Nuclear annihilation. It’s a frightening, almost existential notion that many of us—especially those born before or during the Cold War—have had to consider at some point in our lives. Duck and cover drills and fallout shelters, command and control procedures, the concept of mutually assured destruction—these once seemed to offer at least a veneer of security for Americans. But today’s nuclear threat has evolved and is somehow even more terrifying. As Carnegie Corporation President Vartan Gregorian writes in this issue of the Carnegie Reporter, “There is no longer a single proverbial ‘red phone’ in the event of a nuclear crisis.”

Nuclear security—and, more specifically, the threat of nuclear terrorism—was the subject of the fourth and final international Nuclear Security Summit organized by the White House in Washington, D.C., last March, and is a focus point in this issue of the Corporation’s flagship publication. In addition to the president’s letter, we feature a graphic novel-like retelling of the dramatic 2007 break-in at the Pelindaba Nuclear Research Centre in South Africa, a snapshot of the four scenarios in which a terrorist group could carry out a nuclear attack, and policy prescriptions from our nuclear security brain trust to help prevent any of those terrible scenarios from occurring. “This is a responsibility that can’t be delegated to others,” says Joan Rohlfing of the Nuclear Threat Initiative, a longtime Corporation partner in securing the world’s fissile and radioactive material. “It needs to start at the leader level.”

Also in this issue, Hillary Wiesner, director of Carnegie Corporation’s Transnational Movements in the Arab Region program, opens up about the program’s strategy to engage social scientists in the Arab world, while Visiting Media Fellow Scott Malcomson looks at the current state of peacebuilding in Africa. Corporation grantees in these areas know their countries better than anyone else and are best placed to help resolve the many conflicts that have arisen in their respective regions. Our “Carnegie Results” department looks at the effort to bring more economic data into the all-too-often “fact-free” immigration debate, while our “End Note” spotlights a worrisome disconnect between parents’ understanding of their children’s performance in school and how their children are actually testing. These stories, and more, come to life at carnegie.org.

Robert Nolan
Director of Communications and Content Strategy, Carnegie Corporation of New York
“If you want to go far, go together”: Preventing Nuclear Catastrophe

Fall the concerns Andrew Carnegie sought to address through his philanthropy, the pursuit of peace was of paramount importance to him, especially as he grew older and the specter of a world war loomed ever larger. After all his advocacy in the name of peace and diplomacy, Mr. Carnegie was devastated by his inability to prevent the outbreak of World War I and the catastrophe that followed. Few could have imagined at the time that the term “The Great War,” as it was known, would a mere two decades later no longer hold true, as World War II erupted with even greater geographic reach and devastation. Most frightening of all, the Second World War saw the introduction of the atomic bomb, placing into the hands of man, for the first time, the ability to wreak instantaneous and total destruction.

Since 1945, when humanity first witnessed the use of nuclear weapons at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the Corporation, along with several of its sister institutions, has contributed significant funds to ensure nuclear security and nonproliferation. The Corporation’s trustees, like Mr. Carnegie decades before, have supported a variety of measures to avert global war and atomic disaster, noting that “without peace and the prospect of peace, all other plans are worthless.”

Following World War II, and through the 1960s, the Corporation made a series of grants focused on understanding and managing the twin forces of atomic energy and nuclear weapons. Then, after a hiatus, in 1983 the Corporation revived its efforts in the nuclear realm with the launch of the Avoiding Nuclear War Program. The initiative helped foster understanding of the nuclear threat and the necessity of cooperation with the Soviet Union to avert accidental warfare or preemptive strikes. This included helping to develop relationships of trust between Soviet and American nuclear scientists and paving the way for confidence building between Soviet General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

---

FROM THE PRESIDENT

Breaches and Other Nuclear Security Incidents, 2003-2014

With the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991, which brought the Cold War to an end, tensions between the United States and Russia abated. But this seminal shift in the international landscape led to new dangers, including the vulnerability of nuclear weapons and materials in former Soviet republics. Since 1991, even as more than a dozen countries have ended their nuclear weapons programs, and in a few cases dismantled their arsenals entirely, the nuclear threat has continued to spread to new regions. Prominent steps like the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty of 1968 have not prevented India, Pakistan, and North Korea from conducting nuclear tests and joining the United States, Russia, the United Kingdom, France, China, and Israel as the states that are either known or presumed to possess nuclear weapons.

While the United States and Russia account for more than 90 percent of the almost 16,000 nuclear warheads in existence, the once bipolar international system has transformed into a multipolar one characterized by constantly evolving threats. There is no longer a single proverbial “red giant” with nuclear weapons. The United States, Russia, the United Kingdom, France, China, and Israel have emerged as the five nuclear “have” nations, and India, Pakistan, and North Korea have each acquired a small stockpile of the world’s deadliest weapons.

For the fifty world leaders in attendance at the Summit, the stakes could not be higher. The United States and Russia, with the vast majority of the world’s nuclear warheads, have remained very active in supporting the work of policymakers and nonprofit leaders in the nuclear realm, including work to prevent nuclear terrorism. Indeed, the Corporation’s commitment to analysis and policy outreach on the changing nature of nuclear risks has been unyielding, elevating the foundation to its place as the leading private philanthropic supporter of nongovernmental work on nuclear weapons strategy, security, and nonproliferation.

The most recent Nuclear Security Summit provided the Corporation with an opportunity to partner again with the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, another of the leading nuclear security funders, to announce a “gift basket” that committed the two foundations to invest up to $25 million over the next two years toward nuclear security work.

In the past, one of the grantees the two foundations have been especially proud to partner in supporting is the outstanding Nuclear Threat Initiative, known as NTI, an independent, nonprofit organization that strives to achieve a world without nuclear weapons. Established in 2001 through the generosity of businessman-turned-philanthropist Ted Turner, founder and funder of the United Nations Foundation, and led by national defense expert and former U.S. Senator Sam Nunn, NTI has become a hub of nuclear research and dissemination.

In addition to Senator Nunn, NTI is fortunate to have other great national and international leaders on its board, such as Vice Chairman Des Browne, former Defense Minister of the United Kingdom; General Eugene E. Habiger, former Commander in Chief of the U.S. Strategic Command; Igor S. Ivanov, former Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs; Gideon Frank, former Director General of the Israel Atomic Energy Commission; Liu Cui, former President of the China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations; and Ambassador Hamad Alkaki, Permanent Representative of the United Arab Emirates to the International Atomic Energy Agency and Special Representative for International Nuclear Cooperation. NTI’s advisory board is equally distinguished, including investor and philanthropist Warren Buffett and HHRI Prince El Hassan bin Talal of Jordan.

As a grantee, but more importantly as a partner, NTI has had many successes over the course of its 15-year history. It has helped to secure vulnerable stockpiles of nuclear materials to prevent their use by terrorists, while working to break down communication barriers to develop more effective standards on nuclear security. NTI has also helped communicate a better public understanding of the urgency of reducing nuclear stockpiles, all with the ultimate goal of eliminating nuclear weapons across the globe.

