 18

## Asia

- Executive Summary (One Belt One Road) ....................................................... 22
- Security Implications in Afghanistan .............................................................. 24
- Security Implications in Pakistan .................................................................. 26
- Economic Implications ................................................................................. 28
- Environmental and Health Implications ......................................................... 31

## Africa

- Executive Summary (Somalia) ........................................................................ 37
- Establishing Good Governance to Promote Stability ......................................... 38
- Climate Change: Addressing the Impact of Drought on Stability and Terrorism ...... 40
- Fighting Drought-related Diseases to Prevent Regional Instability ..................... 42
- Mitigating Piracy on the Coast to Enhance Security and Protect Economic Interests ... 44
- Countering Al-Shabaab and Preventing Insurgency .......................................... 46

## The Middle East

- Executive Summary (U.S. Security) ............................................................... 51
- Iraq: Expanding U.S. Soft Power .................................................................... 52
- Iran: Enlarging the Nuclear Deal ..................................................................... 54
- Yemen: Our Mutual Interest ......................................................................... 57
Latin America

Colombia:
- U.S. Support for the Peace Accord
- Infrastructure Investment and Addressing the Natural Resource Trap
- Sustainability in Indigenous Communities
- Education as a Prevention Policy to Reduce Rebel Group Participation
Glossary

ACG - Gaitanista Self-Defense Forces of Colombia
ACR - Colombian Agency for Reintegration
ADAM - Areas for Municipal-Level Alternative Development
BACRIM - Bandas Criminales “criminal Bands”
COCA NASA - Coca production company of the indigenous Nasa tribe
CONPA - Afro-Colombian Peace Council
DOD - Department of Defense
ELN - National Liberation Army
EU - European Union
FARC - Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia
GDP - Gross Domestic Product
GLYPHOSATE - Herbicide used to eradicate fields of coca crop
HECTARE - An area of land equivalent to 10,000 m2 or 2.471 acres
IDPs - Internally Displaced Persons
INL - International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement
NGO - Non-Governmental Organization
NRC - National Reincorporation Council
ODA - Official Development Aid
SENA - The National Learning Service
UNGEI - United Nations Girls Education Initiative
USAID - U.S. Agency for International Development
4G - Fourth Generation Toll Road Concession Program
UNHCR - United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
Executive Summary

The historic 2016 peace accord between FARC and the Colombian government presents an opportunity to demobilize rebels and solve conflict through dialogue. However, the peace accord failed to address the root causes that fueled decades-long violence. During the 52 years of armed conflict, insurgency groups in Colombia systematically committed widespread abuses against civilians, including forced displacement, kidnappings, sexual violence, executions and recruitment.¹ Lack of economic opportunity and education continue to plague expansive, unstable and ungoverned areas. Violence has forcibly displaced more than 7.7 million Colombians, second only to Syria.² It would be more effective for the U.S. to address the root causes of internal displacement rather than relying on weapons to combat internal conflict.

Since the Plan Colombia initiative, the U.S. and Colombia have remained strong allies.³ Despite the peace accord, threats from insurgency groups are still present in Colombia and need to be addressed to establish peace within ungoverned areas. Stabilizing Colombia’s internal situation is necessary for unlocking the country’s development potential. Combating regional instability, drug production, and poor economic development will advance U.S. interests by minimizing security threats that weaken U.S.-Colombia trade relations.

U.S. Support for the Peace Accord

Recommendations

1. Remove restrictions on the Colombian government’s use of U.S. aid
2. Fund reintegration of former FARC rebels into Colombian society
3. Partner with Norway and Cuba to facilitate negotiations between the Colombian Government, ELN, and BACRIM

Background

The U.S.’ key interest is to support the peace accord with FARC as it aims to reduce the supply of illicit drugs to the U.S. and reduce violence in Colombia. The 52 year conflict with FARC killed over 220,000 people and displaced more than 7.7 million. Since the 1980s, Colombia has been ranked amongst the top suppliers of illicit drugs to U.S. markets. The peace accord aims to reintegrate rebels into society, create a political party for government opposition, eradicate illegal crops, provide justice and reparations, and disarm the FARC, actions that together will help reduce drugs sent to the U.S.

Plan Colombia, a U.S. initiative to combat drug cartels, did not achieve its goals to decrease drug trafficking to the U.S. and return rebel controlled territory to the Colombian government. Instead, Plan Colombia militarized a set of complex political and social issues. It intensified armed conflicts that led to the forced displacement of millions of Colombians. Plan Colombia failed to address these humanitarian crises because it allocated only $30 million of the initial $4 billion budget to this issue. It also failed to eliminate the supply of illicit drugs to the U.S. Coca production in Colombia increased by 52% in 2016. Through Plan Colombia, the U.S. funded DOD to provide weapons and training to the Colombian police and army to combat drug production with force. In 2016 this assistance totaled $87.7 million. The U.S. also mandated in 2017 that 20% of all aid provided to Colombia be used in International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement, which funds armed service’s efforts to intercept illegal drugs destined for U.S. markets.

The peace accord has neither eliminated guerrilla groups nor decreased production of illicit crops in Colombia because the negotiations did not include the ELN or BACRIM. The peace accord was only signed between the Colombian government and FARC. The ELN filled the void left in previously FARC controlled regions and continues to kidnap, kill, displace, recruit children, and plant landmines. The BACRIM continues to supply cocaine to U.S. markets through Central America. Some FARC rebels are not demobilized, and have joined other organizations.

---

6 Mejia, Daniel. “Plan Colombia: An Analysis of Effectiveness and Costs”.
8 Coca crops in Colombia increase over 50 per cent in one year”. UNODC, July 2017.
Proposal and Implementation

We propose Congress remove restrictions on the Colombian government’s use of U.S. aid. The regulations hinder the Colombian government’s ability to implement the peace accord because the majority of the current aid is already allocated to programs or specific issues. Before reallocating funds to the peace accord and humanitarian aid, Congress needs to amend the 2017 State and Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill. First, remove the mandate that 20% of the 2017 aid is used for International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement. Second, we propose Congress lift restrictions that prevent financial support for former FARC members. Removing both restrictions will provide more flexibility and availability in funds for the Colombian government to implement the peace accord.

We propose the U.S. fund reintegration efforts of former FARC rebels into Colombian society. Cash transfers provide incentives for guerrillas to demobilize, reintegrate into civil society and refrain from drug trafficking as means of survival, thereby reducing the supply of illicit drugs to the U.S. The payments would provide rebels income to pay for basic necessities, raise their families, and support them while they search for a job or and professional development programs. We propose the U.S. fund the NRC’s reintegration program. It will oversee payments equivalent to 90% of the Colombian national minimum wage for a span of two years to demobilized FARC rebels. The 2017 budget will allocate $191 million to the Colombian government if the Secretary of State declares that the peace accord is in U.S. interest. We recommend the Secretary of State make this declaration to release these funds, so the Colombian government may use them to pay for the NRC’s reintegration program.

We propose the U.S. partner with Norway and Cuba to facilitate negotiations between the Colombian Government, ELN and BACRIM. The 2016 peace accord did not achieve Colombia and U.S.’ desired outcomes because FARC members have not been fully demobilized, and coca production did not decrease. A new peace agreement that includes all guerrilla organizations is needed to achieve peace and end conflict in Colombia. We recommend the U.S. partner with allies to facilitate negotiations between the Colombian government, the ELN, and BACRIM. A more comprehensive agreement that includes all guerrilla and paramilitary organizations ensures a higher likelihood that Colombia achieves peace, reduces drug trafficking and violence, and solves its humanitarian crises.

Challenges and Costs

The Trump administration's proposed 2018 U.S. budget reduces aid to Colombia by 36% from the allocation in 2017. This decreases current U.S. efforts to stabilize Colombia and undermines the implementation of the peace accord as crucial U.S. financial support is diminished. U.S. aid is vital to meeting Colombia’s projected financial needs as its economy slows, commodity prices decline, and its currency weakens. If the peace accord is not successfully implemented, a return to violence and intensification of drug production are likely.

Colombia’s Constitutional Court rulings prevent the government from implementing the peace accord. They

---


declared two clauses of the agreement between FARC and the government unconstitutional. These mandates from the courts prevent the Colombian government from initiating any program described in the accord. Meanwhile, FARC members and other organizations continue to terrorize communities, expand drug trafficking and displace people.

The 2018 Colombian presidential elections pose a threat to the peace accord because a new president may decide not to implement the programs articulated in the agreement. There is divided national opinion within Colombia regarding the peace accord. Many Colombians worry FARC has not received proper punishment for the human rights violations committed. Nearly 50.2% of the 13 million people who voted in a national referendum last year rejected the first version of the peace accord.\textsuperscript{14} Presidential elections held next year provide opponents time to mobilize and campaign around this issue. If the new President does not support the peace accord, the progress to bring peace to Colombia could be jeopardized. A return to violence, insecurity, and the rearmament FARC cannot be overlooked.\textsuperscript{15}

Infrustructure: Investment and Addressing the Natural Resource Trap

Recommendations

1. Strengthen and diversify Colombia’s workforce by investing in SENA
2. Invest in the Fourth Generation Toll Road Concession Program, specifically in projects that were suspended due to funding shortages

Background

Economic instability in Colombia is a security threat to the U.S. Colombia’s lack of infrastructure and reliance on natural resources have perpetuated violence and drug trafficking. It is in the U.S.’ security interest to ensure stability in the Americas, especially for its second largest trading partner in South America. Although GDP per capita reflects a growing Colombian economy, its reliance on natural resources is not sustainable. Since Colombia depends on oil production as its largest export, the record-low world oil prices of 2016 have severely limited growth. Colombia must focus on broadening competency and technical skills that could help diversify the workforce and the economy. Helping Colombia improve its infrastructure can tighten U.S.’ relationship with an important Latin American ally. Employed Colombians will be less likely to look to drug cartels and guerrilla groups as means of survival. This will help address Colombia’s lack of employment opportunities, a problem known to perpetuate violence.

