



# A Foreign Policy for All

*Re-Thinking U.S. Foreign Policy for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*

Discussion Draft, October 2014

by the Foreign Policy for All Working Group

**Published** by Massachusetts Peace Action Education Fund, October 14, 2014

11 Garden Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts • [www.masspeaceaction.org](http://www.masspeaceaction.org) • 617-354-2169

**Copyright** © Massachusetts Peace Action Education Fund 2014

### **Massachusetts Peace Action Education Fund**

Massachusetts Peace Action is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization working to develop the sustained political power to foster a more just and peaceful U.S. foreign policy.

Through grassroots organizing, policy advocacy and community education, we promote human rights and global cooperation, seek an end to war and the spread of nuclear weapons, and support budget priorities that re-direct excessive military spending to meeting human and environmental needs in our communities.

### **Foreign Policy for All Working Group**

The discussion draft of “A Foreign Policy for All: Re-Thinking U.S. Foreign Policy for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century” was written by the Foreign Policy for All Working Group, a group of activists and academics acting in their personal capacities and not as representatives of their organizations. Any views expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the views of any organization.

The discussion draft is available at <http://masspeaceaction.org/learn/foreign-policy-for-all>. Please send comments to [fp4a@masspeaceaction.org](mailto:fp4a@masspeaceaction.org).

# The Foreign Policy for All Working Group

Organizations for identification only

**Igor Bolshakov**

Northeastern University

**Shelagh Foreman**

Massachusetts Peace Action

**Joseph Gerson**

American Friends Service Committee

**Subrata Ghoshroy**

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

**Cole Harrison**

Massachusetts Peace Action

**Hayat Imam**

Dorchester People for Peace

**Paul Malachi**

Massachusetts Global Action

**Phil Martin**

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

**Val Moghadam**

Northeastern University

**Thea Paneth**

Arlington United for Justice with Peace

**John Ratliff**

Massachusetts Peace Action



# Contents

- 1.0 - Introduction ..... 1
  - 1.1 –An Unsustainable Status Quo ..... 1
  - 1.2 - Now is the Time ..... 2
  - 1.3 – A Foreign Policy by and for the Corporate Elite..... 3
  - 1.4 - Anatomy of the National Security State ..... 4
  - 1.5 - Reorienting the Conversation: What is Security?..... 5
  
- 2.0 – A Values-Based Framework for Foreign Policy Thinking ..... 7
  - 2.1 – Democracy for All..... 7
  - 2.2 – Peace and International Cooperation for All ..... 7
  - 2.3 – Justice for All ..... 8
  - 2.4 – Human Rights for All ..... 9
  - 2.5 – Sustainability for All ..... 10
  
- 3.0 – Looking Forward to a Foreign Policy for All ..... 11
  - 3.1 – Key elements of a Foreign Policy for All ..... 11
  - 3.2 - Action Agenda..... 15
  
- 4.0 – Toward a Political Strategy for Change ..... 16
  - 4.1 – Priority Areas for Movement-Building..... 16



# 1.0 - Introduction

After over a decade of war in Iraq and Afghanistan, and aggressive actions in Somalia, Yemen, Libya, Ukraine, Cuba, Venezuela, Korea, and Asia-Pacific to name a few, the United States maintains an interventionist, military-first foreign policy. Yet with the huge costs and continual failures of these policies, many Americans are now questioning the values and goals of U.S. foreign policy and the levels of military spending. With a new war on ISIS already upon us, this is a good time to reappraise the basic tenets of U.S. foreign policy.

In *A Foreign Policy for All*, we seek both to critique current foreign policy approaches that exacerbate global insecurity, and also to outline a positive vision of non-militarist U.S. global engagement. Our vision considers the real security needs of people in the United States and around the world, and is consistent with the principles of peace and justice for all. We also explore the political changes needed to realize our vision.

## 1.1 –An Unsustainable Status Quo

U.S. foreign policy is mired in an unsustainable paradigm of worldwide military dominance, with force as an option of first resort. In its alliances, the United States focuses on training and equipping governments abroad with ever more deadly military hardware, effectively providing U.S. backing for the militarization of politics worldwide, undermining democracy and the rule of law, and in many cases arming its opponents. This policy has been increasingly unsuccessful in meeting its stated goals and is not in the interest of most Americans.

The organizing principle of U.S. foreign policy since the end of the Cold War has been to ensure that all nations fall under a security structure managed and controlled by Washington. Nations that refuse to follow U.S. wishes find themselves demonized and pressured to conform.

In short, Washington seeks to act as the world's policeman. Defenders of U.S. hegemony often darkly warn of the disorder that might result if the United States did not shoulder this task, that they claim is a U.S. nation's responsibility. They offer the 9/11 attacks as the ultimate darkness to spring from an un-policed world. But this strategy often causes more insecurity and resentment toward the United States. Peace and security require support for diplomacy, economic development, and universal human rights -- not giving more power and money to repressive and violent governments who curtail civil rights and subjugate their citizens. A more restrained and less militarized U.S. global approach to the world would be more democratic, allowing other nations and peoples to bring their views to global problems. It would generate

less anti-Americanism, and it would cost less, freeing up resources to improve the welfare of U.S. society.

We must therefore work to change our foreign policy. We seek to encourage discussion and debate for alternative and constructive U.S. policy that would support international institutions, encourage non-violent conflict resolution, and promote social and economic development and human rights as the foundations of genuine security.