This year’s Nuclear Security Summit provided an ideal occasion for NTI and the Corporation to issue a joint call to action on reducing nuclear weapons and combating nuclear terrorism. This statement, which appeared in the New York Times, the Wall Street Journal, the Washington Post, and across the Internet, garnered signatures from more than 140 prominent government, business, and academic figures from the United States and around the world. It called on global leaders to “accelerate the effort to prevent catastrophic nuclear terrorism and continue their work beyond this last Summit to create global standards, accountability and best practices for securing all nuclear materials.” Those who signed the call to action recognize that what recently took place in Washington may have been the final formal Summit, but the work to secure weapons usable materials is far from over. They know, as the Corporation does, that the risks are too high and the dangers all too real.

In his speech on the tenth anniversary of NTI, Senator Nunn reminded us of an African proverb that states, “If you want to go fast, go alone; if you want to go far, go together.” The Corporation, together with NTI and the entirety of our partner funders and advocacy groups, will continue to do everything in our power to support policy-makers in ensuring that nuclear terrorism and a new arms race never come to pass.
African Peacebuilding: Realities on the Ground

The time has come to challenge received ideas about peacebuilding.

by Scott Malcomson
...have to say that there was a questioning," Comfort Ero explained tentatively, "of whether we had learnt anything at all—internationally, regionally, or locally." She was referring to a period of rethink- ing after a series of conflicts in Africa—notably in Central African Republic, Mali, and South Sudan—shook policymakers' confidence that they had figured out how to preserve peace and to build peace. That period of rethinking continues today.

Ero directs the Africa program at International Crisis Group, a 20-year-old non-governmental organization. She passed as a passing airplane made it impossible to hear her over Skype. ("The Dakar office is unfortunately next to a runway," she said with a distant laugh.) Ero continued: "From 2012 through 2015, you see a reversal, or regression. I think that all of this is encapsulated in a runway," she said with a distant laugh.) Ero continued: "From 2012 through 2015, you see a reversal, or regression. I think that all of this is encapsulated in a..."

The achievements of these new “multidimensional” missions were mixed. In particular, the failure to prevent genocide in Rwanda in 1994 prompted much official introspection. Reflecting on the Brahimi Report, which laid out United Nations Peacekeeping Operations, usually known as the Brahimi Report (after Lakhdar Brahimi, the Algerian diplomat who headed the panel). The UN Peacebuilding Commission and Peacebuilding Support Office began its operations in 2005, followed the next year by the UN Peacebuilding Fund—elements of what became known as the UN’s “peacebuilding architecture.”

The integration of peacebuilding into an international system dominated by existing states brought with it fund- ing, military resources, and—ultimately—the dilemma that peacebuilding efforts that were not congruent with existing state interests—or that might even run counter to those interests—were difficult to mount, at best.

That challenge is a universal one, but it is especially keen in Africa. Most African states were originally constructed in the course of European imperial competition and, ultimately, ratified in the process of decolonization, beginning in the 1950s. There is considerable artifice involved in the construction of most, if not all, modern nation states. This is the case whether, like the United States and other coun- tries of the Americas, they grew out of the long dissolution of the British and Iberian empires; or, as in the Middle East and the Balkans, they emerged from the rather more sudden collapse of the Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian empires.

Recent events have shown that even relatively stable mod- ern and democratic states can face secessionist challenges and periods of significant reconfiguration. Nonetheless, the relationships between state and society in Africa—within the compressed postcolonial time frame of a few decades—have proved to be notably fraught. The wary embrace of peacebuilding by African states and state-led institutions has meant that peacebuilding efforts are often kept at arm’s length, with the rivalries of those states and hampered by their flaws and shortcomings. The dominance of what is called the “technical” approach to peacebuilding—engineering legal, electoral, and administrative structures aimed at solidify- ing liberal, democratic states within existing borders—frees growing skepticism. The agony of South Sudan is seen by many as one instance of the failure of this broader, Western-inspired model.

“"I was told,” Fundi Olunsiakon of King’s College, London, explains, “that you could impose a certain kind of state and conflict would be no more, it would become a thing of the past.”

Olunsiakon is founding director of the African Leadership Centre, with its headquarters in Nairobi. Her experience includes working in the United Nations system and the leading regional organization ECOWAS (Economic...
African leaders and populations are moving in opposite directions, they are moving divergently. Populations are learning to subsist, to creatively live their lives in spite of their governments. This is the story of a generation, unfolding slowly before our eyes.

Community of West African States), as well as in the academy and government. “At the time that many African states became independent,” she continues, “if you look at the 1960s, you begin to see nation states, or so-called nation states, that were not the product of the popular expressions of their people. These were the states that were handed over by the colonial system. And the new elite did not think to negotiate the terms by which the different groups in these states would live together. The bottom line—the narrative of an African state that has never really belonged to the people—has never really changed. Many, many countries did not negotiate the terms by which they would live postindependence with the ruling elite, and so they have stuttered in different ways: two steps forward, one step backward.”

The African Peacebuilding Network’s Cyril Obi agrees: “Africa has very sophisticated and beautiful mechanisms and frameworks, well thought out and well designed, some inspired by peace mechanisms developed elsewhere, some of African design. But the question is: do the political costs match up, between the political elites and those who are fighting? The existing mechanisms for peacebuilding tend to look at those costs that are bearable politically for those who wield power. But are they bearable for the society at large? What happens when the costs of leaders and the costs of society don’t align?”

What happens is chronic conflict. For Obi and others, African states simply do not reflect the needs and passions of their people. Citizens do not identify with their states. “The world already has a lot of knowledge about how to build the body of the state,” Obi says. “It has much less on how to build the soul of the state.”

Politics in Africa, as elsewhere, has long swung between exhilaration and pessimism, and disappointment at recent relapses into conflict can obscure the reality that organized, large-scale political violence has decreased on much of the continent as democratization, political coordination, and economic growth have advanced.

“I am optimistic,” Pierre Buyoya, former president of Burundi and current African Union high representative for Mali and the Sahel, said in an interview on the sidelines of a recent Wilton Park conference, “Peacebuilding in Africa: Developing African Approaches,” held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. “Africa is making progress in promoting democracy, human rights. It is making progress in development. We still have conflicts. But generally I think the trend is positive. We have developed how to confront these conflicts.”