Colombia has historically suffered from huge regional disparities due to a lack of transportation infrastructure that connects the country’s vastly different geographic regions. In 2013, the Colombian government announced the Fourth Generation Toll Road Concession Program (4G), the largest road infrastructure program of its kind in Latin America today. It aims to double the length of the current road network, upgrade airports and railways, and expand ports. In addition to connecting the outskirts of the country with the urbanized central region, 4G will reduce transportation costs and stimulate economic development, particularly in rural communities. Odebrecht, the Brazilian company responsible for the world’s largest corruption scandal, provided a significant part of the funding for two 4G sub-projects. Their contracts have been terminated and constructions were halted, leaving a $10.6 billion void for foreign investors to fill. Without U.S. investment, it is possible that these projects will not be funded.

Proposal and Implementation

We propose that the U.S. allocate ODA funds to strengthen SENA’s existing social assistance programs. This will accommodate the large community of newly demobilized FARC members. Rural residents, such as farmers, are less likely to seek job opportunities in illegal markets if they have sustainable and profitable alternatives. A decrease in drug activities in Colombia can result in less contraband trafficked to the U.S. U.S. efforts to strengthen SENA will help improve SENA officials’ capacity to train and prepare Colombians for employment. Helping increase Colombia’s productivity will help make Colombia a stronger trading partner for the U.S.

We propose that the U.S. partner with the E.U. in investing in the construction of 4G, specifically the projects on Magdalena River and Ruta del Sol. These projects have been suspended because their funds from Odebrecht were cut. By playing
a role in this massive infrastructure project, the U.S. and E.U. can help foster regional development in the areas that have been most affected by the FARC and other rebel groups. The construction of transit infrastructure has successfully decreased violence in Colombia’s economically isolated communities. Therefore, investing in rebuilding these areas is one action the Colombian government, with U.S. and E.U. investment, can take to improve national and regional stability. It is important for the U.S. to have Colombia as a stable ally in South America for trade. Furthermore, the U.S. needs to support actively initiatives that will make Colombia more secure, given that much of the drug-related violence in Colombia is due to U.S.’s cocaine demand. That violence has already spilled over into the U.S.

Challenges and Costs

The U.S. is likely to lose a potential strategic ally if Colombia fails to diversify its economy. Monitoring SENA’s effectiveness has been a challenge in the past for the Colombian government. To ensure a return on its investment, the U.S. should allocate resources to ensure that training needs are met. Currently, vocational education and training make up the majority of the services offered, while the remaining is technical. By expanding technical services, the U.S. would face the cost of funding additional instructors capable of teaching technical skillsets. However, this additional cost would be outweighed by the benefit of ensuring a strong economic partnership between the two countries that remains secure, especially in the face of a growing Chinese presence in Latin America. Without U.S. investments in Colombia, China is one step closer to becoming the leading figure in economic relations with Latin America.

Colombia and Latin America as a whole are constantly plagued by corruption. This prohibits the government from carrying out effectively projects like 4G that boost the economy and increase security. To ensure transparency in governance, the U.S. needs to work cooperatively with 4G project managers by requiring that investors have access to information about 4G’s progress. Afro-Colombians and indigenous activists have historically opposed mega-projects infringing on their ancestral lands. The U.S. and E.U. can assist in reconciling minority groups with the Colombian NGO Justice and Peace to promote inclusive development and ensure that there is no further displacement of peoples.

---


Sustainability in Indigenous Communities

Recommendations

1. Aid Colombian efforts to attain agricultural sustainability through crop substitution

Background

It is in the U.S.’ security interest to support Colombian coca crop substitution policy to halt the transfer of cocaine to the U.S. While Plan Colombia has helped Colombia drastically reduce coca production in the past two decades, the trend has reversed dramatically in the past two years. From 2015 to 2016, coca production rose by 52%, from 96,000 hectares to 146,000 hectares.  

Because Colombia is the world’s top producer of cocaine, it is in the interest of the U.S. to help reduce Colombian coca production. Aiding in coca crop substitution would make Colombia more secure. This would free the Colombian government to work with the U.S. to advance other U.S. regional interests. Crop diversification also enriches soil and reduces the need for harsh chemical use to protect monocrop fields.

Indigenous and ungoverned regions in Colombia are especially susceptible to guerrilla violence. Some regions include Catatumbo in the north and Nariño and Putumayo in the south. Coca sales have contributed to funding guerrilla activity in these areas. The majority of IDPs in Colombia are indigenous and Afro-Colombians who live in these regions have been displaced by guerrilla violence.

Proposal and Implementation

We propose the U.S. aid the Colombian government’s efforts to help coca farmers to obtain training to diversify crops. Reducing coca production is likely to reduce cocaine smuggling to the U.S. The U.S. could support Colombia’s production of bananas, coffee and cocoa, all the which could draw considerable revenues from global markets. Bananas are one of Colombia’s most important agricultural exports and can serve as a subsistence crop.

We propose the U.S. to offer technology packages that provide water, pesticides, soil, and crop management techniques that would help farmers diversify their crop production. Successful crop substitution would increase food sustainability to communities that relied on coca as their main source of income. The increased stability would allow for greater

---

18 “Coca Crops in Colombia Increase Over 50 per cent in One Year”. UNODC, July 2017.
21 Mejia, Daniel. “Plan Colombia: An Analysis of Effectiveness and Costs”.
Colombian agricultural productivity and trade. This would strengthen the economy of one of the U.S.’s closest regional allies.

**Challenges and Costs**

The proposed foreign aid budget cuts for U.S. fiscal year 2017/2018 remain a challenge for foreign aid program implementations in Colombia. The U.S. has tried to help Colombia with crop substitution in the past. USAID has been a main source of funding for these efforts, but with mixed results. Once coca is substituted for a diversified crop farming system, the market prices for these crops may result in families making less than what they made when producing coca.

From 2006 to 2011, the U.S. funded a USAID program called ADAM, but the project encountered infrastructural challenges. The program sought to aid coca crop substitution and diversification. Implementation, however, did not account for the lack of infrastructure in some areas. ADAM did not impact coca substitution as greatly as predicted.

Farmers may struggle to sell new crops because of infrastructural challenges. These issues can complicate crop substitution. Transportation challenges mean that the newly cultivated crops do not always make it to a formal market before spoiling. USAID’s ADAM failed largely because of lack of infrastructure to get the crops to buyers before they withered. Crop substitution programs must be coupled with infrastructural development so farmers can send their goods rapidly to markets.

---


27 Beittel, June S. and Liana W. Rosen. (16).

28 Huertas Diaz, Oscar and Keri Culver. (40).
Education as a Prevention Policy to Reduce Rebel Group Participation

Recommendations

1. Invest in ACR, an agency that launches education initiatives to provide Afro-Colombians access to education.
2. Collaborate with UNGEI to invest in education that benefit Afro-Colombian women.

Background

It is in the U.S.’ interest to invest in Colombian education. Education can serve as a deterrence policy because it will reduce guerrilla groups’ recruitment influence in rural areas. A lack of educational opportunities in rural regions of the country encourages Afro-Colombians to join rebel groups instead of enrolling in school. According to UNHCR, Afro-Colombians who reside in rural areas are exposed to armed groups that also reside in the same rural areas and therefore are more likely to be recruited. Such armed groups operate from within rural areas to traffic drugs and weapons. Rebel groups can threaten U.S. security if they continue to export drugs rural areas in Colombia to the U.S.

To prevent ex-rebels from joining other rebel groups, the U.S. can invest in education and partner with groups like the ACR. 82% of Afro-Colombians lack basic needs, including education. Their illiteracy rate is 43%, compared to 23.4% for non-blacks. High levels of illiteracy and low levels of education make a population less competitive for the job market and can hinder the economic development of the country. Afro-Colombians who were part of the FARC should be provided assistance to be reintegrated into society.

Given that 40% of FARC members were women, it is important that young Afro-Colombian women receive educational resources, as this may prevent them from seeking employment in rebel groups. Afro-Colombian women have higher unemployment and illiteracy rates than Afro-Colombian men and non-Afro-Colombian women. Training and teaching former FARC Afro-Colombian women with basic skills such as reading will better equip them to participate in Colombia’s labor force.

Proposal and Implementation

We propose that the U.S. invest in ACR, which incorporates an educational component to prevent former Afro-Colombian FARC members from re-joining rebel groups. ACR’s reintegration program is a six and a half year commitment that provides training for work, psychological support, and most importantly, education. Resources are needed to build offices in rural areas and fund agency officers. This collaboration would focus on educating Afro-Colombians in professional job training. The agency should maintain records of job retention rates after 3 to 6

months to monitor success rates of civilian reintegration.

We propose that the U.S. collaborate with UNGEI to invest in girls’ education. The costs associated with prevention policy outweigh the costs of fighting a war. ACR’s program should focus on rural primary education and providing resources to improve their human capacity. Rural primary education is a priority because young girls living in rural areas are more likely to be a victim of a crime when cohabiting with rebel groups. In addition, cohabiting with rebels can make them targets of recruitment at a young age. Educating young women can enhance their technical skills, thus making them competitive job candidates.

Costs and Obstacles

The lack of representation of Afro-Colombians in politics hinders the successful implementation of resources that can benefit the Afro-Colombian Community. When the negotiations for the peace accord were initiated in 2012, there were no Afro-Colombian representation. The lack of political will by the government and Afro-Colombians’ limited voice may delay the implementation of services. The lack of representation can exclude the Afro-Colombian community from certain opportunities and resources. Although the lack of representation is an obstacle, it is manageable. The Colombian government can address this issue by recruiting more Afro-Colombians into politics.
Asia

One Belt One Road:
- Security Implications in Afghanistan
- Security Implications in Pakistan
- Economic Implications
- Environmental and Health Implications
Glossary

ACIA- ASEAN Comprehensive Investment Agreement
AIIB- Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank
ASEAN- Association of Southeast Asian Nations
ANDSF- Afghan National Defense and Security Forces
BITS- Bilateral Investment Treaties
BSA- Bilateral Security Agreement
CTUM- Confederation of Trade Unions Myanmar
CPEC- China-Pakistan Economic Corridor
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DOD- Department of Defense
FTAS- Free Trade Agreements
FDI- Foreign Direct Investment
FIL- Foreign Investment Law
ICT- Information and communications technology
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MIIT- Ministry of Industry and Information Technology
NATO- North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NDB - New Development Bank
OBOR- One Belt One Road
SPA- Strategic Partnership Agreement
SMAF- Self-Reliance through Mutual Accountability Framework
TIFA- Trade and Investment Framework Agreement
UN- United Nations
UNEP- United Nations Environment Programme
UNDP- United Nations Development Programme
USAID- United States Aid for International Development
WHO- World Health Organization
Executive Summary

The U.S. has two major opportunities for influence in Asia. The first missed opportunity was its decision not to join AIIB, a multilateral bank that aims to increase infrastructure development in Asia. Fourteen E.U. allies joined. This leaves the U.S. more isolated in its pursuit for influence in Asia. The second missed opportunity was the U.S. withdrawal from the TPP, an Asia-centered multilateral trade agreement designed to integrate the economies of partner states. Projected annual income gains from TPP ranged between 57 and 131 billion USD by 2032. By withdrawing, the U.S. lost market access to key Asian countries including Japan, Australia, Vietnam, Malaysia, and Singapore.