## 1.2 - Now is the Time

Many Americans view the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq as ill-advised, reckless, or just wrong. They are increasingly skeptical of immense military budgets and expensive interventions; they are wary of war.

A 2004 poll taken jointly by the Council of Foreign Relations and Pew Research Center found that 72 percent of respondents favored a foreign policy based on moral principles rather than narrow national self-interests. In 2013, a survey by the same organizations found that:

Fully 70% of respondents believed that the United States is less respected than in the past.

A majority (52%) agreed that the United States should “mind its own business” internationally.

Preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destructions and reducing dependence on foreign oil were top foreign policy priorities among majorities of respondents.<sup>1</sup>

A growing number of mainstream intellectuals and scholars of American foreign policy have also concluded that it is time for a more restrained and less militarized U.S. role in world politics. For example, Barry Posen challenges the wisdom of maintaining worldwide military predominance accompanied by an ideology that seeks to reshape the domestic politics of other nations in its own image - and advocates for a dramatically reduced U.S. global military footprint.<sup>2</sup> Dan Drezner has also presented evidence showing that U.S. military primacy has not provided the economic benefits that its advocates often proclaim.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Pew Research Center for the People & the Press, “Foreign Policy Attitudes Now Driven by 9/11 and Iraq”, August 11, 2004, <http://www.people-press.org/2004/08/18/foreign-policy-attitudes-now-driven-by-911-and-iraq/>

<sup>2</sup> Barry Posen, *Restraint: A New Foundation for U.S. Grand Strategy*, Cornell University Press, 2014

<sup>3</sup> Daniel W. Drezner, “Military Primacy Doesn’t Pay (Nearly as Much as You Think),” *International Security* Vol. 38, No. 1 (2013), pp. 52-79.



Unfortunately, most Republican and Democratic elected officials take for granted a strategy of U.S. military power to bring “order” to the world<sup>4</sup>, limiting the national security debate between Democrats and Republicans in Congress and the mainstream media to what Barry Posen has called “the modalities of hegemony.”<sup>5</sup> How did this situation arise?

### 1.3 – A Foreign Policy by and for the Corporate Elite

Given this lack of support, why has our foreign policy continued in the same direction? A key answer is that the only group benefitting directly from our foreign policy is made up of economic elites, and they dictate the terms of our foreign policy. Their influence is a direct outcome of an economic system that fosters inequality, and concentrates wealth and power in the hands of a small sector of society. Today, 10% of Americans control around 60% of national income. This gives them great power over government decisions, related to the weapons trade, the military budget, energy policy, regulation of corporations and media, foreign policy, and war and peace.

Large-scale economic interests have dominated U.S. foreign policy from the 18<sup>th</sup> century. But progressive forces with global and democratic values have also existed, and we seek to renew their struggles for influence. When Mark Twain opposed imperialism in the Philippines, when Nazi war criminals went on trial, when President Roosevelt led in creating the United Nations, and when Eleanor Roosevelt led in formulating the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the influence of powerful progressive movements with democratic globalist values contended for influence on policy, though the interests of U.S. corporate elites ultimately subverted each of those projects. However, the Marshall Plan, the Peace Corps, and “humanitarian interventions” from Kosovo to Afghanistan to today’s war on ISIS, were in part cynical ploys to enlist support from people with democratic values in projects whose real purpose was to expand American hegemony.

Corporate domination of foreign policy is not limited to military adventures. Recently, the State Department has worked closely with energy companies to spread fracking around the globe and helped U.S. firms clinch lucrative shale gas deals worth billions of dollars in other countries, with disastrous consequences.<sup>6</sup> Another example is the contemporary U.S. opposition to the

---

<sup>4</sup> Thomas Friedman, “Order vs. Disorder, part 3”, *New York Times*, August 23, 2014, <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/08/24/opinion/sunday/thomas-l-friedman-order-vs-disorder-part-3.html>

<sup>5</sup> Barry Posen, “Command of the Commons: Military Foundation of U.S. Hegemony”, *International Security*, Vol. 28, No. 1 (Summer 2003).

<sup>6</sup> Mariah Blake, “How Hillary Clinton’s State Department Sold Fracking to the World”, *Mother Jones*, Sept./Oct. 2014

creation of the Chinese-led Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank which would be a counterpart to the U.S.-dominated World Bank.<sup>7</sup>

Our foreign policy has been used to control resources, forge trade agreements and markets and, at times, to keep U.S. citizens in check. During the Cold War, anti-capitalist, socialist experiments were seen as dangerous, with the potential to “infect” U.S. workers. In Cuba, Chile, Nicaragua, and Venezuela, land distribution and support to the poor were seen as threatening examples of egalitarian social and economic models that needed to be rooted out through aggressive strategies. In Iran and Guatemala, democratically elected officials were replaced by U.S.-chosen leaders. President Nixon's opening to China in the early 1970's occurred in part due to heavy pressure from the US private sector who were seeking markets in China, in particular agricultural industries. Adding fuel to the fire, U.S. foreign policy facilitates huge arms deals on behalf of military and security companies. These deals represent half the weapons sold worldwide, and it is the corporate sector that benefits.