One reason for such progress might be that disinterested nonstate actors, supported by academic field research, are playing a somewhat greater role than they have in the past. Comfort Ero of International Crisis Group relates how official negotiators did not, at first, welcome arguments that their peace process in Mali was excluding important political forces from the northern part of the country. The suggestion was seen as interfering with the Malian state,
which has its base in the south. But in the end, Ero be-
lieves, accommodation of a broad array of representatives
from the north makes for a stronger peace, an outcome
acknowledged even by the reluctant state. “Advocating
from the north makes for a stronger peace, an outcome
Westphalian state is a myth.” She continues, “African lead-
ers and populations are moving in opposite directions, they
are living in an economic context where unemployment is
high and young people have access to all forms of informa-
tion through technology. Globalization is both a good and
an evil. It opens up the doors for transforming societies,
but at the same time, if the political organism that is
supposed to express the totality of the people’s lives does
not operate in a way that opens up more opportunities for
them, then they don’t identify. They go to the wrong side
of globalization. They take advantage of globalization to try
to put at a disadvantage that political organism that they
think is against them.”

And that organism is very often the existing state. “The
conflicts we are seeing on the continent really are in large
part a renegotiation of the existing states,” Olonisakin says.
“We either allow them to be renegotiated according to the
desires of the people on the ground, or we keep going back
to those places to make peace again.” However and when-
ever this renegotiation takes place, it must be conceived,
led, and implemented by Africans themselves. This notion
may seem self-evident, but on a continent long subject to
the imperatives of external actors, the need for eliciting
and applying local knowledge—a centerpiece of Carnegie
Corporation’s grantmaking on peacebuilding in Africa—
cannot be overstated.

Pierre Buyoya sees the Sahel as a logical place for the
African Union to play a dominant role because the 11 states
with borders in the Sahel do not themselves have a regional
organization comparable to ECOWAS. He emphasizes
the value of intelligence and security coordination among
Sahelian states, as well as joint border patrols in a vast
region that is lightly populated and whose peoples have
never placed much store in the delineation of territories by
distant capitals.

Looking at the same set of facts, Funmi Olonisakin sees
states spending money on a battle they cannot win. “Even
in non-Sahelian states,” she says, “you see markets are
often located next to borders, and borders are crisscrossed
all the time. And yet you have an African Union regional
agenda that is not based on people-to-people integration;
rather, it recognizes state-to-state movements, including
the importance of borders.” Referring to the modern state
model that emerged in Europe as a result of the 1648 Peace
of Westphalia, Olonisakin says that in Africa today, “the
Westphalan state is a myth.” She continues, “African lead-
ers and populations are moving in opposite directions, they
are moving divergingly. Populations are learning to subsist,
to creatively live their lives in spite of their governments.
This is the story of a generation, unfolding slowly before
our eyes.”

“The youth have been very ingenious,” Ero notes, “in
particular with social media. It is a whole other sphere of
influence for this generation, whether they’re militants, or
just protesters, or gangs.” Africa’s younger generation lives
within colonial-era boundaries, but they did not experience
colonial reality. Nor have they lived through the hopes and
expectations engendered by the anticolonial movements and
the nation building of the early independence era. The
younger generation’s chief experience has been tied to glo-
balization. Apart from social media technologies like Face-
book and Twitter—which, while popular, depend on very
uneven Internet access and are subject to interruption by
the state—young Africans communicate by mobile-phone
text messaging. They build like-minded communities be-
yond the reach of both the state and their elders.

The wealth that has been accumulated in the course of
economic expansion in Africa is visible in the growing cities; it
is there on satellite television, to be admired, envied, and
resented. “Globalization opens the door,” Cyril Obi says,
‘but it doesn’t bring you through.” Zachariah Mampilly,
director of African studies at Yasser University and an expert
on rebel movements, points to the “circular migration” of
young people from villages to cities and back again. They
are aware of globalization’s possibilities but are often
unable to seize them. The rise in GDP conceals a reality of
high youth unemployment or, more hardly, appealing jobs,
low-paying jobs with little future.

This is the generation that is fueling the urban protests
characteristic of the past several years. As Obi argues,
“Yet these young generations have not received the kind
of education that people two generations before enjoyed, and
are living in an economic context where unemployment is
high and young people have access to all forms of informa-
tion through technology. Globalization is both a good and
an evil. It opens up the doors for transforming societies,
but at the same time, if the political organism that is
supposed to express the totality of the people’s lives does
not operate in a way that opens up more opportunities for
them, then they don’t identify. They go to the wrong side
of globalization. They take advantage of globalization to try
to put at a disadvantage that political organism that they
think is against them.”

And that organism is very often the existing state. “The
conflicts we are seeing on the continent really are in large
part a renegotiation of the existing states,” Olonisakin says.
“We either allow them to be renegotiated according to the
desires of the people on the ground, or we keep going back
to those places to make peace again.” However and when-
ever this renegotiation takes place, it must be conceived,
led, and implemented by Africans themselves. This notion
may seem self-evident, but on a continent long subject to
the imperatives of external actors, the need for eliciting
and applying local knowledge—a centerpiece of Carnegie
Corporation’s grantmaking on peacebuilding in Africa—
cannot be overstated. ■
Widening the Lens on the Arab World

An interview with Carnegie Corporation’s Hillary Wiesner

by Michael Moran
he decline of the strong central state in parts of the Arab region has fed borderless and proxy conflicts, while creating new roles for an array of nonstate actors. In the wave of change since Tunisia’s Jasmine Revolution, civil society movements have championed issues of citizenship that emphasize the social contract, human rights and rule of law, economic inclusion, and opportunities for the young majority. Meanwhile, armed conflict has empowered violent actors, including the so-called Islamic State (IS) and groups aligned with al-Qaeda. Hillary Wiesner is Carnegie Corporation of New York program director for Transnational Movements and the Arab Region. The program connects Arab experts who are using the tools of social science to analyze the region’s varied social movements—civil or religious, militant or peaceful—and to apply their knowledge to the challenges of their societies. Wiesner recently sat down with Michael Moran, Visiting Media Fellow for International Peace and Security at Carnegie Corporation, to discuss the program.

**MCRAH:** Hillary, you’ve spent decades engaging and engaging with Arab cultures and societies, past and present. You’re not alone among Western scholars in seeking a deeper, richer understanding of the Arab world’s cross-currents. Why the particular focus on transnational issues, and why now?

**WIESNER:** Carnegie President Vartan Gregorian made these issues a priority from the outset. When I joined his team at Carnegie beginning in 2001, we aimed to boost research on the extraordinary diversity of Muslim societies and to enhance intercultural understanding. At present, our focus is on the crises in the Arab region, and the solutions being developed by political scientists, economists, and social scientists, as well as by humanitarians, historians, and other thinkers in the region. Failed intervention and failed governance have led to crisis. It isn’t going to be solved from the outside, not by external intervention, nor by the private sector alone, nor by the UN system and diplomatic negotiation. It will happen within the region itself, by people who are experts on their own societies. Therefore our work includes a new initiative supporting scholar mobility and policy development by social science and humanities experts.

**MCRAH:** Your background in the history of ideas: is it a useful background to have, to tackle contemporary issues?

**WIESNER:** Like everything else, the past is a controversial topic. When it comes to the Arab region, they could rightly say to us, “We are not your past. We are not a snapshot of how you used to be before the evolution of secular institutions.” The Arab region has known plenty of secular institutions. Nor is it the case that there are now only purely reactive, or passive conditions. Rather, we have written our own history, and we can innovate and envision our own futures. We need to be creative and imaginative about what a society should look like.