Meanwhile, China is increasing its influence in Asia through the One Belt, One Road (OBOR) initiative. OBOR aims to stimulate China's economic relationships with states in Asia, Africa and E.U. by connecting these regions through railroads, roads, ports, bridges, energy transit systems, and technology. The “belt” refers the land component of the project, running from China through Central Asia to E.U. The “road” refers to the maritime transit from China through Southeast Asia and beyond. Financed from the Silk Road Fund, CDB, AIIB, and NDB, OBOR is estimated to cost 1 trillion USD and involve approximately 65 countries.

In 2017, the U.S. expressed interest in OBOR for the first time. In May 2017, China and the U.S. announced their 100-day U.S.-China Trade Agreement during the U.S.-China Comprehensive Economic Dialogue. In that plan, the U.S. recognized the importance of OBOR and announced its intent to send delegates to the OBOR Forum in Beijing. However, the U.S. needs to do more to secure its pivot to Asia. This report will examine OBOR’s security, economic, and environmental/health implications for the U.S. and Asia.

Security

OBOR has addressed security concerns that may strengthen the U.S.’ counterterrorism efforts worldwide, including in Afghanistan and Pakistan. Therefore, OBOR is a chance for U.S. to increase counterterrorism efforts in Afghanistan and Pakistan. China provided military assistance to Afghanistan to ensure that OBOR projects were built successfully. However, while the U.S. may benefit from China’s efforts to stabilize Afghanistan, OBOR may erode U.S foreign policy’s

---

42 Zheng, S. (2017). All you need to know about China’s ‘Belt and Road Initiative’: what is it, who’s paying, who’ll benefit and who might lose out. N.p.: South China Morning Post.
effectiveness in promoting accountability and transparency in governance. OBOR’s “unconditional aid” may divert the Afghan government from proper government reform.

Current U.S. counterterrorism efforts in Pakistan have failed because the U.S.’ approach has not effectively addressed drivers of terrorism. Drivers of terrorism in Pakistan include unemployment, poverty, and human rights violations. The China Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC), the Pakistani specific portion of OBOR, is a project that invests in economic, security, transportation, and other forms of development. CPEC also aims to address unemployment poverty through job creation. CPEC is an opportunity for the U.S. to work with Pakistan and China to address the drivers of terrorism.

**Economics**

OBOR’s infrastructure development presents an opportunity for the U.S. to enhance cross-regional trade with Asia, while also strengthening China-U.S. relations. Along with OBOR are other Asian infrastructure development plans and initiatives. For instance, the ADB, a multilateral bank that aims to enhance economic growth and cooperation in Asia, invests $881 billion annually on infrastructure projects in Asia, yet invested only $0.4 million in 2016 on OBOR projects.\(^\text{44}\) Although the ADB invests significantly in Asia’s infrastructure development, it is not investing in an optimal way. Rather than duplicating infrastructure efforts, ADB can fund OBOR. We recommend that the U.S. encourage fellow ADB members to allocate more ADB funds to OBOR’s infrastructure projects.
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**Environment/Health**

As a global leader in health and a major contributor of foreign aid for environmental protection, the U.S. is interested in participating nations of OBOR that it has provided aid to for several decades. OBOR may counteract U.S. efforts by planning to build infrastructure and transportation systems that can have significant negative impacts on environment and health in these nations. Therefore, the U.S. needs to become involved by coordinating and collaborating with the U.N., the World Health Organization, and the World Bank to encourage China to adopt environmental protection measures and Sustainable Development Goals.
One Belt One Road: Security Implications in Afghanistan

Recommendations

1. Reinstate funding for USAID’s Community Cohesion Initiative (CCI) in Afghanistan.
2. Tighten U.S.-Afghanistan trade agreements by strengthening TIFA and SMAF
3. Reinstate funding for the Commander’s Emergency Reconstruction Program and the Provincial Reconstruction Unit

Background

The U.S.’ key interest in OBOR is benefitting from China’s efforts to promote stability in Afghanistan and countering terrorism. In 2016, China provided military assistance to Afghanistan for the first time. Beijing has sought to quell terrorist activities near the Afghanistan-China border that may hinder China’s infrastructural development plans in Afghanistan. Both countries have tightened their security partnership and conducted joint anti-terrorism programs in China.

Similarly, U.S. foreign policy has aimed to bolster ANDSF’s military competency, and expedite Afghanistan’s economic reconstruction by tightening U.S.-Afghanistan security relations. China’s military assistance supports U.S. counterterrorism objectives in Afghanistan. However, the problem with OBOR’s military aid is its lack of emphasis in government and economic accountability. Although Chinese military aid may provide short-term solutions to terrorism, it may impede the U.S. goal of helping Afghanistan to stabilize its institutions.

We recommend the U.S increase counterterrorism efforts in Afghanistan. This could be achieved through: (1) reinstating funding for the Community Cohesion Initiative (CCI) in Afghanistan (2) strengthening trade agreements with Afghanistan (3) reinstating funding for stabilization programs.

Proposal and Implementation

We recommend the U.S. reinstate funding for the Community Cohesion Initiative (CCI) in Afghanistan. Refinancing the CCI may increase political participation in Afghan communities and increase pressure on the Afghan government to strengthen their accountability and transparency frameworks. The CCI was led by USAID’s Office of Transition Initiatives (OTI). OTI’s mission in Afghanistan was to bolster community cohesiveness in times of political unrest, terrorist activity, and other tensions. For example, the CCI created a huge network of local radio channels that make positive political news accessible to public. CCI may compensate for OBOR’s negligence in promoting government
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accountability. CCI could also strengthen U.S. efforts to stabilize Afghanistan.

We recommend the U.S. tighten U.S.-Afghanistan trade agreements by strengthening TIFA and SMAF. The TIFA and SMAF can increase bilateral trade while requiring the Afghan government to commit to government reform and human rights law.\(^{52}\) The U.S. and other governments pledged $15.2 billion of international financial support to Afghanistan at the Brussels Conference in 2016.\(^ {53}\) In return, Afghanistan pledged to facilitate government reform, and strengthen local human rights law. TIFA and SMAF may become key factors in ensuring increased transparency from the Afghan government. Hence, China’s OBOR will be less likely to jeopardize U.S. stabilization efforts in Afghanistan.

We recommend the U.S. reinstate funding for two stabilization programs in Afghanistan: Commander’s Emergency Reconstruction Program (CERP) and the Provincial Reconstruction Team (PRT). The CERP and PRT can complement OBOR’s infrastructural development plans in Afghanistan. However, their greatest contribution to Afghanistan is protecting Afghan human rights and promoting government accountability. CERP financed reconstruction projects in Afghanistan. The program funded military commanders to lead the rebuilding of infrastructure during the war in Afghanistan. Further, CERP required the military to allocate the funds to benefit the Afghan people.\(^ {54}\) Similarly, PRT organized reconstruction projects in Afghanistan in 2002 and partnered with the Afghan government to strengthen their accountability and governing techniques.\(^ {55}\) These programs can address OBOR’s disregard of government legitimacy in Afghanistan.

**Challenges and Costs**

Reinstating CERP and PRT may drastically increase U.S. military presence in Afghanistan. This may require greater program administration to prevent overlooking human rights conditions. Monitoring programs should be included in each initiative to ensure proper implementation of reconstruction plans.

Second, U.S.-Afghanistan trade agreements may have limited impact on Afghanistan’s political instability stemming from tensions with neighbors. Increasing U.S.-Afghanistan trade will not necessarily eradicate political unrest in Afghanistan. Furthermore, insurgencies may discontinue trade in Afghanistan, causing huge economic loss for U.S. partners. We recommend U.S. investors partner with or finance CERP and PRT to tighten Afghanistan’s security regulations. This may create a more conducive trading environment in Afghanistan.

Finally, proper impact evaluation and monitoring is costly but necessary.\(^ {56}\) For the reinstatement of CCI to be successful, stricter impact evaluation and monitoring requirements must be implemented.

---
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One Belt One Road: Security Implications in Pakistan

Recommendations

1. Partner with Pakistan and China on CPEC projects that fight poverty, unemployment and human rights violations

Background

Since the beginning of the GWT, it has been in U.S. interest to fight terrorism in Pakistan. The U.S.’ post 9/11 counterterrorism approach has, however, failed because the U.S. has not taken an aggressive, comprehensive approach to combating terrorism. CPEC is an opportunity to address domestic problems in Pakistan that are drivers of terrorism. These drivers include unemployment and human rights violations. The U.S. must transition from a military-centric counterterrorism plan to a comprehensive approach that emphasizes investment in human capital and protection of human rights. It is in the U.S.’ interest to partner with specific CPEC projects to address issues of unemployment, poverty and human rights violations.

The U.S.’ current counterterrorism method is flawed because it fights terrorists, not contributors to terrorism. The U.S. has fought terrorism with Pakistan since 9/11. Despite U.S. efforts to reduce terrorism in the region, in 2016 Pakistan ranked 4th among the countries most affected by terrorism and the 6th deadliest in the world. Moreover, the number of terrorist organizations in Pakistan is increasing and spreading across the country. Given the time and resources the U.S. has invested to fight terrorism in Pakistan, this is a disappointing outcome. U.S. and Pakistani efforts have failed because they are neglecting the drivers of terrorism.

CPEC serves as an opportunity for the U.S. to work with Pakistan to fight unemployment, poverty and human rights violations. To fight terrorism, the U.S. must take a comprehensive approach to address these contributors to terrorism. CPEC provides Pakistan with the financial support it needs to address these drivers. CPEC is already investing $46 billion into economic, security, transportation, and other forms of development. The U.S. only needs to work with CPEC to expand its projects to reduce unemployment, poverty, and human rights violations.

