



TALKING ABOUT THE CONNECTION BETWEEN U.S. AND GLOBAL SECURITY

A Message Builder from the U.S. in the World Initiative
April 2008

Prepared in Collaboration with the Stanley Foundation

This Message Builder¹ on U.S. and Global Security was developed through a consultative process with the Stanley Foundation's Public Engagement Working Group¹ on U.S. and Global Security. It reflects findings from an extensive synthesis and analysis of publicly available polling and focus group data on national security and related issues, conducted by Public Knowledge LLC. This Message Builder is part of a larger strategy that the Stanley Foundation is working on to inform the American public about the interconnectedness — the interdependence — of U.S. security with global security. Members of the working group believe that if the following ideas and arguments were understood by more Americans, advocates would be able to mobilize broader public support for a balanced, principled and pragmatic set of national security and foreign policy approaches.

The guidance offered here aims to help communicators reach the mainstream American public. It builds on recommendations from U.S. in the World: Talking Global Issues With Americans (www.usintheworld.org). This Message Builder is a working draft, subject to further discussion, testing, and revision. It consists of the following sections:

- Before You Begin: The Big Story (context and shared themes).....1**
- Building Your Message (what to convey, advice on how to convey it).....3**
- Examples of Success/Proof Points.....6**
- Overall Guidance (Do's and Don'ts).....7**
- Sample Quotes10**
- Appendix: Answering Tough Questions.....12**
- Additional Resources.....14**
- List of Working Group Members.....15**

Before You Begin: The Big Story!

The big story is essentially what you want your audience to take away from your communications – it's the big picture that you hope will "stick" with your audience and inform their thinking from that point on. A shared big story helps diverse advocates pull in the same direction and reinforce one another's messages, even if they disagree on policy details. With this story, you are signaling to your audience what your issue is really "about" and beginning to lead your audience down a particular path of reasoning. If you tell the right big story, your arguments, facts and policy prescriptions will all align and make sense — they will fit with the "frame" that you are invoking in your big story.

¹ A Message Builder is a tool to facilitate the preparation of messaging points for spoken or written public communications. It offers a framework of ideas and suggestions that communicators can use to find their own voice and tailor messages to their own needs.

Through cognitive science research, we know that people rely on stories that already exist in their minds to make sense of new information; our communications interact with these preexisting ideas or stories. Therefore, which of these ideas is activated and begins to guide your listeners' thinking will play a large role in determining whether your audience pays attention or tunes out, accepts or rejects your arguments, comes to a new understanding or finds that its preconceptions have been confirmed. Choosing the wrong big story can lead your audience down a path of reasoning that is detrimental to your cause and will not allow your audience to hear what you have to say or the solutions you have to offer. So it is important to understand where your audience is "at" and what they already understand or think they understand about your issue, not to confirm what they already believe, but to more effectively lead them to a new understanding.

Background: Polling data and focus groups have shown us that the public is looking for a new approach to national security and foreign policy – and they want a new approach now. They have a general understanding that a more stable and peaceful world is safer for everyone – including the U.S. – but they aren't certain about the steps and policies that are needed to create such a world. And while Americans are deeply concerned about national security and understand that events far away can affect our security, the “national security frame” – a frame in which communications are conveyed through a lens of fear of physical harm from an external hostile force – can lead people to see the world in “us vs. them” terms. This worldview is problematic when it comes to promoting a foreign policy that is cooperative, responsible, and constructive, across a range of issues.

It's challenging, but not impossible, to talk about security issues without reinforcing this frame. In fact, making the connection between national and global security is one way to do that.

Advocates and experts who believe that the United States should adopt such a foreign policy need to foster a better public understanding of how national security depends on global stability, and how foreign policies that promote global and regional security also promote U.S. security. Reinforcing these connections will help the public think through the issues that we care about and will help inoculate people against some of the most damaging competing frames or worldviews. Earlier research – on which the initial *U.S. in the World* guide was based – demonstrated conclusively that using the concept of interdependence as a “priming” frame raised the salience of a range of global issues and increased support for cooperative approaches across the board. In other words, the research showed that when people are thinking in terms of an interdependent world, they automatically grasp the logic of comprehensive, cooperative policy approaches. Therefore, it is important to put your arguments, facts, and recommendations in the context of the following big story. This story takes people down a thought path that enables them to see the logic and feasibility of your policy approaches. It puts people in an “in it together” mindset that doesn't require people to choose between self-interest and altruism.