Over the past five years, Islam-as-governance got unexpected opportunities. This wasn’t foreordained, or primordial. Social and political movements with their roots in the 20th century have worked to transform religious identity into political identity for political uses, as Aziz al-Azmeh has written. In addition, as you know, the U.S. has had a role since the Cold War in funding, supporting, arming, and training militias and militant movements which the U.S. itself labels as “extremist.” Currently, some hold territory, while Caliphate movements exist in dozens of countries—places with war economies, failures of governance, or simply a failed transaction of citizenship. People have alternatives; they might not identify with a nation state if that’s not bearing fruit for them.

**MCRAH:** The concept of “transnational” in the program—than how it needs defining. It’s easy to imagine transnational as meaning the ancient Bedouin who traveled between countries and who don’t recognize borders. It could denote questions about people like the Palestinians, onto whom borders have been imposed. Or it could just refer to historic peoples—the Kurds, the Tuaregs, etc.—who have always lived in more than one country, in the Western sense of the word “country.” How do you use the term “transnational”?

**WIESNER:** We begin from the concept of social movements. Social movements can be movements with a cause—a liberation movement, a justice movement, civil rights movements, women’s movements, youth movements. These are civil society movements. And we’re also studying militant movements, which can be connected with conflict zones, corruption, trafficking, and criminal networks. And thanks to technology, all these transnational movements we’ve been discussing are here, right now, in your pocket.

Research and analysis on these regional trends is happening in hundreds of think tanks, universities, and institutes in the Arab region. A 2016 report by the Arab Council for the Social Sciences—an organization with hundreds of members—found a ten-fold increase in Arab research centers since 1980; they count 436 research centers today. The fastest growth was seen in Algeria, the Palestinian territories, Jordan, Iraq, Lebanon, Egypt, and some of the Gulf States.

And when it comes to analyzing conflicts, one thing that the World Bank found in its conflict and fragility study is that “extremism” often reduces to a local conflict intersecting with a local identity. A shared identity group becomes an entry point into someone else’s local conflict. The local, political, and sometimes sectarian nature of that “extremism” and the economic transactions of its war economy—that’s what these young people are involving themselves in. They are often unaware of what they’re getting into. They do not understand the actual nature of the conflict in which they’re becoming combatants.

**MCRAH:** Can these phenomena be grouped as violent extremism?

**WIESNER:** There are many critiques about the governmental framing of these issues as “Countering Violent Extremism,” or CVE. It is a framework which generalizes problematizes the individual psychology, in order to dissuade individuals from mobilization to violence. This individual approach represents a gap in scale, when the conflicts are so clearly driven by large geopolitical and economic forces. Therefore, after extensive consultations, including with our leadership and board, our work is oriented toward policy-level intervention points. We aim to illuminate and clarify the existing policies that have brought us to where we are today, and the impact those policies are having. Thus the program supports new understandings of social movements and militant movements connected with the Arab region, including their political economy, financial drivers, and the changing roles of states. What role are states playing, and what connection do people have to states? The decline in effective governance is seen as a global trend, acute in the Arab region. Are the failing states coming back or not? Political scientists are divided on these issues. And then of course there is the goal of policy development—formulating solutions to specific problems. We’re very much looking to support social science and humanities scholars moving toward problem-solving in the longer term.

**MCRAH:** You said earlier that the Arabs are trying to say to us that “we’re not your past.” One often hears, almost as an excuse, the problems of the Arab world. “Well, Islam is only 1400 years old. Remember what barbarians we Chris- tians were at the 1400-year mark—Crusades, Inquisition, etc.” You regard that as a false dichotomy, do you not?

**WIESNER:** Yes. That view is a kind of essentialism or Islamo-determinism. As if everything that happens is only 1400 years old. Remember what barbarians we Christians were at the 1400-year mark—Crusades, Inquisition, etc. You regard that as a false dichotomy, do you not?

**MCRAH:** Social movements can be movements with a cause—a liberation movement, a justice movement, civil rights movements, women’s movements, youth movements. These are civil society movements. And we’re also studying militant movements, which can be connected with conflict zones, corruption, trafficking, and criminal networks. And thanks to technology, all these transnational movements we’ve been discussing are here, right now, in your pocket.

**WIESNER:** We begin from the concept of social movements. Social movements can be movements with a cause—a liberation movement, a justice movement, civil rights movements, women’s movements, youth movements. These are civil society movements. And we’re also studying militant movements, which can be connected with conflict zones, corruption, trafficking, and criminal networks. These are civil society movements. And we’re also studying militant movements, which can be connected with conflict zones, corruption, trafficking, and criminal networks. And thanks to technology, all these transnational movements we’ve been discussing are here, right now, in your pocket.

**WIESNER:** Research and analysis on these regional trends is happening in hundreds of think tanks, universities, and institutes in the Arab region. A 2016 report by the Arab Council for the Social Sciences—an organization with hundreds of members—found a ten-fold increase in Arab research centers since 1980; they count 436 research centers today. The fastest growth was seen in Algeria, the Palestinian territories, Jordan, Iraq, Lebanon, Egypt, and some of the Gulf States.

And when it comes to analyzing conflicts, one thing that the World Bank found in its conflict and fragility study is that “extremism” often reduces to a local conflict intersecting with a local identity. A shared identity group becomes an entry point into someone else’s local conflict. The local, political, and sometimes sectarian nature of that “extremism” and the economic transactions of its war economy—that’s what these young people are involving themselves in. They are often unaware of what they’re getting into. They do not understand the actual nature of the conflict in which they’re becoming combatants.

**MCRAH:** Can these phenomena be grouped as violent extremism?

**WIESNER:** There are many critiques about the governmental framing of these issues as “Countering Violent Extremism,” or CVE. It is a framework which generalizes problematizes the individual psychology, in order to dissuade individuals from mobilization to violence. This individual approach represents a gap in scale, when the conflicts are so clearly driven by large geopolitical and economic forces. Therefore, after extensive consultations, including with our leadership and board, our work is oriented toward policy-level intervention points. We aim to illuminate and clarify the existing policies that have brought us to where we are today, and the impact those policies are having. Thus the program supports new understandings of social movements and militant movements connected with the Arab region, including their political economy, financial drivers, and the changing roles of states. What role are states playing, and what connection do people have to states? The decline in effective governance is seen as a global trend, acute in the Arab region. Are the failing states coming back or not? Political scientists are divided on these issues. And then of course there is the goal of policy development—formulating solutions to specific problems. We’re very much looking to support social science and humanities scholars moving toward problem-solving in the longer term.

**MCRAH:** You said earlier that the Arabs are trying to say to us that “we’re not your past.” One often hears, almost as an excuse, the problems of the Arab world. “Well, Islam is only 1400 years old. Remember what barbarians we Chris- tians were at the 1400-year mark—Crusades, Inquisition, etc.” You regard that as a false dichotomy, do you not?