U.S. elites pursue a program of global control of markets through control of financial institutions, outsourcing, privatization, deregulation, and unfair trade agreements. Their foreign policy seeks hegemony of U.S. corporate interests. They aim to ensure that any nation that does not fall into line with these norms faces economic ostracism, and in some cases, military threats.

In a working democracy, our elected officials would represent us, the citizens, but many in Congress are financially beholden to corporations and business interests. Former public officials, hired by corporations for big fees, become lobbyists, and money in elections tips the scale further. To shift our foreign policy in the direction that would benefit us and also benefit the world, we need to regain our democratic rights. A good place to start is to challenge government/corporate collusion.

## **1.4 - Anatomy of the National Security State**

As a European colonial settler state, the United States from its inception relied largely on violence to dispossess the indigenous population and to acquire and suppress the slave labor upon which its initial wealth depended. At the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, after considerable domestic debate, it began the conquests that laid the foundations of empire, dominating peoples in Asia and the Americas.

---

<sup>7</sup> Jane Perlez, “China’s Effort to Set Up a Regional Development Bank Meets U.S. Opposition”, *New York Times*, Oct. 10, 2014

The United States came out of the Second World War as the dominant power in the world economy and one of two military superpowers. Orders for armaments and troops helped lift the economy out of the Great Depression. But postwar planners were worried that national liberation struggles and the possible rise of a competitor state might threaten U.S. predominance, prompting expansion of what President Eisenhower called “the military-industrial complex” (1960), consolidation of massive military spending, and establishing the American state’s global reach.

The policy-making apparatus has come to be known as the national security state, which includes the Pentagon, the White House and National Security Council, the State Department, CIA, NSA and other intelligence agencies, and the Congressional leadership, including the armed services and intelligence committees. This elite group, mostly working in secrecy inside the government, is aided by a large group of experts from think tanks and academia, and lobbyists that help shape the policy.<sup>8</sup>

While the Pentagon and CIA act as the hard edge of a hegemonic, militaristic foreign policy, the State Department, Treasury and Commerce also play important roles, implementing sanctions and export controls and making sure that U.S. business interests are promoted. Key Treasury officials are often drawn from Wall Street firms like Morgan Stanley, CitiGroup, and Goldman Sachs.

Experts routinely move between the Pentagon, State Department, Congressional committees; they use the revolving door to move back and forth to think tanks like Brookings, Hoover, and the Council on Foreign Relations, academia, and military contractor companies, and provide an endless supply of “independent commentators” for the media. The media plays a crucial role in shaping the narrative and influencing the public with mostly biased coverage that provides little space to dissenting opinions and alternative narratives. Many of those who endorsed the “war on terror” and the invasion and occupation of Iraq following the 9/11 attacks now call for war on ISIS.

## **1.5 - Reorienting the Conversation: What is Security?**

We need to reorient the conversation about national security toward the well-being of ordinary citizens rather than the interests of political and economic elites. Common security, human security, and shared security are three attempts to formulate such a new framework.

The “common security” concept reflects an age old truth: a person or a nation cannot feel secure if their actions lead their neighbor or rival to be fearful and insecure. At the height of

---

<sup>8</sup> Douglas Stuart, *Creating the National Security State*, Princeton University Press, 2012.

the Cold War, Swedish Prime Minister Olaf Palme brought leading U.S., European and Soviet figures together to find ways to step back from the brink. Common Security was their answer,<sup>9</sup> leading to the negotiation of the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty, which functionally brought the Cold War to an end two years before the collapse of the Berlin Wall and four years before the break-up of the Soviet Union.

In essence, the idea is to remove, through negotiations, the fear and insecurity of the other without undermining one's own sense of insecurity. This can be applied to arms races, resource competition, trade, climate change, or any other challenges to national security and human survival. It can also be applied within nations to address development, economic inequality, and resource issues. As Reiner Braun stated eloquently: "Common security means negotiation, dialogue and cooperation; it implies peaceful resolution of conflicts. Security can be achieved only by a joint effort or not at all."<sup>10</sup>

In recent decades, it has become increasingly recognized within the international community that any reasonable understanding of security should be first and foremost about the welfare of individual people, not just nation-states. While inter-state military conflicts continue to threaten international peace and stability, the more pressing dangers for most individuals and communities around the world now come from threats like climate change, political oppression and instability, civil wars, disease, and persistent poverty. Thus, "human security" has become an increasingly meaningful concept among civil society groups, humanitarian organizations, and governments around the world, reflecting the widespread desire for a more humane and democratic understanding of security, one which addresses the actual needs of ordinary citizens.<sup>11</sup>

Last year, the American Friends Service Committee and the Friends Committee on National Legislation proposed "shared security", based on these principles: "Demonstrate responsible leadership; Work cooperatively with other nations; Respect the rule of law; Help others in need; Protect the planet on which we all live; Choose peaceful solutions to conflicts as often as possible."<sup>12</sup> Our concerns and solutions are similar to those of the authors of *Shared Security*, but we seek, in addition, to propose a political strategy that can realize the changes we seek.

---

<sup>9</sup> The Independent Commission On Disarmament and Security Issues, *Common Security: A Blueprint for Survival*, Simon and Schuster, 1982

<sup>10</sup> Reiner Braun, International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms (IALANA), address at the International Meeting, 2014 World Conference against Atomic & Hydrogen Bombs, Hiroshima, August 2, 2014.