The Big Story:

We live in an interconnected world, where everyone benefits from increased global prosperity and stability, and no one can avoid the consequences of instability and conflict. America's security is tied to the security of others and to global security. **Our foreign policy – in its style as well as its substance – should reflect that reality.** This new understanding calls for **significant changes in the way we approach security** – but the benefits, for us and for the world, will be substantial as well.

The recommendations that follow are meant to help communicators convey these and other elements of a shared story, thereby framing the issues and policy options in ways that lay the groundwork for effective advocacy.

Building Your Message

The “gateway” arguments suggested below are designed to create openings that allow your audience to hear the more detailed arguments and facts you present. These gateway arguments reflect the shared big story described above, and they evoke big ideas about responsible engagement in an interdependent world – for example, ideas about smart and effective problem solving – that are likely to resonate with many audiences. These gateway arguments represent a scaffolding, not a script or a collection of slogans; nor are they a series of arguments designed to be presented in sequence. They can be the basis for a wide variety of communications efforts, in a wide variety of voices. But messages built around these broadly shared themes and ideas are likely to be more consistent and mutually reinforcing of your big story, and therefore more likely to help change the terms of the dialogue.

Suggested Gateway Arguments:

Today's security challenges are complex, interconnected, and global in nature; no single country is powerful enough to tackle such challenges alone - not even the United States. **This new situation calls for a new style of U.S. global leadership** that is cooperative, takes others' interests into account and rebuilds international trust and goodwill toward America.

Most of today's security threats are **shared threats that confront many nations**, not just the U.S. We should be helping to build and strengthen the **global and regional teams and institutions that are needed to tackle these common threats**.

In an interconnected world, where our security is tied to the security of others, **advancing shared global interests is part of advancing national interests**. We need **farsighted policies that take into account the big picture globally** and that consider how our decisions and actions will affect other regions and countries.

In an interconnected world, **fragile nations that are overwhelmed by poverty or wracked by violence or genocide can destabilize entire regions** and become havens for international criminals and terrorists. **Global cooperation to prevent such humanitarian and security crises** is in everyone's interest, it works, and it's the right thing to do.

Discussion: Advice for Conveying your Gateway Messages:

On International Cooperation:

- *Most Americans understand that international cooperation is fundamental to our security. You can reinforce this understanding by promoting cooperation as a pragmatic, effective way to solve the kinds of problems we face – and by evoking whenever possible the shared nature of today's security threats, since common challenges are more readily seen to require collaborative solutions.*
- *Americans want the US to be a team player and share the burden of leadership, though they also want to maintain leading power and influence - they wish to maintain superpower status. These ideas may seem conflicting and at times are conflicting; basically, though, it seems that Americans are looking to play a major role in the world but not THE leading role.*

- *The trouble is that most people are uncertain about what this kind of shared leadership actually looks like; they may not be aware that effective, multilateral, nonmilitary strategies exist for addressing some critical global problems. Tell the story of what we can accomplish through teamwork and use success stories from the past to illustrate your point. Talk about successes in which other countries played a leading role and U.S. support helped lead to a solution. Talk about using our influence - in partnership with other countries and international institutions - to advance the common good and to be a positive force in the world.*

On Leadership:

- *Style of leadership is as important to the public - to Americans and to the global public - as substance of leadership. Talk about a style of leadership that focuses on problem-solving and gets beyond politics and partisanship (which is how Americans say they want the government to work, at home and abroad). Remember that the leadership qualities Americans most value include honesty and the ability to communicate with others, the ability to take charge AND the willingness to cooperate.*
- *The public is very concerned about the decline of trust and confidence in the U.S., however there has not been a very rich discussion of what it would take and what we would need to do as a country to regain this trust. In addition to talking about the wisdom and practical benefits of your proposal, mention how it would also help build the moral authority that we need if we're to inspire others to work together to solve the problems that threaten global and national security, how it would help mend fences and make a difference in our relationship with others. Then talk about how can the public get involved in helping make this proposal - this solution - a reality.*

On Multilateralism:

- *Discuss international institutions and regional forms of multilateralism as practical mechanisms through which we can address shared problems - discuss them as a means to an end. In fact, compared to a few years ago, communicators now have more of an opportunity to talk about the importance of these cooperative international arrangements as a means to help create global stability. Americans are increasingly interested in working through regional partnerships and international institutions and want to expand their responsibility.*
- *However, the United Nations, in particular has had its reputation damaged. Discuss the need to make improvements to the UN, do not sugarcoat the fact that real problems exist, but remind people that all institutions need to evolve in response to changing circumstances. Don't overpromise or treat international institutions as cure-alls. But remind people that the United States thought international institutions and laws so important that we were a leading force behind their creation.*
- *Remember that most Americans are not familiar with many international institutions and regional partnerships and therefore, communicators must explain - briefly - the history, importance and successes of institutions like the International Monetary Fund, the World Court, the African Union, etc.*
- *Remind people that the way to make international arrangements stronger and more effective is to be a supportive participant. When discussing international laws, remind people that we can not hold others accountable if we fail to follow these laws ourselves; explain how these laws benefit Americans here at home and abroad, particularly our military. See above for more on talking about cooperation and the kind of leadership needed to help build U.S. moral authority.*

On Problem Solving:

- *Americans have said they want policies that work; policies that reflect an honest, clear-eyed assessment of the best way to achieve our foreign policy goals. They worry that the U.S. has been too quick to use military force, and they want their government to use all the tools in its foreign policy toolkit (diplomatic, economic, intelligence) to tackle complex security challenges. Americans know what good problem solving looks like, and they realize it's been in short supply.*
- *Help people use ideas about smart problem solving and responsible leadership in an interconnected world (or community) as yardsticks to take the measure of policy proposals. Reinforce the notion that the questions we might apply to decision making in our own communities and lives are the same questions we should be posing – and expecting our elected officials to pose – about foreign policy choices: Is this strategy likely to produce lasting results, have we carefully weighed costs and benefits, have we considered unintended impacts on ourselves and others, are these actions consistent with our principles, have we consulted with experts, have we taken a range of views into account and looked for common ground, etc. Show how your policy proposals meet these tests.*

On Prioritizing/Connecting Security with other Issues:

- *The public embraces the general idea that a more stable and peaceful world is safer for everyone - including the U.S. – but they aren't certain about how to go about creating such a world. Some of the steps that advocates feel need to be taken to enhance global stability may not be seen by the public as "important contributors" to national security.*
- *For example, the public does not see a direct link between alleviating poverty and reducing terrorism; poverty alleviation and economic development are not seen as important security strategies by the public (although the public does believe that - morally - reducing global poverty is a noble cause and one that the U.S. should help achieve). So take time to explain the connections you see, and how this strategy works (talk about how in an interconnected world, the collapse of one state can destabilize an entire region – or how helping people in poor countries improve their lives is part of rebuilding America's moral authority in the world). Don't oversell linkages between poverty and terrorism, or the lack of democracy and terrorism; remember that the experts themselves disagree about the directness of these connections.*
- *In general, avoid making every global issue "about" security. Due in large part to the fact that the most dominant form of global engagement that people see is our military presence in Iraq and the military dimensions of the struggle against terrorism, the lens through which people see engagement has narrowed to "boots on the ground." This may be leading many progressives to wonder if we can engage constructively at all, and questioning if we should just stay home. If we, as advocates, try to fit too much beneath the umbrella of "security" and overuse constructs that allow national security policy or the fight against terrorism to stand for all of American foreign policy, we may inadvertently feed into that narrowing of public understanding of what can be achieved (and why it should be achieved) through the responsible use of U.S. power and influence abroad – the very opposite of what many who use a "security" frame to raise the salience of other global issues intend.*
- *Point to farsighted solutions that are appropriate for an interdependent world, while communicating that you have America's interests at heart, and help your audience understand how living our values can be both right and smart. And, remember, you won't reach the persuadable public if you reject the idea of national interest, or suggest that it's selfish to consider Americans' interests here at home; in this context, it's all the more important to evoke interdependence, since people readily grasp what the concept of "shared fate" implies about the closer relationship between national interests and global interests.*

Examples of Success/Proof Points

The list below includes examples of instances (recent or longer ago) when U.S. action has advanced global security/regional security and in so doing has advanced national security. The examples can be used to reinforce your gateway messages, illustrating to our audience that our big ideas and policy proposals have led to successes in the past. When using these examples, be sure to highlight the fact that each of these successes were built on the idea of a common good and a shared fate – an interconnectedness in which the security of others led to increased safety for America and Americans. Make sure that you point out that the U.S. played a leading role but relied on other countries leadership to invoke real change – everyone had a role to play in these successes.