**WIESNER:** Yes. That view is a kind of essentialism or Islamo-determinism. As if everything that happens is only 1400 years old. Remember what barbarians we Christians were at the 1400-year mark—Crusades, Inquisition, etc. You regard that as a false dichotomy, do you not?

**MCRAH:** Social movements can be movements with a cause—a liberation movement, a justice movement, civil rights movements, women’s movements, youth movements. These are civil society movements. And we’re also studying militant movements, which can be connected with conflict zones, corruption, trafficking, and criminal networks. And thanks to technology, all these transnational movements we’ve been discussing are here, right now, in your pocket.
phenomena to fit a predetermined pattern, and impose an imagined linear evolution. For example, one might imagine the West as secular, although the data on established state religion and religious practice show otherwise. And then one could contrast that false concept of the West with an imagined opposite. Yes, I definitely agree that that is a “false dichotomy.”

The role of religion in all of this is still to be analyzed from many angles and elucidated, perhaps distinguishing private sphere religion from religion playing a role of governance. At the moment, applications of religious norms as governance are flourishing where space has been created for them to flourish. I wouldn’t call that something that was predetermined or part of a linear evolution. If we compare social patterns fifty years ago, one hundred years ago, we see neither stagnation nor linear progression.

**In our program, if someone says to us “extremism,” we ask them to define it; for example, to define it in specific legal language or in terms of human rights violations, as well as by the conflicts it emerged from.**

**MORAN:** If you had your way, and you could cast your eyes ten years hence and imagine that the Transnational Movements program has really gained traction—what does that look like? How does success for the program look to you in ten years or so?

**WIESNER:** Many in the field are now recalling the transition decades in Latin America. There was a period of transition from authoritarianism, when diaspora intellectuals developed inclusive economic models, dependency theory, and policies that would eventually expand the middle class in countries like Brazil.

In ten years? We may be seeing more connection between citizens and governance in the region, and high levels of social participation. We expect we’re going to see a progression away from framing diverse phenomena as “extremism.” In our program, if someone says to us “extremism,” we ask them to define it; for example, to define it in specific legal language or in terms of human rights violations, as well as by the conflicts it emerged from. In the IS territories we see torture, mutilation, atrocity crimes, war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide crimes against the Yazidis, which the European Parliament has referred to the UN. Cultural heritage destruction is a crime in the 1954 Hague Convention. Instead of undefined concepts like “extremism,” we could clarify the responsibilities of state and nonstate actors. There’s a lot of consensus around the criminal nature of this activity, and potentially some legal accountability.

In contrast, “extremism” doesn’t have a definition. So far, the United Nations left it to each member state to define extremism for themselves. In some countries, extremist means being part of the political opposition. So we think the term clouds rather than clarifies, and it’s possible to frame a problem in a way that it can neither be seen nor solved. It can also be analyzed as political violence, although today’s political violence is mixed with criminal violence and criminal networks resembling organized crime. “Terrorism” has something of a definition—roughly, violence against civilians for political ends.

Currently, working in the “Countering Violent Extremism” approach, we’re seeing an annual 80 percent increase in terrorism (according to the 2015 Global Terrorism Index produced by the Institute for Economics and Peace). I’d consider a lot of that to be armed conflict, fed by massive trade in weapons. But there is one thing you can say about CVE: it’s not working.

There are efforts underway to deconstruct and clarify the diverse phenomena grouped as extremism, while also questioning the geopolitical and economic dynamics that have brought us to this level of social conflict and armed conflict. Conflict prevention is also a way to prevent violent, exclusionary social movements. International Crisis Group concluded, in its global study of IS and al-Qaeda, “Preventing crises will do more to contain violent extremists than countering violent extremism [CVE] will do to prevent crises.”

---

A general view taken on March 31, 2016, shows a photographer holding his picture of the Temple of Bel taken on March 14, 2014, in front of the remains of the historic temple after it was destroyed by Islamic State (IS) group jihadists in September 2015 in the ancient Syrian city of Palmyra.

Syrian troops backed by Russian forces recaptured Palmyra on March 27, 2016, after a fierce offensive to rescue the city from jihadists, who view the UNESCO-listed site’s magnificent ruins as idolatrous.
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The Greatest Threat
Nuclear Terrorism in an Age of Vulnerability

Illustrations by James Fenner

Joe Cirincione, President, Ploughshares Fund

The recent terrorist attacks in Paris, Brussels, and elsewhere should remind the world that nuclear security has never been more important. Even with the disarmament of many Cold War-era weapons, poorly secured stockpiles of weaponizable uranium and plutonium, as well as other radioactive materials, remain across the globe. Many of these materials are stored in facilities that have not received the level of scrutiny warranted by the potential of devastating security failures. Indeed, there have been a number of security breaches in recent years. Without action to keep these materials from terrorist groups and other nonstate actors, an act of nuclear terrorism becomes all the more likely.

"It is hard to imagine a more terrifying prospect than an extremist group like ISIS armed with nuclear or radiological weapons."

Joe Cirincione, President, Ploughshares Fund
The Four Faces of Nuclear Terrorism

In 2004, the Center for Nonproliferation Studies, a program partly funded by Carnegie Corporation of New York, established a framework for understanding the threat posed by nuclear terrorism. Authors Charles D. Ferguson and William Potter posited that there are four scenarios under which a nuclear weapon could be used by terrorists.

1. Terrorists could acquire—through theft or purchase—an intact nuclear weapon from a military nuclear facility.

2. They could build a nuclear device by acquiring—again, through theft or purchase—fissile material, leading to the fabrication and detonation of an improvised nuclear device (IND).

3. Terrorists could sabotage nuclear facilities, especially nuclear power plants, causing the release of large amounts of radioactivity.

4. They could fabricate a “dirty bomb”—a conventional explosive surrounded by radiological materials that have been acquired illegally.

As Carnegie Corporation’s Carl Robichaud has observed, these four scenarios have “different levels of consequence, but we have to worry about all of them.” No nation is immune to the threat of nuclear terrorism. Access to nuclear material remains the biggest barrier for terrorist organizations in search of a nuclear device. However, should a sophisticated group of terrorists gain access to highly enriched uranium or plutonium, they’d have the potential to create and detonate an improvised nuclear device (IND).
The Breach at Pelindaba

November 2007

It was just past midnight in the hilly scrubland outside South Africa’s Pelindaba Nuclear Research Centre, the former site of the apartheid government’s secret nuclear weapons program.

Inside its electric fences, a vault holds the legacy of South Africa’s nuclear past: a cache of highly enriched uranium—enough to build six nuclear warheads.
Pelindaba: Gunmen Slip Inside

That night in November 2007, four gunmen breached chain-link perimeter fencing and slipped inside. One of them disabled a 10,000-volt electrified barrier, circumventing a magnetic anti-tamper device to do so.
Pelindaba: Roaming Undetected

Simultaneously, a second group broke through the perimeter further west. For twenty minutes they roamed the facility—until discovered by a civilian visitor, who was shot as the gunmen fled.
Pelindaba: A “Routine Burglary”? 