Proposal and Implementation

We recommend the U.S. partner with Pakistan and China on CPEC projects that fight poverty, unemployment and human rights violations. First, the U.S. may start a dialogue with Pakistan and China to identify ways to address unemployment and poverty. The U.S. has worked with Pakistan on development projects in the past, so Pakistan is likely to coordinate with the U.S. on CPEC development projects. Second, the U.S. can reallocate USAID funding from peace and security to CPEC projects. Third, the U.S. and the U.N. can work with the Pakistani and Chinese governments to
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address human rights concerns on existing CPEC projects.

**Challenges and Costs**

First, there are other drivers of terrorism in Pakistan other than poverty, unemployment, and human rights violations and the U.S. cannot identify or address all of them. Therefore, the U.S. needs to choose key drivers where it can have the highest impact most efficiently.

Second, it may be a challenge to negotiate the U.S.’ role in CPEC. CPEC is China’s and Pakistan’s economic project and they might be opposed to U.S. involvement on CPEC projects. Third, CPEC might not acknowledge its human rights violations. If the violation is not recognized then this may lead to conflict between CPEC and the U.N. Fourth, agencies such as DOD and USAID might consider the transition to a comprehensive approach unproductive and oppose reallocation of funding. However, the reallocation of funding will avoid additional fiscal costs. Fifth, humanitarian advocates might also oppose reallocation of aid. These humanitarians might consider investing in CPEC an unproductive means of development.
One Belt One Road: Economic Implications

Recommendations

1. Encourage ADB member states to approve allocating more funds to OBOR infrastructure projects

Background

The U.S. has an interest in pushing for increased allocation of ADB funds to OBOR because it is a more efficient use of resources. The ADB, a multilateral bank that aims to enhance economic growth and cooperation in Asia, invests $881 billion annually on infrastructure projects in Asia, yet invested only $0.4 million in 2016 on OBOR. The ADB has similar infrastructure goals of OBOR, which is also partly financed by the multilateral bank, AIIB. The U.S. is not a member of AIIB. Instead, the U.S. is funding Asian infrastructure through ADB. ABD’s investments in infrastructure are duplicating efforts of OBOR. It is not efficient to have separate investments, planning, and labor for multiple infrastructure projects in Asia. Rather than duplicating efforts, it would be more efficient for ADB to fund OBOR. Thus, OBOR is the ideal opportunity to increase—infrastructure development efficiency in Asia.

The U.S. has an economic interest in OBOR because it leads to financial returns. Countries hosting OBOR projects constitute over 65% of the world’s population and one-fourth of the world’s trades of goods and services. Access to these markets and consumers will boost U.S.-Asia trade relations. Furthermore, the enhanced infrastructure through OBOR will raise Asia’s human capacity and productivity. In the long run, investments in infrastructure create a 20% rate of return. Direct economic returns to U.S. include enhanced telecommunications, increased transportation of goods, and business opportunities along the OBOR route. Indirect economic returns are rooted in the multiplier effect of infrastructure. First, increased core infrastructure (e.g. roads and telecommunications) leads to an increase in public capital (e.g. hospitals and schools). Second, this increase of public service demand and supply boosts employment opportunities and overall wellbeing. Third, these interrelated dynamics contribute to greater political and social stability in a region. A stable region is associated with low risk in trade and investment, thus benefiting U.S. economic interests.

The U.S. has an interest in enhancing U.S.-China economic collaboration. Some argue OBOR will allow China to increase its own economic power along the route. However, U.S. support of OBOR will lead
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to an expansion of a rules-based economic and trading system. U.S. participation in OBOR will also allow for abundant U.S.-China business and trade relations. Although the U.S. and China currently have an Economic Cooperation 100-day plan\(^69\), the ADB’s financial support of OBOR can further strengthen U.S.-China economic ties. The U.S. already missed an opportunity to collaborate with China by not joining AIIB.

It is expected that China will be receptive to U.S. support of OBOR because (1) the countries are already discussing how to enhance economic collaboration and (2) OBOR is projected to require additional funds. There is strong a commitment to the U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue, a platform to increase bilateral economic cooperation.\(^70\) While China estimates OBOR will cost $1 trillion, experts anticipate the investment may range from $4-8 trillion.\(^71\) Furthermore, in May 2017, the president of the AIIB emphasized that an “infrastructure bottleneck is coming up just because of the fast growth [of Asia].”\(^72\) These circumstances create the optimal opportunity for U.S. to support OBOR.

**Proposal and Implementation**

We recommend the U.S. encourage ADB members to approve reallocating existing ADB funds to OBOR infrastructure projects. To achieve this, the U.S. can propose a vote to the ADB Board of Directors to reallocate ADB funds to OBOR. Key players in the voting process include the U.S., China, E.U. member states, Japan, and India.

The first step is for the U.S to apply considerable diplomatic power to form a partnership of ADB leaders that will vote “yes” to support the reallocation of funds to OBOR. This partnership will be between the U.S., China, and E.U. member states. This partnership creates substantial collective voting power. As you can see from Table 1, the U.S. alone does not have sufficient voting power (12.8%). However, the collective voting power of the U.S. (12.8%), the E.U. (13.8%), and China (5.5%) is 32%.

The second step is for the partnership to prepare a proposal to reallocate existing ADB funds to OBOR. This proposal could be announced at the next ADB Annual Meeting. In the fall of 2017, the U.S. can organize a meeting with the partnership to discuss how to pitch the proposal. In the early spring of 2018, the coalition can finalize the proposal and prepare for the 51\(^{st}\) ADB annual meeting in Manila, Philippines (May 3\(^{rd}\) - 6\(^{th}\)).\(^73\)
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Costs and Challenges

The major challenge to our recommendation is pushback from Japan and India. These two countries currently do not support OBOR and are expected to vote against the proposal. As you can see from Table 1, Japan and India constitute a collective 18.22% of votes. However if the U.S. successfully develops a coalition with the E.U. and China, the U.S. will have superior voting power over Japan and India combined (32.0% vs. 18.2% respectively).

Another consideration is the potential of weakening relations with Japan and India in the voting process. The U.S. and Japan partner in security, diplomacy, science and technology, and global health. The U.S. and India have deepened their economic relationship with the U.S.-India Strategic Dialogue. U.S.-Japan trade totaled to $270.7 billion in 2016. U.S.-India trade totaled to $114.8 billion in 2016. These diplomatic and economic relations may be at stake if the U.S. opposes Japan’s and India’s stance against OBOR.

There is no direct cost associated with this recommendation because it would be a reallocation of ADB’s existing $881 billion investment in Asia’s infrastructure to fund OBOR’s infrastructure project.
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One Belt One Road: Environmental and Health Implications

Recommendations:
1. Collaborate with the UNDP to strengthen its two specific Sustainable Development Goals for China to consider carefully during OBOR’s construction:
   a. Sustainable Energy for All Initiative
   b. Good Health and Wellbeing programs
2. Coordinate with WHO to strengthen the China-WHO Country Cooperation Strategy to maintain and monitor basic health standards in OBOR member states

Background

The U.S. is interested in maintaining the internationally accepted health and environmental standards in OBOR member states. The U.S. is already providing assistance for these respective issues in developing countries participating in OBOR, such as Bangladesh, Indonesia, Nepal, and Vietnam. OBOR’s unsustainable infrastructure and development plans may significantly increase environmental and health concerns. Thus, these actions can jeopardize U.S. development assistance and make our programs ineffective.

China’s use and production of harmful infrastructural materials undermines U.S. environmental assistance efforts in these member states. First, to build the transportation infrastructure, China plans to invest in large amounts of “chemical, concrete, steel, and base metals” production. These chemicals and materials are being produced in the countries where the infrastructure is being built with loans from China. This can significantly increase air and water pollution in these developing member states that lack the capacity to handle mass production of harmful materials. By excluding itself from this conversation, the U.S. could harm relationships with these developing democracies.

Another reason OBOR undermines U.S. environmental assistance is that many of the OBOR member states are already dealing with dangerous environmental issues. First, OBOR member states, along with China, already account for “half of the world’s greenhouse gas emissions.” In its Sustainable Development Goals, the U.N. recognizes that one of the main contributors to climate change is energy, which accounts for 60% of global greenhouse gas emissions. This shows that OBOR may increase harmful emissions leading to great long term damage globally. Therefore, the U.S. must voice its interest to make sure that the large amount of foreign aid given is not wasted. Table 2 demonstrates U.S. foreign aid with a focus on health and environment given to Bangladesh, Indonesia, Nepal and Vietnam in 2017.

---

79 Qin, L. (2016, July 1).
Furthermore, OBOR’s unsustainable infrastructure and development plans undermine U.S. health assistance efforts in these developing member states. China believes that OBOR will help develop the participating poor states. However, WHO recognizes that implementing such development projects in the member states where poor health services hinder growth can harm those countries more than help them. OBOR can increase pressure on national governments' lack of capacity to control disease outbreaks and deliver basic health services.\footnote{Linlin, W. (2017, January 19). China and WHO Adopt Transformative Approach: Linking Health and Economic Development with New Agreement on One Belt One Road Initiative. Retrieved July, 2017} Therefore, it is imperative that the U.S. is involved in the process to avoid increasing health concerns that prevent those states from taking advantage of U.S. assistance. We recommend the U.S. collaborate with UNDP, cooperate with WHO, and begin an environment and health dialogue with China.

**Proposal and Implementation**

We recommend the U.S. collaborate with the UNDP to strengthen their two specific Sustainable Development Goals for China to carefully consider during OBOR’s construction. The two goals are Sustainable Energy for All Initiative and the programs under Good Health and Well Being. The U.S. can advance these goals by offering additional funding to the World Bank on the condition that loans to China for OBOR require meeting internationally accepted environmental and health standards. The World Bank can mandate China to work towards specific environmental and health goals recognized in the SDGs in return for loans. One requirement can be limiting the production of chemicals or greenhouse gas emissions. This is in U.S. interest because ensuring that China meets SDG standards will allow for a more effective use of U.S. aid to these developing member states.

We recommend the U.S. coordinate with WHO to strengthen the China-WHO Country Cooperation Strategy to monitor basic health standards in OBOR member states. Priority six of this Strategy states that WHO and China will collaborate to address health needs in developing countries including the member states in the OBOR Initiative.\footnote{CHINA-WHO Country Cooperation Strategy 2016–2020. (2017). Retrieved July, 2017} The U.S. can work with China through WHO to recognize the basic health services in these nations. This action allows U.S. to monitor China’s adopting sustainable development programs in collaboration with the governments of these nations. This can allow the U.S. to re-direct its foreign aid in these areas to other important issues.