- **Marshall Plan**
- **President Reagan's meeting with President Gorbachev on disarmament**
- **Anti-Apartheid Movement**
- **Biological and Chemical Weapons Conventions**
- **Global cooperation on disease/pandemics (i.e. smallpox, polio, Avian flu)**

Overall Guidance

(1) Consider introducing or linking your specific points with big themes and ideas that are part of a shared, overarching story. Research tells us that as human beings, we are wired to listen or look for clues that help us deal with incoming information; this helps us from feeling overwhelmed by new information. So we ask, “What is this ‘about’? What is the underlying big idea? Is this like a story that I already know?” We make a judgment and file the new information accordingly. In other words, people look for meaning at a conceptual level before they take in details. And when diverse messengers unite around shared themes and messages, the results can be powerful and mobilizing for a broader array of citizens. An example of this is the civil rights movement, whose big themes or ideas of freedom, dignity, and equality managed to link together a wide range of constituencies.

(2) Use a pragmatic, constructive tone and avoid partisan attacks. Many Americans are sick of partisan politics and “politics as usual.” You can use a constructive tone while still being critical and pointing to the gap between current approaches and the positive alternatives you advocate. The focus should remain on policies, not personalities.

(3) Help people understand that there are alternatives to the policy approaches you criticize. It is easier to persuade people if you give them reason for hope and show that something can be done.

(4) This message builder is meant to complement, not substitute for, the detailed guidance for talking about security issues provided in *U.S. in the World*, developed through consultations with hundreds of experts and advocates over a two-year period. We urge you to consult the “Top 20 Recommendations” (http://www.gii-exchange.org/guide/top_20/top_20.shtml) and especially the sections on “America’s Role in the World” (http://www.gii-exchange.org/guide/americas_role/), “International Cooperation” (http://www.gii-exchange.org/guide/international_cooperation/) and “Terrorism, Weapons, and Force” (<http://www.gii-exchange.org/guide/terrorism/>).



- Put your proposals and arguments in the context of an **interconnected world** – a world in which isolationism is unrealistic, teamwork is more a requirement than an option, and tackling complex problems, including national security, with comprehensive solutions is a necessity.
- **Be respectful of citizens’ fears.** There are real and serious security challenges underlying them. Encourage people to use their critical reasoning to put threats in context and to support taking concrete steps to reduce risks.
- Remind your audience that there is a **longstanding, bipartisan legacy of political support** for international cooperation to protect U.S. security and to help the world as a whole. Let people know that **senior military officers support cooperative and balanced approaches** to security problems, because they know that the more nonmilitary options available, the easier their job is.
- **Emphasize that how we act matters** – the style and tone of our engagement with the world – **not just what we do.**
- **Talk about what kind of country we want to be in the world, with reference** to our ideals and traditions - who we strive to be as people. Talk about the values and aspiration we share with other people around the world.

Don't



- **Avoid starting with an emphasis on the "dark side" of interdependence** (e.g. fears of anti-Americanism leading to terrorism and nuclear proliferation, the dire effects of global warming).
- **Don't reinvigorate an "us versus them" mindset.** Avoid using language that could encourage listeners to think only about narrow self-interests.
- **Don't overlook or try to override people's fears.** While most Americans feel that the government plays too much on fear, you will alienate much of the public if you assert that their fears have no basis or if you imply that the U.S. government has not done anything to address security threats.
- **Avoid making the U.S. solely responsible** for the lack of progress on problems.
- **Don't assume that people are being selfish, uncaring, or isolationist** if they say that we should focus our attention here at home and stay out of the "world's problems". Remember that the Iraq war has made people wary of global engagement and that they are usually expressing a desire to help others in their own community. Assume that they want to do something to help others here and abroad; the question is how much - and whether it is effective.