<sup>11</sup> Roland Paris, "Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?", *International Security*, Vol. 26, No. 2, (Fall 2001)

<sup>12</sup> American Friends Service Committee and Friends Committee on National Legislation, *Shared Security:Reimagining U.S. Foreign Policy*, April 2013, <http://sharedsecurity.wordpress.com/>.

## 2.0 – A Values-Based Framework for Foreign Policy Thinking

We advocate for a foreign and military policy that is in the interest of the majority of Americans. To this end, we believe that a foreign policy that works in the interests of *everyone* is one that comports with the following five principles: 1) democracy, 2) peace and international cooperation, 3) justice, 4) human rights, and 5) sustainability.

### 2.1 – Democracy for All

Although the U.S. is nominally a democracy, its foreign policy has long been dominated by a narrow group of political and economic elites. While a small set of Congressional leaders is taken into confidence, Congress as a whole has little control over how U.S. foreign policy is set or implemented, though it is responsible for funding and otherwise supporting the current policy. There are rarely any Congressional votes or debates when Presidents send military forces to fight abroad, order drones to attack so-called “terrorists” overseas under secret policies, record citizens’ phone calls and email messages, and initiate wars at will.

While Congress has only a limited role in the formulation of foreign policy, the public has even less say. These examples of the “democracy deficit” harm us all. *Citizens United* is only the most recent and flagrant example enabling money in politics to control the political system. To make foreign policy serve the interests of the broader public, we need institutional changes to ensure real democracy.

### 2.2 – Peace and International Cooperation for All

International cooperation and respect for other nations are widely shared values among people in this country and around the world. Americans are increasingly exposed to the world’s people through travel, study, global business, immigration, veterans returning from overseas military deployments, and the new global media environment, including social media.

Peace and international cooperation stand in contrast to “American exceptionalism”, the myth that America is a uniquely democratic, free, and virtuous nation, which is often used to support a unilateralist foreign policy which claims for the United States the duty to “lead” the world -- by force if necessary. Instead, to survive we must work towards strengthening global institutions of cooperation to facilitate dialogue and share responsibility to meet common challenges.

When we joined the United Nations, we promised not to use force or the threat of force except in self-defense or as part of UN-authorized collective security actions. Yet almost every administration since has reserved the right to unilaterally use force to protect so-called “national interests.” The two positions cannot be reconciled -- and it is in our interests to honor the UN Charter. Multilateralism and collective security, diplomatic and nonviolent means, and adherence to international peace, non-aggression, human security, and the rule of international law, should become the basis for the relations among states.

Crisis prevention, de-escalation, and averting war are among the most important tasks of the international governance system; the UN and the Security Council must be able to act effectively to safeguard international peace, which may necessitate Charter reform. International bodies also need to be able to act effectively to protect human well-being, life and the environment when they are threatened by the actions of corporations. States must recognize a shared concept of security and respect for international law. International cooperation also means acceptance of a diversity of social and economic systems rather than the imposition of a single, global “free market” that demands unfettered competition.

The shrill insistence of U.S. elites that the United States must “lead” is an attempt to turn back the clock. Multiplicity and diversity of power are increasingly the rule in today’s world, and a new global governance regime must therefore be based on peaceful coexistence and mutual respect between nations. Democratic institutions should give proper weight to the human population globally: an international parliament should be added to the bodies of the UN. International governance and legal systems need to be given a secure financial basis, possibly based on taxation of multinational economic interests, to fund efforts to implement international cooperation.

## **2.3 – Justice for All**

Justice as a principle of American politics dates to the Declaration of Independence. Without justice, there cannot be peace. People will resist injustice and oppression. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. invoked justice when he declared in 1963 that “injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere,” and called on all justice-loving people to unite.

Justice provides a framework for peaceful resolution of conflicts in a way that also entails racial, social, and economic fairness not otherwise available in a context of militarism and runaway corporate capitalism.

Militarism diverts enormous resources from social programs, jobs, and environmental protection; this reality provides the basis for movements and organizations working for environmental, social, economic, and racial justice to take up a Foreign Policy for All.

Justice calls on us to build a movement to aid the victims of extreme inequality, of migration driven by war, economic and climate disaster, and of militarized sexual violence. And it requires the appropriate social investments by government.

Justice in foreign policy includes respect for internationally constituted judicial institutions. The *Nicaragua v. USA* decision by the International Court of Justice (1986)<sup>13</sup> was a case of a small nation attempting to utilize the international court to obtain justice against outside support for the contra forces who caused devastating damage to Nicaragua. The United States denied that the ICJ had jurisdiction, refused to pay the reparations ordered by the court, and withdrew U.S. recognition of ICJ jurisdiction over further international lawsuits involving the United States. A Foreign Policy for All would never have attempted to impose the U.S.' will on its neighbor and would have honored the verdict of the court.

## 2.4 – Human Rights for All

Notions of human rights are widely resonant in the United States and globally. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was drafted in 1948 under the leadership of Eleanor Roosevelt and codified into international law in a series of six treaties, but since then the U.S. has been a laggard. It has ratified only three of the six: on civil and political rights, elimination of racial discrimination, and torture. Congress refused to ratify the conventions on discrimination against women, on economic, cultural and social rights, and on the rights of the child; in each case, it is one of a small handful of UN member states that have not ratified these key human rights treaties.