We recommend the U.S. begin an environmental and global health dialogue with China. Given U.S.-China's past success in economic dialogues, the U.S. has the experience and ability to propose and host another dialogue specifically focused on environmental and health issues. This action allows U.S. and China to work collaboratively on the environmental and health issues without being bound by an official agreement.
Challenges and Costs

One challenge is to convince the World Bank to push for environmental and health friendly conditions because the World Bank may resist placing additional conditions on its loans. Therefore, the U.S. may need to increase its contributions to the World Bank to persuade China to alter its environmental and health policies in directions that the U.S. desires. Another challenge is to ensure and monitor that China will work per the *Affordable and Clean Energy Goal* and the *Good Health and Well Being Goal* because it is difficult to hold China accountable. In addition, the U.S. must recognize that U.S. and China have different interests and values. Therefore, both China and the U.S. will enter this conversation with different goals and might not share the same perspective. Thus, the main challenge for the U.S. is to defend American interests when dealing with China’s vigorous pursuit of its own interest.
Table 1. ADB Voting Power in \(^{84}\)%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Subscribed Capital (% of total)</th>
<th>Voting Power (% of total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>15.567%</td>
<td>12.752%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.U. Countries</td>
<td>12.378%</td>
<td>13.780%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>6.473%</td>
<td>5.477%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34.418%</strong></td>
<td><strong>32.009%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>15.677%</td>
<td>12.840%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>6.359%</td>
<td>5.386%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.036%</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.226%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. *U.S. Foreign Aid 2017 in millions of dollars: Health and Environment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Health Expenditures</th>
<th>Environment Expenditures</th>
<th>Total Health and Environment Expenditures</th>
<th>% of Spent Total Foreign aid on Health and Environment</th>
<th>Total planned amount to be spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>$17.59</td>
<td>$8.33</td>
<td>$25.92</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>$101.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>$9.36</td>
<td>$12.17</td>
<td>$21.53</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>$87.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>$7.86</td>
<td>$3.53</td>
<td>$11.39</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>$51.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>$4.72</td>
<td>$9.56</td>
<td>$14.28</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>$71.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Somalia:
- Good Governance to Promote Stability
- Climate Change: Addressing the Impact of Drought on Stability and Terrorism
- Fighting Drought-related Diseases to Prevent Regional Instability
- Mitigating Piracy on the Coast to Enhance Security and Protect Economic Interests
- Countering Al-Shabaab and Preventing Insurgency
Glossary

AIAI- al-Itihad al-Islamiya
AMISOM- African Union Mission in Somalia
AU- African Union
CMF- Combined Maritime Forces
CTF 151 - Combined Task Force 151
EUNAVFOR – European Union Naval Force
E.U.- European Union
FGS- The Federal Government of Somalia
UNFPA- United Nations Population Fund
PAC- Physicians Across Continents
IOM- International Organization for Migration
ICU- Islamic Courts Union
MIA- Mogadishu International Airport
NATO- North Atlantic Treaty Organization
TFG- Transitional Federal Government
UNITAF- United Task Force
UN OCHA - United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
UNICEF - United Nations Children's Fund
UNOSOM I- United Nations Operation in Somalia I
UNOSOM II- United Nations Operation in Somalia II
USAID- United States Agency for International Development
Executive Summary

U.S. strategic interests in Somalia is to eliminate terrorist threats and promote democracy. Poor governance in Somalia is leading to political instability, environmental and security challenges, all of which aggravate instability in the Horn of Africa.

Political Instability

The absence of a functional central government, lack of resources and administrative capacity, and weak institutions contribute to the security issues in Somalia. Instability has resulted in the deterioration of state legitimacy, state institutions, and the delivery of public services like education and healthcare for the Somali people.

Environmental Challenges

Climate change in the Horn of Africa contributes to instability in Somalia. Drought related diseases and food insecurity are regional crises, fueling conflict and migration. As the effects of climate change intensify, the U.S. must coordinate with the E.U., U.N., and NGOs to mitigate the humanitarian and security crisis in Somalia.

Security

The re-emergence of piracy in Somalia threatens American vessels, commercial assets, and humanitarian aid. The U.S. should establish effective measures to counter violent extremism and al-Shabaab’s dominance in south and central Somalia.
Establishing Good Governance to Promote Stability

Recommendations

1. Press the Federal Government of Somalia (FGS) to halt the federalist project and work instead within the current governance structures
2. Facilitate peace talks between FGS and members of al-Shabaab
3. Provide capacity building and anti-corruption training for FGS officials

Background

Somalia’s instability and lawlessness threatens U.S. national security, because of the rise of terror groups like al-Shabaab, and U.S. Indian Ocean maritime trade route. Political corruption, clan favoritism, and a lack of political consensus have led to the deterioration of legitimate state institutions and the delivery of public services for Somalis. Furthermore, the instability and lawlessness have bred distrust between the FGS and its citizens. Tackling bad governance will promote peace and security within Somalia, ensuring Somalia’s ability to have a strong and stable democracy.

Somalia’s multiple changes of government failed to address the needs of the Somali people, which empowered clan Chiefs and warlords. Somalia transitioned from a weak democracy to a dictatorship to anarchy. During Somalia’s period of anarchy from 1991 to 2013, the U.S. closed its embassy and carried out humanitarian missions to help Somalis. These missions failed because Somali warlords who wanted control of an anarchic Somalia initiated combat with U.S. soldiers. Somalia’s lack of central governance elevated the power of clan Chiefs and warlords. Clan Chiefs declared the regions of Puntland and Somaliland autonomous. In 2013, the FGS was established and recognized by the U.S. government. The FGS struggled to combat the instability caused by political corruption, clan favoritism, and a lack of political consensus.

Somalia has started the state-building process, but it needs more technical support from the U.S. The election of President Mohamed Abdullahi Farmajo in 2017 represents a positive outlook for the future of Somali governance and democracy. While President Farmajo has paid government salaries, regained airspace control, and disrupted the flow of illegal weapons, he needs to address issues of political corruption, clan favoritism, and a lack of political consensus to combat instability. This struggle is widespread even with support from USAID. Stability in Somalia requires the FGS to work within current governance structure, start peace talks with al-Shabaab, and continue anti-corruption training for FGS officials.

Proposal and Implementation

The U.S. should press the FGS to abandon the federalist project temporarily and work within the current governance structures. The FGS should govern
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alongside the Presidents for Somaliland and Puntland to provide security for the people. For the areas where the FGS has sole control of governance, the FGS should strengthen the capacity of the local governments to advance development. These actions show Somalis President Farmaajo and his administration's dedication and legitimacy to Somalia. This will serve to promote unity and clan reconciliation.

The U.S. should encourage peace talks between the FGS and members of al-Shabaab. The U.S. government should push for open, honest dialogue between the Somali government and the members of the al-Shabaab. The members of al-Shabaab are Somali people who are desperate for basic security such as food and clean water. They represent a discontent group who are angry about government failures. Addressing their issues will weaken the capacity of al-Shabaab leaders to carry out terrorist attacks. The goal of these talks should be a peace treaty between the FGS and al-Shabaab members.

The U.S. should continue capacity building and anti-corruption training with the FGS officials. Even though President Farmaajo ushered in a wave of hope for the Somali people, corruption within Somalia’s government institutions is still rampant. USAID’s Democracy, Human Rights, and Governance program in Somalia has achieved results. The program has helped FGS officials formulate the Public Financial Management Act, the Public Procurement Act, and the National Audit Act. This is a step in the right direction for the FGS. Capacity building and anti-corruption training shows the Somali people that Farmaajo and his administration will be transparent and accountable.

Challenges and Costs

There is a deep sense of anti-Americanism in Somalia because of failed missions. Collaboration between both governments could distance the Somali government from its people and threaten Somalia’s emerging democracy.

There is no guarantee that clan leaders will work with Farmaajo or that al-Shabaab members will engage in dialogue. If Farmaajo is unable to reach a governing agreement with clan leaders or a peace treaty with al-Shabaab members, peace and security in Somalia could deteriorate. This deterioration could result in continued instability in Somalia.

90 Democracy, Human Rights, and Governance: Strengthening Somali Governance (2017, April 19). In USAID.

Climate Change: Addressing the Impact of Drought on Stability and Terrorism

Recommendations

1. Increase humanitarian aid to the World Food Programme to support in famine areas
2. Cooperate with the E.U. to urge the Somali government to transition from AMISOM to SNA
3. Pressure FGS to develop an effective water reclamation system

Background

The U.S.’ key interest is preventing Somalia from becoming a safe haven for international terrorism. The U.S. must address the impacts of climate change to further its interest in Somalia. Since November 2016, the drought in Somalia has displaced over 680,000 people and contributed to forced migration of Somalis to Yemen and Libya, gateways to E.U. shores. The humanitarian aid community has warned that the drought could result in similar consequences to those of the 2011 famine, which killed more than a quarter of a million Somalis.

There is concern within the international community that al-Shabaab may block aid to regions under its control. During the 2011 famine, al-Shabaab banned aid agencies from towns under its control. Currently, al-Shabaab provides assistance to families in its territory, a strategy to frame itself as a governing entity for rural communities and gain popularity amongst clans. This can exacerbate political instability in the country and threaten the U.S.’ interest to counter violent extremism (CVE) in Somalia.

Additional U.S. financial support of AFRICOM and AMISOM can help neutralize terrorism threats in Somalia. AMISOM must receive enough funding to train and transfer responsibilities to SNA, before withdrawing from Somalia starting in October 2017. Inadequate U.S. support of AMISOM, AFRICOM, and aid agencies can undermine CVE progress.

Proposal and Implementation

We recommend the U.S. increase humanitarian aid to the World Food Programme to support in famine areas. Immediate funding is needed for food, nutrition assistance for children, and safe drinking water. Food aid in famine regions will mitigate the risks of youth joining al-Shabaab. SNA and AMISOM must continue to patrol roads to protect humanitarian workers. The U.S. can provide logistical support to nonprofit organizations, like Oxfam and Mercy Corps, that provide assistance in al-Shabaab controlled regions. This will ensure that Somalis in rural towns are receiving aid while ensuring the safety of humanitarian workers.