Keep in Mind



- **If you are calling for U.S. leadership on an issue(s), be clear about the kind of leadership you are advocating and about how you want the U.S. to be as a leader** (e.g., the kind of leadership that works through international institutions, the kind that encourages other countries to work together). Simply calling for more "leadership" in general could inadvertently trigger the mindset that "the U.S. is already doing so much already". Polls have shown that a majority of Americans consistently want the U.S. to play a "major role" in world affairs, but the percentage wanting the U.S. to play a "leading role" is diminishing.
- Remember that **Americans stress shared leadership but want to maintain significant influence in world affairs.** They desire "shared leadership" but don't want to give up America's superpower status. Talk about using our influence - in partnership with other countries and international institutions - as a force for good in the world.
- In part as a **consequence of the Iraq war**, opinion on some issues is strongly divided by a **partisan lens**, more than has been the case in the past. For example, Americans agree that global public opinion has a poor view of the U.S., but split along party lines as to whether that is because of bad policies or an inevitable consequence of necessary actions. Views of the war itself, terrorism, how to fight terrorism, how the U.S. should relate to the UN and even whether it is possible for the U.S. to achieve much in the world are now sharply divided along partisan lines. **Progressives' interest in the U.S. taking a leading role in world affairs, and confidence in our ability to solve global problems, has taken an especially sharp hit.** Try to inspire without grandiose appeals to global leadership or the power to transform the world; offer a positive vision, but also reasons to believe it's attainable.
- A number of the broad arguments that advocates of constructive U.S. engagement with the world like to make have been **undercut in the public's mind by the war**,

the debate leading up to the war, and the consequences of the war. Sweeping claims about the importance for national security of promoting democracy, fostering economic development in poor countries, and even protecting civil liberties here at home are increasingly met with suspicion and pragmatic questioning. **Will it work? Will it keep us safe? Will it help or harm our image in the world?** Americans – and progressives more strongly than conservatives – say that they have learned from Iraq that sometimes it is better to leave a dictator in place than promote democracy, for example.

- Americans already recognize a number of the “hard truths” you might like to tell. In general, the public responds **better to critiques that look forward. You risk needlessly alienating large segments of the public if you seem to dwell on the past at the expense of looking ahead toward solutions.** Try asking “**Are we doing everything we can? Do we have our priorities right? Do we have a balanced strategy?**” Talk about your ideas for the additional steps we could be **taking to make us safer in the short term as well as steps that could make us safer in the long term.**

Sample Quotes:

The sample quotes below are reflective of our big story; the quotes showcase different ways of invoking big ideas that illustrate the interconnectedness of U.S. security and global stability.

"Dear Mr. President...As you prepare your Fiscal Year 2009 budget, we are writing to express bipartisan support for an increase in the International Affairs Budget – one that reinforces the continued commitment of Congress and your Administration to invest in the strategic tools that are essential to protecting our national security, building economic prosperity and demonstrating our moral values. We live in an interconnected world where infectious diseases, failed states, and terrorism have no borders. America's security and prosperity are linked with the security and prosperity of other nations. The global realities of the 21st century require America to utilize the full range of non-military tools as a fundamental pillar of our national security. Investments in our international affairs programs bolster our national security by allowing us to work with foreign partners to track down terrorists and weapons, to improve the political and economic lives of others, and to help stabilize fragile states...." (***Co-signers of the Feinstein-Hagel-Durbin-Smith-Dodd-Coleman and Berman-Kirk-Chandler-Shays Letters to the President for increase in FY09 International Affairs Budget (61 Senators, 125 Representatives)***)

"It's an interchangeable world, a very, very interconnected world...Events in, say, Ethiopia can directly affect the United States of America and our economy. We're not separate from everyone else. The world depends on us, and we depend on the world." (***Evan Rosenfield, age 15, participant, 2007 North Texas Academic WorldQuest competition for high school students***)

"...If a country is engulfed in a civil war, it can destabilize whole regions, radicalize populations, become a haven for terrorism and organized crime, and hasten the spread of disease...And if perpetrators of mass atrocities are allowed to get away with their crimes, it only emboldens others to do the same...So,...in this era of interdependence, let us banish from our minds the thought that some threats affect only some of us. We all share a responsibility for each other's security, and we must work together to build a safer world. Indeed, in strengthening the security of others, we protect the security of our own." (***Kofi Annan, The Secretary-General's Address to the 41st Munich Conference on Security Policy: "A More Secure World: the future role of the United Nations," February 13, 2005***)