Though it preaches human rights, U.S. foreign policy constantly contradicts this principle in practice. It lectures to its adversaries on the subject but ignores the violations of its allies; protects and arms military dictatorships; and invokes a distorted version of the “responsibility to protect” doctrine to justify its repeated military interventions. The United States’ has undermined the credibility of its to human rights.

Human rights violations within the United States, such as our 2 million imprisoned citizens, the largest number in the world, and our continued use of the racially discriminatory death penalty, further expose our government’s insincerity on this subject.

Yet human rights provide a strong basis for advocacy, both inside the U.S. and overseas, not only for civil and political rights, but for universal human rights, including rights to water, food, jobs, housing, health care, education, social security, electric power, communications, civil

---

<sup>13</sup> International Court of Justice, *Nicaragua v. United States of America*, <http://www.icj-cij.org/docket/index.php?case=70&sum=367>

rights, prisoners' rights, and against racial discrimination and torture, among others. We would do well to follow Martin Luther King Jr. who, in launching the Poor People's Movement in 1968, called for a shift from a civil rights to a human rights paradigm.

The European Court of Human Rights has demonstrated how an effective treaty can be enforced when the participating nations seriously agree to a joint commitment. Over the years it has protected Irish prisoners against English repression, LGBT people against anti-gay laws in Ireland, immigrant asylum seekers in various countries, and Iraqi prisoners' rights while under British military custody in Iraq.

## 2.5 – Sustainability for All

The environmental movement's successful promulgation of the concept of sustainability is an important achievement. It provides a fundamental value that can save us from the environmental costs of industrialization and capitalism, the overriding threat of climate change, and the dangers inherent in nuclear energy. We must connect these to the disastrous environmental consequences of wars and the production and use of nuclear weapons.

Our moment of truth has arrived. Continuing the current course of globalized development capitalism would ensure the end of life as we know it.<sup>14</sup> We need to reorient and revolutionize productive processes and economic models in a sustainable direction. To avoid climatic catastrophe and wars for the control of natural resources, including water, we need a comprehensive, long-term, global view of the economy, development, society, and the environment. As such, international cooperation becomes an absolute necessity.

Climate justice is not free, but it is cheaper than militarism. Climate finance will cost the developed nations some \$200-400 billion per year, or 0.5 to 1.0% of their GDP, while NATO pushes countries to spend 2% of GDP on their military budgets, and the US spends 4%.<sup>15</sup>

A sustainable economy would replace the current arrangement that concentrates wealth in a tiny minority with one that would provide meaningful employment and essential resources for all. A foreign and military policy committed to sustainability would embrace global cooperation, freeing up necessary resources for a transition to a sustainable economy and energy system. We thus see that the peace and the climate movements represent the same

---

<sup>14</sup> Sustainable Solutions Development Network, *Pathways to Deep Decarbonization: Interim 2014 report*, July 2014, <http://unsdsn.org/resources/publications/pathways-to-deep-decarbonization-2014-report/>, page 2

<sup>15</sup> Tamara Lorincz, *Demilitarization for Deep Decarbonization*, draft working paper for the International Peace Bureau, September 2014, [http://ipb.org/uploads/documents/other\\_docs/Green\\_Booklet\\_working\\_paper\\_17.09.2014.pdf](http://ipb.org/uploads/documents/other_docs/Green_Booklet_working_paper_17.09.2014.pdf)



constituents, face the same problems and same adversaries, and should build a durable alliance.

## 3.0 – Looking Forward to a Foreign Policy for All

The problems we face have solutions, but how we resolve these problems has become crucial to the security of the people of the United States and of those with whom we share our planet. It is not hard to envision what a reasonable system might look like. For example, for the cost of developing a fleet of F-35 stealth fighter planes, the government could fund existing organizations such as the State Department, the U.S. Agency for International Development and all United Nations peacekeeping operations for nearly twenty years. These funds could clearly be expended to help develop new and expand existing international organizations to encourage a true security.

Articles 25 and 26 of The Universal Declaration of Human Rights state: “Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services...” and “Everyone has the right to education.” Were these commitments to be implemented, we would be on the transformative path. If foreign policy established as a primary goal the day-to-day well-being of women, children, and workers, the policies that emerged would be rooted in cooperation, negotiation and compromise. Policies would be framed around basic neutrality towards other nations and would recognize the value of every living being on our planet and our common humanity.

To move forward as human beings, the values by which we make choices need to change. Nations and corporations can no longer seek to maximize control over resources, acquisition of territory, and imposition of strong-arm control over populations, because the immiseration of all and the collapse of the earth’s environment are the proven, known and ultimate costs of this path.

### 3.1 – Key elements of a Foreign Policy for All

**Nuclear Disarmament:** The U.S. must prioritize action to end the threat of nuclear annihilation which hangs over the heads of every living creature on earth. We must urgently seek multilateral negotiations leading to an early conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention, as sought by the United Nations General Assembly, the International Red Cross and Red Crescent

Movement, the International Trade Union Confederation, the World Council of Churches, among others,<sup>16</sup> fulfilling our obligation under Article 6 of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The U.S. should facilitate negotiations for a Middle East WMD Free Zone and other regional disarmament initiatives.