The U.S. should cooperate with the E.U. to urge FGS to complete and implement an exit
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strategy from AMISOM. The SNA must prepare to take security responsibility starting October 2017. Once AMISOM troops leave in October 2017, SNA must be prepared to overtake the security responsibilities. The U.S. must engage in multilateral discussions between the A.U., E.U., and FGS to strategize on how to move AMISOM operations in progress to SNA.

The U.S. should pressure FGS to develop an effective water reclamation system. We propose the U.S. partner with the Somali National Drought Committee and the U.N. to build an effective water reclamation system. Investment in water supply projects can reduce Somalia's vulnerability to future food insecurity. Improved water supply will benefit households and irrigation to improve food supply. Steady water supply in rural areas can reduce conflicts over limited resources, which improves collaboration between clans. Water-recycling projects may be costly, but it is imperative to establish long-term political stability in rural areas.

**Challenges and Costs**

Providing aid and sponsoring development projects will require adjustments to the U.S. budget. Funds may be redirected from larger sections of the defense budget to augment AFRICOM’s countering violent extremism initiatives.\textsuperscript{100}

Identifying monetary sources and coordinating capital to invest in water reclamation projects may be challenging for FGS because of political corruption and bad governance. However, securing water supply is crucial to improving drought outcomes.

---
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Fighting Drought-related Diseases to Prevent Regional Instability

Recommendations

1. Establish mobile clinics to provide health services to Somalis living in remote areas
2. Promote health education initiatives on how Obstetric Fistula increases the outbreak of cholera
3. Encourage the Somali Ministry of Health to test for Parasitic Amoeba and Valley fever

Background

Stability in the Horn of Africa protects U.S. economic relations with countries in the region. With the catastrophic drought in Somalia, nearly 1.5 million Somalis are internally displaced while an estimated 900,000 are refugees in host countries including about 308,600 in Kenya, 246,700 in Ethiopia and 22,000 in Djibouti. The inflow of refugees increases instability in Africa’s horn by inflicting economic, social, and environmental costs on the host nations. Based on these costs, the Kenyan government recently announced plans to close down Dadaab camp, which provides shelter to at least 260,000 Somali refugees.

The drought in Somalia impacts the country’s economy because over half of Somalis work in agriculture. The drought leads to infertile lands and affects both crops and livestock; hence subsistence and commercial farmers are unable to provide food for their families and their customers. The lack of freshwater in lakes and other bodies of water causes bacteria levels to increase significantly. Communities drink water directly from these contaminated lakes and are thus exposed to water-borne diseases like cholera.

In order to mitigate the effects of drought-related diseases, efforts should be aimed at combating Obstetric Fistula because it causes poor sanitation. Obstetric Fistula is a common childbirth defect affecting the majority of Somalia’s women. Poor sanitation is a major factor that aggravates the spread of diseases in Somalia’s drought regions. Obstetric Fistula causes the leakage of urine and feces in women and aids the growth of bacteria in their environment, thus increasing the chances of cholera. The cholera epidemic increases instability in Somalia because the high mortality rate reduces economic productivity within the nation. Host countries are affected because infected Somali refugees are likely to spread the disease in these countries.

The U.S. involvement in mitigating Somalia’s insecurity and cholera epidemic complements its humanitarian policies aimed at fostering peace in countries threatened by war, violence, and insecurity. It also promotes the U.S. National Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security. The insecurity in Somalia is worsening the mortality rate associated with the cholera epidemic. The Al-Shabaab terrorists prevent Somalis in remote areas from accessing freshwater.

---

healthcare services offered by humanitarian organizations.\footnote{Burke, J. (2017, July 27). Al-Shabaab militants ban starving Somalis from accessing aid.}

**Proposal and Implementation**

We propose that the U.S. establish mobile clinics to provide services to Somalis living in remote areas. The most affected communities live in the rural areas of Somalia where the authority of Al-Shabaab is strongest. AMISOM is working to decrease Al-Shabaab’s dominance in Somalia. If AMISOM succeeds, the U.S. will have a better chance of providing medical care to cholera-infected Somalis. Once the cholera epidemic is mitigated, there will be a lower risk of migrating Somalis spreading the disease in host regions.\footnote{Kenya: Cholera Outbreak Spreads to Dadaab Refugee Camp. (2015, December 17). Medecins Sans Frontieres.} This effect will decrease the likelihood of disease outbreaks and instability in neighboring countries.

The U.S. should work with the Somali Ministry of Health and UNICEF to promote health education initiatives on how Obstetric Fistula increases the outbreak of cholera. The initiatives should address root causes of Obstetric Fistula such as untimely access to healthcare for pregnant women. By promoting awareness of this medical condition, the U.S. can help mitigate the effects that poor sanitation has on drought related diseases. This action will address poor health which is one of the root causes of poor instability in Somalia.

We advise the U.S. to encourage Somali Ministry of Health to test for Parasitic Amoeba and Valley fever. These are deadly drought-related diseases with causes and symptoms similar to cholera. Medical personnel should monitor a sick patient not recovering from cholera treatment. This may be a sign to check for the emergence of other drought-related diseases. These preventive measures will reduce the incidences of multiple drought-related diseases spreading among Somalis and refugee communities.

**Challenges and Costs**

Terrorism is a major challenge. The dominance of Al-Shabaab militants in the rural areas of Somalia will delay inhabitants’ access to mobile clinics in these areas. Somalis in Al-Shabaab territories will be unable to access medical care until the U.S. and AMISOM are able to combat the militants.

The average cost to treat Obstetric Fistula is approximately $586 per person. Also, with a focus on cholera as the main drought-related disease in Somalia, limited funds may be available to test for Parasitic Amoeba and Valley Fever. The U.S. will need to partner with the E.U. to fund these efforts.
Mitigating Piracy on the Coast to Enhance Security and Protect Economic Interests

Recommendations

1. Continue participation in Combined Maritime Forces: Combined Task Force 151
2. Pressure NATO to re-establish Operation Ocean Shield
3. Endorse the African Union’s 2050 Integrated Maritime Strategy

Background

Piracy off Somalia’s coast threatens the security of American vessels and commercial assets, the delivery of humanitarian aid, and important trade routes. The security of Somalia’s waters is a critical topic in the global maritime community because $700 billion worth of international cargo transits along the Somali Coast each year. The U.S. is part of CTF 151, a 31-nation naval partnership that patrols the Gulf of Aden to disrupt piracy and armed robbery. In 2008 and 2009, CTF 151, NATO Operation Ocean Shield, and the EUNAVFOR Operation Atalanta combined their international missions to respond to piracy off Somalia’s coast.

Piracy resurfaced in the early months of 2017 following a relaxation of international naval oversight; the relaxation occurred in response to observed declining piracy rates between 2012 and 2016. NATO’s operating budget for Ocean Shield decreased from about $5.5 million in 2011, to about $1.4 million in 2014. NATO’s mandate in the seas off the Horn of Africa ended in December 2016, with a declaration that it had achieved its objective of reducing piracy by a significant amount. Somali piracy reached its peak in January 2011 when 736 hostages and 32 ships were captured. By October 2016 those stats dropped to zero successfully held hostages and ships, an accomplishment attributed to the oversight of the joint international navies. Yet, there have been at least 5 successful piracy attacks from January to April 2017. Piracy rates rose when international naval patrols decreased, suggesting that such patrols are a temporary fix. The U.S. can contribute to long-term solutions in Somalia by alleviating the causes of piracy.

Causes of Somali piracy include animosity over illegal fishing by foreign vessels and the absence of a functioning government in Somalia. The African Union’s 2050 Integrated Maritime Strategy aims to deter illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing in Africa’s waters as well as develop effective Coast Guards in vulnerable African states. A combination of short and long-term approaches is necessary to end piracy off Somalia’s coast.

---
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Proposal and Implementation

The U.S. should continue participation in CTF 151 by leaving U.S. Navy operational assets in place off the coast of Somalia. Participating in CTF 151 contributes to multinational efforts and compliments EUNAVFOR Operation Atalanta. The U.S. has a responsibility to protect U.S.-flag vessels, their citizen crews, and commercial assets abroad. The U.S. needs to maintain its work with the Combined Maritime Forces, and make sure the program’s funding remains secure.

The U.S. must pressure NATO to re-establish Operation Ocean Shield by using diplomatic leverage. U.S. ambassadors to NATO have a strong say in what operations to engage in since the U.S. budgets 50% more towards NATO’s funding than the rest of the members combined. The withdrawal of NATO naval presence has left a noticeable gap in maritime security off Somalia’s coast, proven by the return of piracy. In the past, NATO provided naval escorts for the U.N.’s World Food Programme in Somali waters. U.N. vessels provide humanitarian aid to millions of Somalis who face food shortages due to the ongoing drought. The U.S. must ensure that piracy does not climb to peak levels again, and that humanitarian aid can get to Somalia efficiently.

The U.S. should endorse the African Union’s 2050 Integrated Maritime Strategy to foster its actualization. For example, if the A.U. begins working on developing an effective coast guard for Somalia, the U.S. can help coordinate those efforts or give technical support. U.S. approval of the strategy engages and further legitimizes the A.U.’s maritime security progress. The A.U. strategy calls for enhanced maritime-centric capacity-building and increased security and safety of maritime transport systems. A more capable and stable Somali state could provide its own maritime security in the important trade routes along the Gulf of Aden and the Western Indian Ocean. This would allow the U.S. to reduce its anti-piracy spending off the coast while still benefitting from safe trade routes.