South African officials who investigated the break-in dismissed it as a “routine burglary.” No enriched uranium was stolen. The government has refused to speculate on the motives of the intruders, all of whom escaped.
The Cooperative Threat Reduction Program (CTR) is initiated by the United States Congress in order to assist the Soviet Union in securing its nuclear material.

Megatons to Megawatts
The United States–Russia Highly Enriched Uranium Purchase Agreement is initiated. More popularly known as the Megatons to Megawatts program, it concerns the disposition of highly enriched uranium extracted from nuclear weapons.

Project Sapphire
Part of the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, Project Sapphire is a covert operation between the United States and Kazakhstan aimed at reducing the threat of nuclear proliferation.

1991
Cooperative Threat Reduction Program

1993
Megatons to Megawatts

1994
Project Sapphire

1995
IAEA Incident and Trafficking Database
The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) establishes the Incident and Trafficking Database information system in order to document incidents of illicit trafficking and other unauthorized activities, and to monitor any events involving nuclear and radiative material outside regulatory control.

2004
United Nations Security Council Resolution 1540
The United Nations Security Council unanimously adopts Resolution 1540 under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. The resolution obligates states to develop and adopt measures preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction by nonstate actors. At its core, Resolution 1540 acts as a complement to the various treaties and protocols already adopted, and closes gaps in nonproliferation treaties and conventions in order to prevent terrorists and criminal organizations from obtaining the world’s most dangerous weapons.

2005
International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism
Treaty created by the United Nations criminalizes acts of nuclear terrorism and promotes police and judicial cooperation between states in order to prevent, investigate, and punish these acts. Currently known as the Nuclear Terrorism Convention, to date it has 125 signatories and 105 state parties.

2005
Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material
In July, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) amends the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material (originally signed on March 3, 1986). The amendments make it legally binding for state parties to protect nuclear facilities and material in peaceful domestic use, storage as well as transport. It also expands cooperation regarding rapid measures to locate and recover stolen or smuggled nuclear material, mitigate radiological consequences of sabotage, and prevent combat-related offenses.

2007
Break-In at Pelindaba Nuclear Facility
Four armed intruders break into the Pelindaba nuclear facility, near Pretoria, where supplies of weapons-grade uranium are being stored. The event stresses the need for a stringent nuclear security architecture, and causes South Africa to ratify the 2005 Amendment to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material.

2011
Police Arrest Six Suspects in Former Soviet Republic of Moldova
Six people are arrested in the former Soviet republic of Moldova for allegedly trying to sell at least one kilo of weapons-grade uranium to undercover officers.

2016
Terrorist Activities Raise Questions for Nuclear Security
Multiple sources confirm that a suspect in the Paris terrorist attacks had been surveilling a high-ranking nuclear scientist in Belgium, presumably to gain access to radiological materials.

Key Moments in Nuclear Security

1991
Cooperative Threat Reduction Program

1993
Megatons to Megawatts

1994
Project Sapphire

1995
IAEA Incident and Trafficking Database

2004
United Nations Security Council Resolution 1540

2005
International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism

2007
Break-In at Pelindaba Nuclear Facility

2011
Police Arrest Six Suspects in Former Soviet Republic of Moldova

2016
Terrorist Activities Raise Questions for Nuclear Security
The challenges in securing fissile materials around the globe

The 99% probability of nuclear materials remaining secure is very good. But, the 1% is a chance that we can’t take. If you assess the consequences of an attack, whether it’s a radiological attack or an attack using nuclear materials, the consequences for that particular state and global society would be severe. This requires states to come together and spend best efforts to make sure that 1% is actually much less than 1%.

Roughly two dozen countries in the world have enough nuclear explosive material for at least one bomb. A large amount of this is plutonium. Another large amount of it is highly enriched uranium. These are both the spark plugs of nuclear bombs, and the United States helped spread some of this around the world in its past. We gave it to people to use for reactors, and we tried to get it back once we realized this was a big security mistake. But, many countries have been reluctant to give it up.

Every country that has nuclear materials has had nuclear security incidents. They often don’t make the papers. There’s a lot of secrecy around the issue of nuclear security. We do know, from the IAEA international database, that there are over 400 incidents of Category 1 materials, which include highly enriched uranium and plutonium that can be used in nuclear bombs. There are over a dozen instances of HEU or plutonium that was seized, most of it in very small quantities but often marketed as a sample of a larger stockpile. So, it’s a real threat.

We are only as secure as our people who guard this material. We can have the most high-tech equipment in place, you can have all the laws and all the regulations in place—but if a custodian decides to look the other way when an attack happens, there is nothing we can do. One specific measure that can be taken to reduce insider threat is investment into education and training—making sure that those we entrust with guarding this sensitive material, that they understand all the risks, understand the responsibility they bear, that they do their jobs as well as they can.

There are a number of measures we’d like to see states taking that range from signing international agreements ... to improving their physical protection, their accounting systems for nuclear security. It’s also very important to build a security culture within the facilities that are responsible for these materials and for weapons, and ensuring there’s an accountability process that starts, frankly, at the very top. This is a responsibility that can’t be delegated to others. It needs to start at the leader level. It needs to start at the head of state level.

How are we going to deal with the rules and regulations of nuclear security on a global basis? Like a lot of security issues, there’s enormous tension between national sovereignty and global need. International law tends to favor national sovereignty. But we live in a totally different environment than when most of the nuclear agreements and most of the nuclear laws were written. We live in a completely interdependent world today. So, a nuclear incident in one country is not going to stay contained in that country.
Dollars & Sense: Making the Fiscal Case for Immigration Reform

The Immigration Project crunches the numbers.

by Gail Ablow
When the Solicitor General of the United States stood before the Supreme Court this April to argue the case of United States v. Texas, he sparred with Chief Justice John Roberts over a financial question: does Texas have standing to sue because, as the state claims, it would suffer irreparable fiscal injury if it is required to issue drivers’ licenses to undocumented immigrants?

Texas subsidizes the costs of issuing drivers’ licenses to legal residents of the state. The state claims that it would be prohibitively expensive to do the same for undocumented immigrants if they are added to the mix under the executive order signed by President Barack Obama in 2014. That’s what United States v. Texas boils down to: the very narrow question of the cost of issuing drivers’ licenses to undocumented immigrants. For one seasoned analyst, it was “kind of staggering” that that was the only injury Texas could come up with.

But, indeed, the Texas solicitor general called it a question of “deep economic significance” to his state and the 25 additional states that joined the suit. Associate Supreme Court Justice Sonia Sotomayor responded, “You keep saying that, ‘deep economic significance.’ Those nearly 11 million unauthorized aliens are here in the shadows. They are affecting the economy whether we want them to or not.”