**Climate Justice:** The future of humanity will be bleak unless the world rapidly comes together to confront this urgent challenge. A combination of burning carbon-based fuels and deforestation has dramatically increased carbon emissions in the air, warming the planet and the oceans, and melting sea and mountain ice. Rising ocean levels have made all low elevation coastal zones vulnerable to inundation by century's end. Reducing carbon emissions is essential to avoiding catastrophic climate change that will affect the world's food supply. Developing nations, who have contributed the least carbon emissions to the atmosphere, are often the most at risk.

The U.S. should mount a major effort to reduce and reverse climate change as an urgent national priority. To build a carbon-free, nuclear-free energy future we need to undertake an emergency program to make our cities energy efficient, create a new energy grid based on renewable energy sources, impose an escalating carbon tax, stop building new fossil fuel infrastructure, and rapidly develop solar, wind, and geothermal technologies. The U.S. and other countries which are most responsible for carbon emissions, and which can best afford to pay, must change their production and consumption habits and commit the resources to achieve an 85% global cut in greenhouse gases by 2050, reduce carbon levels in the atmosphere to 350 ppm, and support rapid green economic development in less developed countries.

**Strengthen international law and international organizations:** In an interdependent and globalized world, the system where each nation-state pursues its security and interests through military force is a dangerous anachronism. In San Francisco in 1945, the U.S. led the world in creating the United Nations, pledging to "ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest". Our country must return to compliance with the U.N. Charter and forswear the use of military force except in defense of its territory and in accordance with U.N. decisions. No single nation and no hastily-assembled "coalition of the willing" can unilaterally elect to be the enforcer of the rights embodied in the United Nations. The U.N. must be reformed to more democratically apportion decision-making power and increase its ability to effectively resolve international disputes.

---

<sup>16</sup> International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, <http://www.icanw.org/why-a-ban/positions/>

The U.S. needs to recognize the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and abide by its decisions, and join the International Criminal Court. It should follow the lead of over 100 other nations and ratify international treaties such as the Landmine Ban Treaty, the Treaty on the Rights of the Child, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), the Arms Trade Treaty, the Law of the Sea Treaty, among others, and restore the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty.

**Peaceful Coexistence:** The U.S. should uphold the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence, also called the Panchsheel principles. They are mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in the internal affairs of another country, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence.<sup>17</sup>

**Non-intervention:** The principle of non-interference means that the U.S. should end its pattern of intervention, whether military, political, or economic, in the internal affairs of other countries. The U.S. should end “counter-terrorism wars” and renounce the Bush/Obama doctrine of pre-emption, which are contrary to international law. If “humanitarian intervention” is required to prevent violations of human rights, it should be carried out by a reformed United Nations reflecting the will of humanity, not by one country or a self-selected group of countries.

**Peacebuilding Abroad and at Home:** The U.S. should support international peacebuilding efforts led by civil society and grassroots organizations to address the root causes or potential causes of violence. Women must be at the table. We can achieve peace and security only through diplomacy, economic development, and social provisioning. Vengeance invites vengeance, and non-violence is a pillar for peace. Within our country, we should create a societal expectation for peaceful conflict resolution and work to stabilize society politically and socioeconomically. End mass incarceration. Build constituencies for peace at the local level through anti-bullying watchdogs, demilitarized police, non-violent community patrols, prevention of racism in hiring/civil service practices, protecting civil liberties, restorative justice, and conducting peace audits.

**Protect the global commons:** The U.S. should support international protection of the oceans, the atmosphere, outer space, the Arctic and Antarctic, and cyberspace, managing them as the global heritage of humankind, protecting them from exploitation by commercial interests, and ensuring that they are never militarized.

---

<sup>17</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Five\\_Principles\\_of\\_Peaceful\\_Coexistence](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Five_Principles_of_Peaceful_Coexistence)

**Demilitarization:** The U.S. should reduce its military spending by 50% or more, withdraw its forces from overseas bases, and refocus the mission of our military on defense of the national territory and participation in international missions of a reformed U.N.

**Arms Trade:** The U.S. should ratify the Arms Trade Treaty, which would prevent transfers of weapons likely to be used for violations of international law. Strict regulation of the international arms trade is needed and transfers of advanced weapons must be severely curtailed.

**Development:** The U.S. should contribute generously to meeting the Millennium Development Goals and to the post-2015 sustainable development agenda now being formulated by the UN.<sup>18</sup> The industrialized countries have done much to impede the development of the rest of the world; their security now lies in providing the resources to bring all peoples of the world to dignified levels of economic development in a way that does not exacerbate climate change.

**Just Transition:** As we scale down our military production and fossil fuel industries, we must insist that the transition to a sustainable economy and a foreign policy for all not be accomplished at the expense of those now employed in the military and fossil fuel sectors and the communities in which they work and live. Energy and armament corporations should bear the lion's share of the social cost to make that transition a just one.

**Trade Justice:** A just U.S. trade and investment policy of Fair Trade would foster cooperation, solidarity and sustainable development, and thus peace. It should facilitate the equitable distribution of the world's wealth by giving people access to resources, goods and services which are needed for the fulfillment of their needs. U.S. trade policy must be open to public scrutiny and democratic debate and be developed by democratic structures that facilitate maximum citizen participation.<sup>19</sup>

**Priority Regional Issues:** The U.S. should develop healthy cooperative relations with China; sign a peace treaty with North Korea and withdraw military forces from the Korean peninsula; renounce the Carter Doctrine's commitment to intervening militarily to ensure privileged access to Middle East and Persian Gulf oil resources; and end foreign military aid and shift instead to development and assistance in meeting climate goals. We should end aid to Israel until it complies with U.N. resolutions and ends its occupation of Palestine; sign a nuclear deal and build a cooperative relationship with Iran; end our military presence in Africa; end the blockade of Cuba; stop supporting the "color revolutions"; stop the policy of hostility to Venezuela; fairly

---

<sup>18</sup> "United Nations, Millennium Development Goals and Beyond 2015". <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/beyond2015-overview.shtml>

<sup>19</sup> Trade Justice Network, Progressive Trade Alternative, <http://www.tradejustice.ca/pta/progressive-trade-alternative/>

resolve the just demands of the Marshall Islands for compensation for nuclear tests; and withdraw from NATO and other military alliances.