Challenges and Costs

Piracy rates off Somalia’s Coast have declined sharply in recent years. Therefore, critics argue that U.S. participation in Combined Task Force 151 is unnecessary. NATO members may also oppose funding the $1.4 million cost to re-establish Operation Ocean Shield. A few months ago, NATO members chose to end the program instead of extending its mandate. Internally, the U.S. may resist contributing to NATO Operation Ocean Shield since participation in CTF 151 is ongoing, and both efforts address the same issue. Endorsing the AU’s 2050 Integrated Maritime Strategy does not require funding. However, giving vocal support without funding may appear insincere to other nations looking into the strategies’ viability. Nonetheless, decreasing piracy off Somalia’s coast is a necessary and beneficial venture for the U.S.
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Countering al-Shabaab and Preventing Insurgency

Recommendations

1. Provide targeted economic assistance to territories liberated from al-Shabaab
2. Continue covert operations to degrade al-Shabaab’s offensive capabilities
3. Reopen the U.S. Embassy in Mogadishu

Background

In March 2008, the U.S. Dept. of State designated al-Shabaab as a terrorist organization for using “intimidation and violence to undermine the Somali government and [threatening] civil society activists working to bring about peace.” Since then, the U.S. has cooperated with the FGS and AMISOM to achieve three main objectives which eliminate the sources of al-Shabaab’s power: (1) shut down al-Shabaab’s revenue streams, (2) degrade al-Shabaab’s offensive capabilities and territorial occupations, and (3) make Somalia not conducive to further insurgency. The current U.S. tailored engagement strategy is achieving the first and second goals. However, areas of Somalia recently liberated from al-Shabaab remain most vulnerable to re-insurgency since their economic and health disparities continue once under FGS jurisdiction. Additionally, the U.S. has lacked a consistent diplomatic presence in Somalia since the Embassy’s evacuation in 1991. The lack of an embassy has hindered the U.S. from forming effective foreign policy to combat drivers of terrorism and insurgency.

Islamic extremist doctrine was an early actor in Somalia’s history of instability. Al-Shabaab originated from al-Itihaad al-Islamiya, a militant insurgent group founded in 1983. When Barre’s regime fell in 1991 and Somalia’s civil war officially began, AIAI emerged as a powerful actor among the decentralized chaos. Despite AIAI’s defeat in 1966 by Ethiopian forces, religious extremist doctrine survived. In 2006, a dozen clan-based Sharia courts united to form the Islamic Courts Union. The unification under Islam offered by the ICU was seen as a chance to overcome clan-based fragmentation. In August 2006, al-

---

128 Ibid.
Shabaab announced itself as a militarized security force for the ICU.\textsuperscript{131} In December 2006, U.S.-backed Ethiopian forces led a successful invasion of Somalia, including Mogadishu, targeting ICU and al-Shabaab bases. Al-Shabaab leadership regrouped and rose to fill the vacuum the ICU left, while borrowing ICU tactics such as using anti-federalist politics and soliciting funds from al-Qaeda. Long-rooted in the history of Somalia, al-Shabaab continues to threaten U.S. interests in the Horn of Africa, to counteract stability in Somalia, and to intimidate and harm Somalis. Al-Shabaab threatens the stability of Kenya, the U.S.’ strongest ally in the Horn of Africa. Al-Shabaab targets Kenyan citizens and threatens the security of Kenya’s northern border. Additionally, al-Shabaab’s territorial occupation prevents FGS from enforcing policy to address drivers of instability, such as famine, unemployment, and piracy. Most importantly, al-Shabaab is responsible for “pervasive human rights abuses and indiscriminate attacks” against the Somali people.\textsuperscript{132} Al-Shabaab shifted to lethal tactics once the U.S. and its allies weakened their territorial occupation and financial resources.\textsuperscript{133} From 2011 to 2016, al-Shabaab averaged 33 attacks and 711 civilian causalities per month.\textsuperscript{134} Since these lethal strategies have eroded Somali support for Islamic extremist doctrine, al-Shabaab now exploits drought-related famine and access to resources to maintain power.\textsuperscript{135}

**Proposal and Implementation**

The U.S. should provide targeted economic assistance to areas liberated from al-Shabaab. Al-Shabaab exploits Somalia’s economic and health disparities by preventing aid organizations from entering its territories.\textsuperscript{136} When an area is liberated from al-Shabaab, AMISOM forces provide security against al-Shabaab for a limited time.\textsuperscript{137} Once AMISOM forces leave, only prospering communities can resist the ploys of al-Shabaab or other insurgency groups. Therefore, USAID’s Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance should introduce aid financing strategies which target the needs to these most vulnerable regions. First, the U.S. should invest in infrastructure to alleviate food insecurity. Second, the U.S. should develop strategies with FGS to decrease unemployment, such as funding infrastructure and education projects.

The U.S. must continue covert operations targeting al-Shabaab. Despite the progress made with U.S. partners, al-Shabaab remains a threat in Somalia. The U.S.’ partners in Somalia depend on U.S. intelligence collection and direct action, especially air-borne attacks, to disrupt and dismantle al-Shabaab.\textsuperscript{138} Our recent
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successes in airborne attacks include the following: a drone strike in December 2015 killing a leader of al-Shabaab, Abu Ubaidah; airstrikes in March 2016 killing 150-200 militants in a training camp north of Mogadishu; and a precision airstrike in June 2017 to a command unit in an al-Shabaab camp. The training camp demonstrates that al-Shabaab retains its ability to mobilize the masses. The U.S. and its allies would be in more danger if the U.S. chose to reduce its current level of military engagement via AFRICOM.

The U.S. needs to reopen the U.S. Embassy in Mogadishu. The lack of an embassy hinders the U.S. from maximizing the impact of its foreign policy. Inconsistent U.S. foreign policy has immediate impacts on Somalia and long-term consequences for the U.S. For example, Somalia was vulnerable to insurgency when the U.S. withdrew its support for Barre at the end of the Cold War in 1991. Now, in the order to counter the strength of al-Shabaab, the U.S. must maximize its military victories against al-Shabaab. An embassy in Mogadishu is necessary to introduce robust diplomatic action with the FSG’s new president and to see oversee strategic economic assistance to areas liberated form al-Shabaab.

**Challenges and Costs**

The $85-125 million contract from the State Department’s Bureau of Overseas Buildings Operations to build the Mogadishu embassy has strict requirements for submitting construction firms. In May 2015, Secretary of State John Kerry made an announcement of the U.S.’ intent to reopen the embassy, which did not include a fixed timeline. The contract has remained open for over two years. As the FSG transitions into a new presidential administration, the U.S. has a shrinking window of opportunity to address causes for the unprecedented delay. The consequence of complacency would be inefficient use of the U.S. foreign aid, continued inconsistency in U.S. foreign policy measures in Somalia, and a loss of progress in the fight against al-Shabaab.

---


142 The embassy is set to be build on the Mogadishu International Airport compound. In order to be eligible for the contract, firms must obtain access authorization from MIA.
The Middle East

U.S. Security:
- Iraq: Expanding U.S. Soft Power
- Iran: Enlarging the Nuclear Deal
- Yemen: Our Mutual Interests
Glossary

AQAP: Al Qaeda in Arabian Peninsula
Europol: Intelligence Agency of the European Union
IAEA: International Atomic Energy Agency
ISIS: Islamic State of Iraq and Syria
JCPOA: Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action
MPLA: People’s Movement for the Liberation of Angola
P5+1: UN Security Council Members (United States, United Kingdom, China, Russia, France) + Germany.
PSARD: Public Service Provision Improvement Program in Agriculture and Rural Development
ROYG: Republic of Yemen Government
SABA: Comprehensive Basic Sanitation Mode
SDC: The Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
SHA: Swiss Humanitarian Aid
UNCTAD: United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UN CTTTF: United Nations Counter Terrorism Implementation Task Force
UNDP: United Nations Development Program
UN FFES: United Nations Funding Facility for Expanded Stabilization
UNITA: The National Union for the Total Independence of Angola
Executive Summary

The Middle East presents numerous security threats to international security and to U.S. national security. Political strife, economic instability, and intra-state terrorism have wrecked states such as Iraq, Iran, and Yemen.

The decision to invade Iraq in 2003 catalyzed a long and futile war. The U.S. dedicated over $1 trillion to this war effort. The war transformed Iraq into a failed state in the Middle East. This instability created a power vacuum for transnational terrorist threats, political instability, and economic insecurity.

The JCPOA signed in 2015 prevented Iran from further developing and deploying nuclear weapons. This deal, known as the Iran Nuclear Deal, effectively mitigated the threat of Iran’s nuclear weapons development program in the region. However, some aspects of the JCPOA failed to address pressing security threats. JCPOA exacerbated pre-existing issues that threaten U.S.’ security interests. These issues include Iranian foreign policies that stress the development of its non-nuclear military capabilities, and financial and tactical support for terrorism in the Middle East.

Since 1990, Yemen has been a weak state due to political and economic instability. This lack of political unification negatively affects economic security, poverty, and unemployment in Yemen. The Houthi conflict, the annexed AQAP territories, and ineffective global intervention have weakened the Government of Yemen’s ability to stabilize the country. Political discord has created a power vacuum, enabling the rise of insurgent groups such as the Houthis and AQAP. Yemen's human rights conditions have deteriorated tremendously. This deterioration threatens U.S. and E.U. security as worsening humanitarian conditions may encourage terrorist recruitment in Yemen.
Iraq: Expanding U.S. Soft Power

Recommendations

2. Expand the U.N.’s Funding Facility for Expanded Stabilization program (U.N. FFES)

Background

U.S. interests in Iraq include maintaining political stability and eliminating transnational terrorist threats. A weak Iraqi state has contributed to the Middle East’s turmoil. With the rise of terrorist groups such as ISIS, it is important for U.S. to support stabilization and counterterrorism efforts. Previous U.S. military actions have failed to stabilize and eliminate terrorist threats in Iraq. In 2003, the U.S. invaded Iraq and has dedicated $800 billion to the Iraq War. However, U.S. operations in 2003 did not stabilize Iraq despite deploying tens of thousands of soldiers.

Proposals and Implementation

We recommend the U.S. to employ soft power in Iraq and strengthen U.S. foreign policy to the country. The U.S. will not effectively counter terrorism in Iraq without addressing the factors that led to the rise of ISIS. Soft power has often resulted in more durable outcomes because it relies on persuasions rather than force. Leading by soft power will give the U.S. greater influence in pursuing its interests in Iraq. We propose that the U.S. use two programs to exercise soft power in Iraq.

First, we propose the U.S. to cooperate with E.U. to create an Integrated Rule of Law Mission for Iraq. Between 2005 and 2013, the first E.U.-led Rule of Law Mission succeeded in strengthening political and human rights conditions in Iraq. Even with a challenging security environment, the Rule of Law Mission trained more than 7,000 Iraqi officials. We propose a new joint U.S.-E.U. mission that would mirror the previous E.U. Rule of Law Mission. The mission will promote political stability by strengthening Iraq’s rule of law.