"...No nation can defend its own interests without blending them with the interests of others and seeking common solutions to common problems. ...The United States needs a new realism in its foreign policy if it is to meet the challenges of this changed world. Such a new realism must harbor no illusions about the importance of a strong military in a dangerous world, but it must also understand the importance of diplomacy and multilateral cooperation in a world in which what goes on inside of one country has profound impacts on other countries....A new realist foreign policy will require that the United States alter its present course in several ways. First and foremost, the United States must repair its alliances. The United States cannot lead other nations toward solutions to shared problems if these other nations do not trust US leadership. US policymakers need to restore respect and appreciation for US allies and for shared democratic values in order to coordinate international efforts for global problems..." (***Bill Richardson, governor of New Mexico, and former US Congressman, US Secretary of Energy, and US Representative to the United Nations, Harvard International Review, Summer 2007***)

"...For decades, the United States used its power and influence to help forge international consensus on vital issues. America's leadership inspired the trust and confidence of a generation of governments and nations around the world...because we pursued common actions that reflected common interests with our allies...because we remained committed to global engagement...and because we exercised our power with restraint. We made mistakes. It was imperfect. There were differences with our allies. But despite the imperfections and shortcomings, the United States and its allies contributed to world stability and the spread of freedom and prosperity." ***(Chuck Hagel, U.S. Senator, Nebraska, speech at the Brookings Institution, July 28, 2006)***

"...In this time of challenge and change, the United Nations is more important than ever before, because our world is more interdependent than ever before. Most Americans know this. Unfortunately, some Americans, in their longing to be free of the world's problems and perhaps to focus more on our own problems, ignore what the United Nations has done, ignore the benefits of cooperation, ignore our own interdependence with all of you in charting a better future. They ignore all the United Nations is doing to lift the lives of millions by preserving the peace, vaccinating children, caring for refugees, sharing the blessings of progress around the world...But let me reassure all of you that the vast majority of Americans support the United Nations, not only because it reflects our own ideals, but because it reinforces our interests. We must continue to work to manifest the support that our people feel. So let us strengthen our determination to fight the rogue states, the terrorists, the criminals who menace our safety, our way of life, and the potential of our children in the 21st century. Let us recommit ourselves to prevent them from acquiring weapons of mass destruction. Let us work harder than ever to lift the nuclear backdrop that has darkened the world's stage for too long now...Let us make these solemn tasks our common obligation, our common commitment. If we do, then, together, we will enter the 21st century, marching toward a better, safer world; the very better, safer world the United Nations has sought to build for 51 years..." ***(President Bill Clinton, Addressing the 51st UN General Assembly, New York City, September 24, 1996)***

"...Repeatedly over the last century Americans averted their eyes in the belief that remote events elsewhere in the world need not engage this country. How could an assassination of an Austrian archduke in unknown Bosnia-Herzegovina effect us? Or the annexation of a little patch of ground called Sudetenland? Or a French defeat at a place called Dien Bien Phu? Or the return of an obscure cleric to Tehran? Or the radicalization of an Arab construction tycoon's son?...in a speech at Princeton in 1947, Secretary of State and retired Army general George Marshall told the students: 'The development of a sense of responsibility for world order and security, the development of a sense of overwhelming importance of this country's acts, and failures to act, in relation to world order and security – these, in my opinion, are great musts for your generation....'" ***(Secretary of Defense Robert M. Gates, Landon Lecture, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, November 26, 2007)***

Appendix: Answering Tough Questions

Below are talking points to draw from when answering tough questions.

Even in an interconnected world, not everything can be equally important. We can't fix the world. Aren't some countries and regions just more important to us strategically than others?

- While it is true that we have clear, long vested interests with our allies in certain areas of the world, history has shown us the dangers of ignoring problems in places that, at the time, seemed "less important" to our national interests. See Secretary of Defense Robert M. Gates' quote above.
- In this interconnected world, we can't just write off some parts of it and expect the whole to be healthy and stable.
- We now understand that fragile nations – anywhere – can destabilize entire regions and become havens for international criminals and terrorists. It is therefore more important than ever that we have global cooperation to prevent these crises. We have avenues – through international institutions and regional teams - that allow us to work with others in addressing these global needs, and we know that if two heads are better than one to address a problem, a few, several and even many, are better than two.
- See former UN Secretary General Kofi Annan's quote above; See former President Bill Clinton's quote above.
- See "On International Cooperation" and "On Multilateralism" above.