## 3.2 - Action Agenda

Below is a list of specific actions to be undertaken immediately:

- Honor the United States' commitment under Article VI of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, the International Court of Justice's 1996 Advisory Opinion on the Use and Threatened Use of Nuclear Weapons, and President Obama's 2009 pledge at Prague by actively working to begin good faith negotiations for the complete elimination of the world's nuclear arsenals.
- We should fully renounce a nuclear first strike, take our weapons off high alert, and immediately stop "modernizing" nuclear weapons and building delivery systems and production facilities.
- Implement conservation, transportation, and sustainable energy policies that will reduce U.S. energy consumption to at most Western European levels, i.e. one half of current U.S. energy consumption.
- Reduce U.S. military spending to 2% of GDP, the same level the United States demands of its NATO allies. This would mean an annual military budget of \$358 billion, a 45% reduction from the FY2015 level.
- Honoring the spirit of the U.S. Declaration of Independence, begin the process of repatriating the United States' estimated 1,000 foreign military bases.
- Move from the current military and economic "containment and engagement" strategy aimed at China to a commitment to pursue win-win Common Security negotiations. The tensions between the rising and declining powers, current arms race, competition for strategic and economic advantage and resources, complex alliances, territorial disputes, nationalisms and wild cards are dangerously reminiscent of those that prevailed prior to WW I
- Halt NATO expansion and "missile defense" deployments in Europe, which violate the Bush-Gorbachev agreement not to move NATO a centimeter closer to Russia in exchange for Germany reunifying on West German terms, which rekindle Russian fears of invasion from the West as in the catastrophic Napoleonic and German invasions, and which sparked this century's wars in Georgia and Ukraine.

- Participate in transnational legal processes, most importantly the International Court of Justice and the International Criminal Court. By accepting global norms and internalizing them into domestic law, that process can lead to the reformulation of national interests into more cooperative forms. It will also lead to greater respect for the United States as a non-hegemonic nation and create a more inclusive environment for maintaining norms of human rights and justice.
- Financial transaction tax as an independent source of financing for the U.N.
- Pass a constitutional amendment(s) to overturn *Citizens United* and declare that corporations are not people
- Change the Cold War paradigm of science and technology for national security; liberate science to work for peaceful, sustainable ends

## 4.0 – Toward a Political Strategy for Change

As we have said, the making of U.S. foreign policy is an opaque and mostly secret process controlled by an elite that represents corporate capitalist interests and the military industrial complex.

The policy-making apparatus is the national security state. The media shapes the narrative and influences the public with mostly biased coverage that provides little space to dissenting opinions and alternative narratives. Most Democrats and Republicans offer only a narrow range of alternatives, united as they are on a common strategy of U.S. hegemony.

Therefore, a foreign policy that reflects the values of democracy, justice, human rights, peace and international cooperation, and sustainability, and that reflects the interests and desires of a majority of American people, is not achievable without fundamental changes in our economic and political systems. It will require long-term and sustained struggles to challenge the system in place.

Envisioning an alternative as well as mobilizing people against the egregious policies of the day is critical to building a movement for the necessary larger changes that are required to bring about a Foreign Policy for All in the long run.

### 4.1 – Priority Areas for Movement-Building

As the U.S. starts new wars and aggressive actions and continues old ones, the peace movement's **actions to turn public opinion** against them remain crucially important. Protests,

vigils, local resolutions, lecture tours, and letters to the editor will ultimately make U.S. elites pay a political price for their interventions just as was the case with Vietnam in the 1970's, Central America in the 1980's and Iraq in the 2000's. We must also continue to warn against aggressive actions short of war such as those the U.S. is currently conducting from Korea to Ukraine to Nigeria to Venezuela. Veterans, military families and immigrant communities with ties to affected countries are key constituencies in this effort.

The threat of nuclear annihilation continues to hang over humanity, but the issue receded from the headlines after the Cold War ended. But the public in all countries still favors abolition of nuclear weapons, giving the basis to build the strength of the **anti-nuclear weapons movement**.

The tremendous economic cost of hegemony and 21<sup>st</sup> century high tech war, which has been developed in part to minimize U.S. casualties and resulting public opposition to wars, is another weak spot of elite war policy. At a time when funds are urgently needed for public schools, transportation, a green energy transition, and job creation, the basis exists to build a strong alliance to **Move the Money** from militarism and war to social needs.