No one understands Sotomayor’s point better than the Texas state attorney general, State Priorities Partnership (SPP), which has been doing important work analyzing the economic impact of undocumented immigrants on the economies of Texas and the country as a whole.

Foot Soldiers of the Footnotes

For nearly four years, the nine state partners of the Immigration Project have been working together to influence the immigration debate with economic impact analysis. Under the leadership of the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP), these fiscal experts are the foot soldiers of the footnotes, crunching the numbers to inject a dose of facts into the public debate, and new spokespeople into the public conversation on immigrants. Countering “fact-free” with facts and analysis.

Good Data Is Hard to Find

The Immigration Project launched in 2012, following a wave of often harsh immigration bills that had swept through state legislatures. One of the harshest was Arizona’s SB1070, passed in 2009, famously dubbed the “show me your papers” law. It directed local police to take on the immigration enforcement role usually reserved for federal agents. However, state lawmakers had failed to anticipate the economic consequences. The bill hit in the midst of a sluggish economy and boycotts of the state ensued. Arizona’s convention industry alone lost $2.5 billion.

This was the pattern across the country. Immigration enforcement proposals rarely included any kind of economic impact analysis. Lawmakers weren’t getting the complete story. Information was limited, inaccurate, or even nonexistent. Tough immigration measures often had significant negative effects on state budgets, but lawmakers weren’t hearing about this.

The lack of reliable data troubled Geri Mannion, program director of the U.S. Democracy and Special Opportunities Fund at Carnegie Corporation of New York. Historically, one of the accusations leveled against undocumented immigrants is that they drain state coffers. Mannion understood the critical piece missing from the equation: the financial contributions that immigrants make to state economies.

A case in point: Arizona. The state passed restrictive immigration legislation with no revenue impact statement whatsoever. Racial profiling was all but encouraged, and businesses began to leave the state. Mannion kept her eye on the economic repercussions. “It turns out Alabama is one of the biggest states for car manufacturing, including Mercedes-Benz, Hyundai, and Honda,” she points out. Foreign-born auto plant workers were arrested, business recruiters lost projects, and immigrant labor became frightened and fled. Field workers in the agricultural sector grew scarce and crops went unpicked. Unpredictably, local fiscal policy groups lacked the resources—and perhaps the fortitude—to wade into the state’s immigration quagmire.

After observing the fallout in Alabama, Mannion had an idea. She reached out to the Ford Foundation and the Open Society Foundations. Coordinating with the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, the three foundations decided both legal and undocumented immigrants have on local economies, state budgets, and tax revenues at all levels of government. The goal is to bring fresh information into the public debate, and new spokespersons into the public conversation on immigrants. Countering “fact-free” with facts and analysis.

Immigration Reform: A Selective Timeline of Recent Key Events

2008

MAY At a United States Senate hearing, Barack Obama makes a campaign promise: “I can guarantee that we will, in the first year, an immigration bill that I strongly support.”

2010

APRIL Arizona passes SB1070, known as the “show me your papers” law, requiring police to verify the status of people they stop or arrest if there is a “reasonable suspicion” that they are unauthorized immigrants. Copycat bills are introduced in 24 states across the country. Five of the bills pass—in AL, GA, IN, SC, and UT.

DECEMBER A vote by a vote of 240 to 196 in the House, Dream Act, protecting children of undocumented immigrants from deportation, passes in the Democratic-controlled House. It falls short in the Senate 55–41.

2012

JUNE U.S. Supreme Court strikes down key parts of SB1070, Arizona’s immigration law, upholding the federal government’s power to regulate immigration. The court lets stand a controversial provision allowing police to check immigration status while enforcing other laws.

JUNE By executive action, President Obama implements DAPA (Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Long-term Permanent Residents). This second executive action allows unauthorized immigrants—who have lived in the U.S. at least five years who are the parents of U.S. citizens—to apply for deportation relief as well as a three-year work permit. DACA eligibility is also expanded. Shortly thereafter, representatives of 17 states challenge the president’s executive actions in federal court in Texas in a case named United States v. Texas. Nine additional states eventually join the lawsuit.

2013

JUNE With the support of the so-called “Gang of Eight,” the Senate passes the immigration reform bill S.744 (Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act), which includes a path to citizenship. The bill dies in the House.

2014

APRIL The Virginia state Attorney General announces that undocumented immigrants—who grew up in Virginia, graduated from high school in the state, and are lawfully present under DACA—can qualify for in-state tuition under state law. In January 2015, the Virginia state Senate defeats a measure that challenged in-state tuition equity.

NOVEMBER President Obama implements expanded DACA initiatives (but not the original DACA). The Department of Justice appeals.

FEBRUARY The federal court in Texas blocks the president’s DAPA and expanded DACA initiatives (but not the original DACA). The Department of Justice appeals.

MARCH The House Judiciary Committee passes H.R. 1142 out of committee. This bill would criminalize unauthorized immigrants and turn local law enforcement personnel into de facto immigration officers. It never gets a vote.

JUNE The Texas state legislature fails to repeal HB 1403, a bill signed into law in 2009 allowing some undocumented immigrants to pay in-state college tuition.

NOVEMBER A divided panel of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals upholds the Texas lower court’s ruling in United States v. Texas. The Department of Justice asks the Supreme Court to grant “immediate review.”

2016

JANUARY U.S. Supreme Court agrees to hear United States v. Texas. The nine state partners sued the United States to challenge the DAPA program, claiming that it is prohibitively expensive to enact. They also assert that the president has overstepped his powers with his executive actions on immigration.

FEBRUARY Georgia state Supreme Court rejects an appeal aimed at allowing unauthorized students to pay in-state college tuition.

APRIL Supreme Court hears oral arguments in United States v. Texas.

JUNE Supreme Court ruling in United States v. Texas is expected.
Immigration Project partners gather and share economic data on immigrants on a wide range of indicators, including ethnographic makeup and average earnings. Collaboration (funding and research) makes it easier for anyone new to the immigration debate to dive right in. Expert fiscal analysis provides a solid grounding for many of the policies that are being championed, such as letting undocumented immigrants get legal drivers’ licenses or making them eligible for in-state tuition at state colleges and universities. The groups do the “wonky analysis with lots of footnotes,” gauging the economic contributions of immigrants, both legal and undocumented, across the country, and then they do the social math, putting the issues into terms that people—especially lawmakers—can understand.

There are educational webinars, annual conferences, regular conference calls, and shared toolkits—so that no one has to start from scratch. Advocates at the National Immigration Legal Center (NILC) keep track of state-level immigration issues that would benefit from coolheaded analysis. They then serve as matchmakers, connecting local immigration organizers with the state fiscal groups.

Everyone works together to mount a successful campaign or a defense. There is the organizing on the ground, the various politics of the states, and the economic analysis. There is also getting the message out. The groups produce reports, op-eds, blog posts, and graphics, and they push out social media—all of this goes a long way toward getting the information into the right hands. The American Immigration Council (AIC), a national partner, has helped train the groups to effectively frame the information, attract media coverage, and reach policymakers.