Are you saying we should talk with our enemies and potential enemies if they can provide stability in important regions of the world?

- Great nations have been willing to talk to their enemies as well as their friends. Talking is an opportunity to advance our point of view, clarify differences, add to our understanding of our adversaries, and allow for the possibility that some times we may find common ground that will advance our interests and help address common problems.
- See "On Leadership" above.

How do we measure the impact of our investments in things like foreign aid and peace building – the kinds of things you say will make the world more stable and prosperous?

- If we understand that what happens in other countries affect us, then a smart goal would be to assist in helping more countries and people become self-sufficient members of a peaceful and prosperous global community. This means advancing farsighted policies that take into account the big picture and considering how our decisions and actions affect other regions. Being farsighted means investing in the future, and understanding that the dividends may take a while to accumulate; it means preventing problems when we can, addressing problems as they arise and not allowing issues to fester and become bigger, more expensive problems down the road.
- See "On Problem Solving" and "On Prioritizing/Connecting Security with other Issues".
- See "Co-signers of the Feinstein-Hagel-Durbin, et. al. Letter to the President..." above.

Wouldn't increasing our spending on things like foreign aid and peace building divert money from our military which is already over stretched and needs help?

- We need to look no further than our own Department of Defense to garner support for long-term, farsighted investments like foreign aid and peace building – investments that help prevent problems from ever reaching the point where we might have to resort to force. Secretary Gates has, himself, actively supported an increase in the budgets of the governmental agencies that work on these efforts. He understands that these agencies' budgets are disproportionately small in comparison with their importance to national security and global stability; and understands that our military is over stretched partly because they are now being asked to handle critical nonmilitary dimensions of our national security repertoire, such as diplomacy, foreign assistance, and economic reconstruction. (The comments referenced here were delivered by Secretary of Defense Robert M. Gates, Landon Lecture, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, November 26, 2007.)
- We know that in an interconnected world, our fates are shared with those around the world. It is beneficial to all of us - particularly to our fellow Americans in the armed forces - to use all of the tools available to us to prevent the need to send our soldiers in harm's way. Prevention really is the best medicine.
- See Secretary of Defense Robert M. Gates' quote above; See Senator Chuck Hagel's quote above.
- See "On International Cooperation" and "On Multilateralism" above.
- See "Investments" Tough Question above.

We have problems here at home; we can't afford to spend so much money trying to make the world a better place. We can't do it all, so you must be telling us that we have to give something up? What are the tradeoffs that you are talking about?

- The fact is that we live in an interdependent world; what happens in other countries affects us. It's unwise and shortsighted to ignore problems that could snowball into crises – that's true at home and abroad. The truth is, if we invest in solving problems early, we save both lives and money.
- The United States helped create many of the international institutions and regional teams that are needed to take on the common challenges that face us all. Through teamwork and cooperation, we can work with others to advance the common good. If we call upon a new style of U.S. global leadership that is cooperative and builds international trust, we will have the help of friends and allies in addressing these problems.
- We need a leadership that is pragmatic and farsighted, that is willing to address the problems of today and anticipate those of the future. It's about spending effectively and accountably, matching our economic priorities with our values and reorganizing our spending so we can achieve our long-term goals in an interdependent world. The Department of Defense knows this, the State Department understands this. It is time to get beyond the spending that was dictated by the Cold War, and enter into a realism of interdependence.
- See "On International Cooperation" and "On Prioritizing/Connecting Security with other Issues" above.

Additional resources for public dialogue on the connection between U.S. and global security:

- TALKING ABOUT SECURITY, Public Opinion Highlights and Implications for Communicators, *U.S. in the World Initiative*, [contact sue@usintheworld.org](mailto:sue@usintheworld.org)
- MAKING SENSE OF SECURITY, How are Americans Making Sense of Security? A Meta-Analysis of Public Opinion, *Commissioned by the U.S. in the World Initiative*, Author: Meg Bostrom, Public Knowledge LLC, [contact sue@usintheworld.org](mailto:sue@usintheworld.org)
- TEAM PLAYER, NOT LONE RANGER, A Meta-Analysis of Public Opinion, *Commissioned by the Stanley Foundation*, Author: Meg Bostrom, Public Knowledge LLC, http://www.stanleyfoundation.org/publications/other/Team_Player_Not_Lone_Ranger.pdf
- FACETS OF AMERICAN LEADERSHIP, A Meta-Analysis of Public Opinion, *Commissioned by the Stanley Foundation*, Author: Meg Bostrom, Public Knowledge LLC, http://www.stanleyfoundation.org/publications/other/Facets_of_American_Leadership.pdf
- BEYOND FEAR: AMERICA'S ROLE IN AN UNCERTAIN WORLD, a radio documentary by the Stanley Foundation, <http://www.stanleyfoundation.org/articles.cfm?id=403>.
- BEYOND FEAR: SECURING A MORE PEACEFUL WORLD, an event-in-a-box toolkit from the Stanley Foundation that provides everything groups need to put together an event that will explore US leadership in today's uncertain world, <http://www.stanleyfoundation.org/now-showingbeyond-fear.cfm>.
- Other resources from the Stanley Foundation on the global security role that the United States could and should play in the 21st century, <http://www.stanleyfoundation.org/articles.cfm?id=465>



The US in the World Initiative, a project of Dēmos: a Network for Ideas & Action, is a state-of-the-art resource for communicators, advocates, educators, experts, and anyone else who wants to talk with Americans about a cooperative, constructive and effective role for the U.S. in the world. Working with a range of partners and drawing on the latest public opinion and communications research, U.S. in the World develops messaging advice that helps communicators build mainstream public support for this vision of responsible global engagement and for policy approaches that reflect it. The initiative's first multi-issue communicators' guide, entitled U.S. in the World: Talking Global Issues with Americans (www.usintheworld.org), was published in late 2004, to wide and bipartisan acclaim. Since then, US in the World has played an active role in helping advocates and experts meet the communications challenges of promoting responsible U.S. global engagement in a dynamic international and domestic policy context. Dēmos is a non-partisan public policy research and advocacy organization.

U.S in the World Initiative
www.usintheworld.org
220 Fifth Avenue, 5th floor
New York, NY 10001
202-302-0270
212-633-2015 fax
usintheworld@gmail.com

THE STANLEY FOUNDATION'S PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT WORKING GROUP:

The Public Engagement Working Group on U.S. and Global Security was convened by the Stanley Foundation. It was comprised of the following individuals. Members of the working group were consulted in the drafting of this message builder, however, the views expressed here are built on the consensus of the majority of the working group and do not express specific opinions of either the individuals listed or their organizations. The organizations listed below are for identification purposes only.

Charles **Brown**, Occam Advisors
Tanya **Dawkins**, Global-Local Links Project
Brian **Katulis**, Center for American Progress
Lorelei **Kelly**, The White House Project
Katherine **Magraw**, Peace and Security Funders Group
Scott **Paul**, Citizens for Global Solutions
Jonathan **Pearson**, National Peace Corps Association
Barbara **Propes**, World Affairs Councils of America
Eric **Schwartz**, Connect US
David **Shorr**, The Stanley Foundation
Marceline **White**, Americans for Informed Democracy
Jessica **Wilbanks**, Fourth Freedom Forum
Thomas **Wright**, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University

The following Stanley Foundation staff led the working group efforts:

Christina **MacGillivray**, The Stanley Foundation
Keith **Porter**, The Stanley Foundation
Jennifer **Smyser**, The Stanley Foundation



The Stanley Foundation is a nonpartisan, private operating foundation that seeks a secure peace with freedom and justice, built on world citizenship and effective global governance. It brings fresh voices and original ideas to debates on global and regional problems. The foundation advocates principled multilateralism—an approach that emphasizes working respectfully across differences to create fair, just, and lasting solutions.

The Stanley Foundation's work recognizes the essential roles of the policy community, media professionals, and the involved public in building sustainable peace. Its work aims to connect people from different backgrounds, often producing clarifying insights and innovative solutions.

The foundation frequently collaborates with other organizations. It does not make grants.

Stanley Foundation reports, publications, programs, and a wealth of other information are available on the Web at www.stanleyfoundation.org.

The Stanley Foundation
209 Iowa Avenue Muscatine, IA 52761 USA
563-264-1500
563-264-0864 fax
info@stanleyfoundation.org