Second, we propose the U.S. to expand the U.N. FFES program to promote economic empowerment. The U.N. FFES can establish the foundations for long-term stability by generating jobs in ISIS-free cities. The program was established in April 2016, and more than 800 projects are active. U.N. FFES can also provide “basic
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infrastructure repairs, jobs and small-business loans.”\textsuperscript{157} They will help both reconstruction efforts and focus on large public institutions such as schools and hospitals to promote employment and incentivize people to stay in the newly liberated areas.\textsuperscript{158} In addition, the program will be a better investment for U.S. reconstruction efforts in Iraq. A 10% increase in spending for job creation correlates with about a 10% reduction in violence.\textsuperscript{159} The expansion of U.N. FFES is an important step towards stabilizing Iraq and creating a capable partner in countering terrorist threats.

**Costs and Challenges**

A significant challenge for creating a joint U.S.-E.U. Integrated Rule of Law Mission will be the increase in U.S. funding. The U.N. FFES program will need an increase in funds to help provide humanitarian support for Iraq and to build long-term stability. The U.N. FFES program requires $100 million immediately and around $400 million over the next two years.\textsuperscript{160} The U.S. has donated more than $50 million to the program to facilitate recovery. Despite the costs, the potential of these programs will greatly enhance U.S. soft power and serve to further U.S. interests in Iraq.

The current administration is advocating for downsizing U.S. foreign assistance to the Middle East, including Iraq.\textsuperscript{161} There may be pushbacks from the current administration and potentially Congress with increasing funding for these programs. However, to overcome Congressional opposition to the proposed increase funding, this proposed budget augmentation could reduce Department of Defense expenditures in the long term while more effectively achieving U.S. interests because spending on soft power programs correlates with reduced violence. Additionally, through bilateral negotiations, we could propose the E.U. to augment its funding and assist with the costs of these programs.

\textsuperscript{157} Stabilization | Iraq. (2016, November 8).
\textsuperscript{158} Stabilization | UNDP in Iraq. (2017).
\textsuperscript{159} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{160} UNDP Fact Sheet: Expanded Stabilization. (2016, August 10).
\textsuperscript{161} McBride, J. (2017, April 11). How Does the U.S. Spend Its Foreign Aid?
Iran: Enlarging the Nuclear Deal

Recommendations

1. Collaborate with the E.U., the U.N., the IAEA, and Iran to establish an agreement to deter Iran from developing nuclear capabilities after 2030
2. Engage in multilateral military training operations with Europol and the U.N. CTITF to protect vulnerable allies in the Middle East at risk of Iranian insurgency

Background

The U.S. and the E.U. have an interest in mitigating the detrimental effects of Iran’s foreign policy strategy in the Middle East. Iran is the largest state sponsor of terrorism and controls the most extensive ballistic missile force in the Middle East. Despite the success of the Iran Nuclear Deal in delaying Iran’s nuclear weapons program, it did not prevent Iran from expanding its non-nuclear weapons program or in sponsoring intrastate terrorism. Iran also engages in numerous proxy wars against other states that destabilize the region. In July 2015, the P5+1 together with Iran signed the JCPOA. Also referred to as the Iran Nuclear Deal, this joint accord significantly limited the power of Iran to develop, produce, and deploy nuclear weapons for 15 years. Two years later, Iran has abided by the provisions outlined in the Iran Nuclear Deal. The agreement successfully delayed Iran’s nuclear weapons program but it did not fully eradicate Iran’s capacity to develop nuclear weapons in the future. The JCPOA also provides a boost for the Iranian economy, allowing Iran to further support terrorist organizations.

First, the JCPOA did not require the destruction of Iran’s nuclear development program but instead outlined nuclear weapons limitations valid until 2030. After 2030, Iran will be free to resume building their nuclear weapons program. Nuclear weapons in Iran can fortify Iran’s aggressive foreign policy and threaten the security of the U.S. and its allies in the Middle East. Before signing the JCPOA, experts estimated Iran’s breakout time to be from two to three months. Breakout time is the time required to produce enough enriched uranium to power one nuclear weapon. Before 2015, it would have taken Iran two to three months to successfully aim and deploy a nuclear weapon. The JCPOA extended this time to about one year. However, the JCPOA is a short-term solution to a nuclear Iran. This is a threat to U.S. security and its allies as the possibility of Iran with nuclear weapons is stalled, not eradicated.

Second, the economic boost from the JCPOA allows Iran to continue to sponsor regional terrorism. The removal of U.S., U.N., and E.U. sanctions provides the Iranian economy $115 billion assets previously frozen by international sanctions and opens the Iranian economy to the global financial system. The combination of freed revenue and renewed access to the international market boosted the Iranian economy from 4.2% annual growth in 2014 to 4.6% in 2016. With the removal of
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sanctions, Iran can now support terrorist organizations such as Hezbollah in Lebanon— an Iranian backed organization spreading anti-Semitic propaganda and threatening the national security of Israel.\textsuperscript{170} Iran can also continue to develop its non-nuclear military program which it uses to fortify its ‘axis of resistance’ in Syria and fuel its cold war with Saudi Arabia.\textsuperscript{171}

**Proposals and Implementation**

We propose that the U.S. collaborate with the E.U., the U.N., the IAEA, and Iran to establish an agreement to deter Iran from developing nuclear capabilities after 2030. In 13 years, the provisions under the Iran Nuclear Deal will no longer prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons. Once these provisions are dissolved, there will be little incentive for Iran not to restart its nuclear weapons development program. We recommend a multifaceted approach between the P5+1, IAEA, and Iran to establish a future JCPOA agreement. Given Europe’s previous success at intervening during the Iran Nuclear Deal negotiations, the E.U. would be best equipped to mediate the discussions held at the U.N. The future plan will focus on limiting the permitted levels of enriched uranium and maintaining the shutdown of Iran’s second nuclear facility, Natanz. This agreement will also be in effect for more than 15 years to establish long-term determent of Iranian nuclear weapons development.

We propose that the United States engage in multilateral military training operations with Europol and the U.N.CTITF to protect allies in the Middle East who are vulnerable to attacks by the Iranian insurgency. Iran’s aggressive foreign policy directly challenges U.S. allies such as Israel and Saudi Arabia. The objective of this multilateral approach will be to counter Iranian hostility through preparedness. This effort will assist Saudi Arabia and Israel in implementing tactical operations, such as reinforcing intelligence practices and establishing strategic plans in response to possible Iranian offensive attacks. This multilateral effort will not only serve to protect our allies, but it will also demonstrate U.S. commitment to lead in international security.

**Challenges and Costs**

The challenges and costs will depend on how the U.S. government generates support for these recommendations and how Iran interprets these actions.

First, Iran could perceive a multilateral negotiation effort as an encroachment on its sovereignty. The JCPOA did not address the prospect of establishing similar deals in the future. Although Iran would be an important actor in constructing the agreement, it might not be open to establishing further limitations on its nuclear weapons program. Challenges within the U.S. may come from those who disapprove of negotiating with the nonally of Israel—an important U.S. ally. Other internal challenges may emanate from isolationists, arguing against further U.S. leadership in international politics.

Second, Iran could respond negatively to multilateral military operations in Israel and Saudi Arabia if it interprets the recommended multilateral military training as offensive actions. In addition, increased U.S. presence in the region could unsettle Iran and provoke aggressive actions that would destabilize the region. Domestically, policymakers may struggle in securing the additional funding necessary to support the multilateral military training operations.
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Yemen: Our Mutual Interests

Recommendations

1. Develop multilateral partnerships to reconstruct Yemen’s infrastructure, coordinate famine and disease relief efforts, and develop social services that provide water, power, and social services.

2. Use humanitarian aid to limit possible recruitment for AQAP to help protect U.S. oil imports.

Background

Economic insecurity, civil wars, and political fissures have plagued Yemen since the twentieth century. The 2015 civil war between the ROYG and Houthi rebels resulted from these strains. Poverty, famine, lack of job growth, and political strife are at the root of the fragmentation. In 2011 alone, roughly 35% of Yemen’s population lived below the poverty line, 80% of the youth population was unemployed, and 30% of citizens lacked access to healthcare. Yemen’s inability to responding to the Houthi rebels and address its economic and humanitarian crises has allowed AQAP to gain a foothold in the state and recruit for future terrorist operations. AQAP’s unchecked presence there poses a threat to the 10% of U.S. oil imports passing through the Bab al-Mandab strait.

Proposals and Implementation:

To restrict the growth of terrorism and to develop better working relationship with Yemen, we propose the U.S. prioritizes stabilization efforts over militarization. This includes encouraging political reconciliation between the Government of Yemen and Houthis and subsidizing and assisting in economic reconstruction.

We propose that the U.S. foster multilateral partnerships to reconstruct Yemen’s infrastructure and autonomy. This reduces the number of Yemenis who are vulnerable to radicalization. Organizations like the SDC and SHA will be key to this effort due to their successful aid projects during Haiti’s reconstruction. Similarly, programs like SABA and UNCTAD can replicate sustainable models that have worked at the local and national levels in both Peru and Laos. In addition, incorporating UNDP and PSARD’s development models for local and national leaders will stabilize the newly established federal systems.
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We propose that the United States use humanitarian aid to limit possible recruitment for AQAP and weaken AQAP’s foothold in the region to protect oil interests. ROYG military engagement with AQAP is not an option as the ROYG is currently entrenched in conflict with the Houthi rebels. Preventing AQAP from acquiring Yemen’s oil fields or access to the Bab al-Mandab strait is a vital U.S. interest. Establishing a more sturdy supply of food and water, creating construction and contracting jobs (i.e. plumbing, electricity), and developing basic social services like healthcare, education, which will reduce the number of Yemeni who are vulnerable to radicalization. The ROYG is unable to successfully confront AQAP on its own, and it is not in the U.S. interest to start another ground confrontation. By addressing the humanitarian crises, Yemeni citizens will be less vulnerable to indoctrination into AQAP which will reduce the threat to oil exports in the region.

**Challenges and Costs:**

This plan would require funding and cooperation from various actors like the SDC, the U.N. and its affiliate programs, PSARD, SABA, and other organizations. It is beyond the capacity of any one country or group to provide substantial assistance. The Trump administration is drawing down its international assistance, which will significantly impact the U.N.’s budget.

In addition, it will require more than humanitarian aid alone to halt AQAP’s growth. Eventually, the ROYG will need to militarily confront AQAP. Assuming the ROYG and Houthis resolve their issues and reunify, the government would still have to address AQAP’s presence and occupation over territories.