A Foreign Policy for All is only one part of a **people's agenda** that is bringing together labor, people of color, immigrants, women, LGBT people, ex-prisoners, environmentalists, community activists, civil libertarians, and more in a broad progressive coalition. Popular struggles against corporate abuses, extreme inequality, cutbacks, social injustice, and money in politics are joining with campaigns against unpopular wars, killer drones, nuclear pollution, surveillance, wiretapping, militarization of police, mass incarceration, and racial profiling. These combined movements will rise or fall together because all are ultimately struggling the same corporate interests that control our economy and politics for the benefit of the 1%. To win a Foreign Policy for All will take the combined power of the progressive social movements.

**Inequality of power and wealth** is the fundamental factor permitting the 1% to dictate our foreign policy, and it is growing worse. But campaigns for an increased minimum wage and union drives among service workers can begin to shift the power balance and give more power to the great majority, which has no interest in a foreign policy of hegemony; they are also bringing together popular coalitions for the struggles to come. Campaigns against neoliberal trade treaties like the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) and Trans-Atlantic Free Trade Area (TAFTA) show how the international corporate agenda affects everyday issues like wages and jobs.

All the issues come together in the **political arena**. Efforts to build the progressive wing of the Democratic Party and sharpen its struggle with the dominant, pro-corporate centrist wing; the Working Families party, which has elected the Mayor of New York City; attempts to make the

Green Party into a credible electoral force; and electoral campaigns by socialist candidates like Seattle's Kshama Sawant, all seek to create a political expression of the people's agenda. Whatever political campaign is developed, it must be independent of corporate capitalism if it is to advocate for a Foreign Policy for All and mount a challenge to the current, bi-partisan political support for endless wars and U.S. hegemony.

But our movements are too often **fragmented** due to a lack of understanding of the interconnectedness of the issues we address. Fragmentation can cause movement leaders to compromise with elites for apparent short term gains, even when that hurts the broader movement and therefore, indirectly, their own sector. Our alliances need to be based on unyielding support for those most oppressed on the basis of race, gender, class and sexual orientation.

Foreign policy issues and positions against U.S. wars can appear thorny to organizations focused on day to day issues. But when corporations work on a global scale while workers and communities think locally, the inevitable result is that corporations outflank our movements. Advocating for a Foreign Policy for All as part of their agenda is a smart strategy for labor and social and economic justice groups struggling for justice for their constituents. **Social justice unionism** is the strategy for labor that incorporates class struggle, labor-community alliances, race and gender, and a global outlook. "Transformation will occur when the labor movement thinks and acts both locally and globally".<sup>20</sup>

Corporate assaults on democracy bring us the possibility to create **unexpected alliances**. Both progressives and libertarians agree that corporations are not people and that the imperial state is running roughshod over the people's rights. Campaigns against corporate control of politics, against wiretapping and state surveillance, and against undeclared foreign wars are American as apple pie. They seek to reclaim the constitution for the people and they can create coalitions across partisan lines.

We must connect with **international movements** that are struggling against the neoliberal policies of global capitalism. While they are forcing ruthless austerity measures on many countries through diktats from the International Monetary Fund, unemployment and underemployment coupled with a decline in real wages are becoming the norm in advanced industrial countries like the U.S. A capitalist system of profits without borders demands an international movement to challenge it. Already, we have seen signs of such solidarity in the massive attendance in the World Social Forums that have been held across the globe, as well as the European and U.S. Social Forums. Vigorous participation in these events is highly desirable

---

<sup>20</sup> Bill Fletcher, Jr., and Fernando Gasparin, *Solidarity Divided: The crisis in organized labor and a new path towards social justice*, University of California Press, 2008.



to build connections, especially with the global south, which is on the receiving end of U.S. policy actions. The movements for nuclear abolition and for climate justice also provide an important platform for such cross-national collaboration.

The **corporate media** is the lynchpin for the manufacture of consent for an interventionist foreign policy. It is imperative that we make concerted efforts to challenge its monopoly on the news. Already digital technology is providing opportunities to level the playing field somewhat. We have witnessed the effective use of mobile phones and digital communications tools such as Facebook, Twitter, and Tumblr in recent popular uprisings like the Arab Spring and Occupy Wall Street. However, technology cannot be the panacea. It is essential we work hard to document and expose the bias, disinformation, and misinformation inherent in the mainstream media. Efforts should be made to feed as much information as possible to existing media watch outlets like Fairness and Accuracy in Reporting (FAIR), Truthout, and Democracy Now.

Outreach to the **youth** should also be a high priority to change the mindset shaped by the myth of “American exceptionalism.” We should connect with high school teachers and university professors and encourage them to bring up foreign policy issues. As an example, the film director Oliver Stone and Prof. Peter Kuznick have just published a short version of their book *Untold History of the United States*, accompanied by a 10-part film series especially for high school students. It would be a good vehicle to discuss foreign policy. The deep connection between universities and the Pentagon is crucial to research and development of new weapons that are used during invasions of defenseless people from Vietnam to Iraq. For example, world-class universities like MIT and Stanford are closely involved in researching drone technologies. We have an opportunity to organize university students on this issue.

The issues of **race and racism** are ever present in all American conversations. As we have noted earlier, people of color are rarely present in the corridors of power, and even less so when it comes to those that determine our foreign policy. Reaching out to inner city schools with large minority student populations could provide an opportunity to connect with the minority communities. *The Untold History of the U.S.* could be one vehicle.

The Foreign Policy for All is a key part of the platform of the united people’s movement we seek to build. Politics does not stop at the water’s edge – in a globalized world, foreign policy is everyone’s concern.