The work is important and timely—and it has reach. Each time a state group comes out with a new report or launches a new campaign, project partners have another model to work from, another idea to use. And these materials are handed out—even to groups not funded through the project to use in their own states. The Immigration Project has lowered the threshold to becoming involved in these debates.

On the Ground: New York, New Jersey
Immigration Project partners have plunged into the immigration policy debate on different fronts, winning some battles, losing others, and fighting to a standstill elsewhere.

The New York group already had significant experience with immigration issues when it joined the partnership and now serves as a peer adviser, providing technical assistance to the other state groups. Their breakthrough study, Working for a Better Life, made headlines in 2007 when it quantified the immigrant contribution to the economy of New York State, with results that surprised the public, the press, and even the researchers themselves. The report demonstrated that foreign-born New Yorkers added $229 billion—more than 20%—to the state economy in 2005. (This figure combines the contributions of both documented and undocumented immigrants.) Furthermore, immigrants were hugely overrepresented among doctors, researchers, and nurses, and most strongly represented in fields like accounting and finance. So, contrary to popular perceptions, they were not all low-wage earning Hispanics. Most unexpected, perhaps, was the finding that immigrants played a disproportionately strong role in the economy of upstate New York.

When the New York group expanded its inquiry to major cities across the U.S., their grounded analysis demonstrated that immigrants were making a very real and largely unappreciated contribution to the economy of the country as a whole. That point was—and still is—being lost in the often heated public debate on immigration.

Next door in New Jersey, the Immigration Project partner tallied the financial benefits of allowing unauthorized immigrants to secure legal drivers’ licenses. A coalition working to get a bill passed ran with the revenue projections, making sure the facts were front and center in a letter-writing campaign. The bill was moving well, until the terrorist attacks in Paris in November 2015. Governor Chris Christie and state legislators argued that issuing drivers’ licenses to undocumented residents would allow them to purchase weapons and board flights—perhaps even threatening national security. Switching gears from analysis to education, advocates reached out to the media to clear up misinformation about the bill, contacting policymakers to emphasize that immigrants are a tremendous economic asset to New Jersey. Collaborative efforts like the Immigration Project can help shift the debate and get good information where it needs to go. Even then, sometimes all the hard work does not pay off (the drivers’ license fight continues). But sometimes, it does.

Tuition Equity: Success in Texas
In 2001, Texas became the first state in the nation to pass a so-called “Dream Act,” offering in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants who had come to the country as children. For many “Dreamers,” in-state tuition makes the difference between being able to afford college, and not being able to go to college at all. Last year, however, in spite of the program’s success, state leaders threatened to repeal the law.

The Immigration Project went to work, smartly framing the debate as an investment in the state’s future. They marshaled data to make a forceful case, but made sure that the analysis was accessible. This wasn’t a 60-page report with 4,000 footnotes. The fact sheets were highly credible materials that could be picked up, understood, and used.
The numbers were arresting. In 2013, fewer than 2% of students getting in-state tuition in Texas were non-citizens, yet they paid $51.6 million in tuition and fees. The taxes paid by undocumented immigrants each year are also significant. Working in the shadows, they contributed, according to data from one source, more than $1.5 billion annually in property, sales, and excise taxes to the state.

Armed with these numbers, students and business leaders joined forces to protest outside the State Capitol in Austin, while inside, legislators listened to “Dreamers” tell their powerful stories. Students were fighting for their families and their futures, and business leaders were fighting for the state’s economy. At the rally, Bill Hammond, CEO of the Texas Association of Businesses, put it this way: “They work hard, they go to school, they graduate. They will be the future teachers, doctors, architects, engineers in Texas—if we allow this program to continue.”

Working together, students, business leaders, and a coalition of immigration groups helped derail this “bad bill” in Texas. Success in the Lone Star State inspired groups in other states to mount defenses of tuition equity, including in Virginia, where legislative efforts to roll back in-state tuition were thwarted—for now.

Shaking the Tree in Georgia

In 2015, the Georgia Budget and Policy Institute (GBPI) joined the Immigration Project. GBPI Executive Director Taifa Smith Butler thought the time was right for her state to wade into the immigration debate.

“Every year there is anti-immigration legislation that is presented for consideration, or that passes in our state,” says Butler. “Georgia is projected to be a majority-minority state by 2030, and the Latino population is going to be a large part of that, so we thought, why not take the opportunity? We wanted to see if we can make the economic case about what immigrants contribute to the state’s economy, change the debate for a bit, and lift up this narrative in Georgia.”

Georgia has particularly intractable obstacles, says Butler. “As much as we try to fight with facts and data, sometimes people’s inherent biases are a lot stronger.”

Butler and her team are laboring to overcome the existing racial and ethnic barriers that filter into public policy. “It is problematic for our state long-term,” she says. “If we continue to block people’s ability to go to school, to work, and to earn a living—that will continue to drag on our state.” Only a handful of legislators are working to prevent undocumented people’s ability to go to school, to work, and estimating a $10 million annual increase in state tax revenues when those students entered the workforce. The Georgia Undocumented Youth Alliance used the numbers to support its suit against the state’s Board of Regents. Unfortunately, this past February, the Georgia state Supreme Court ruled that the Regents cannot be sued. But no one is throwing in the towel. “One of our challenges, once we present these reports and do these briefings, is how to keep moving the conversation,” says Butler. “How do we continue to elevate it to a broader audience?”

Next up for Butler: building a case for the economic value of immigrants to the overall Georgia economy. “Connecting it to a larger narrative around the workforce is going to be critical,” says Butler. “We’re still shaking that tree, and then linking it with broader business needs.”

For example, some of the Georgia’s largest employers, including Home Depot, SunTrust, and AT&T, are having a hard time filling positions. To address this problem, one of the governor’s economic development initiatives aims to recruit talent from other states. But, says Butler, “We want our homegrown talent to stay here and benefit from these jobs.” A GBPI study found that in a single year Georgia’s immigrants paid nearly $1.8 billion dollars in state and local taxes, solid evidence that—as entrepreneurs, workers, and taxpayers—they bring a powerful boost not only to the state budget but also to the state’s overall economy.

The Immigration Project is helping to reframe the debate in Georgia. The GBPI keeps “shaking that tree,” and the support is there. People talk about the importance of collaboration all the time. For David Dyssegaard Kallick, peer advisor to the New York group, Geri Mannion and Carnegie Corporation “deserve a lot of credit for doing something that’s popular to talk about, but that’s not so easy to do, bringing together multiple foundations and multiple grantees at the same time.”

Volatile Terrain

Immigration is one of the country’s most complicated and controversial issues. It is not easy for nonpartisan fiscal policy organizations to move into such volatile terrain. The Immigration Project is changing that. The collaboration allows the state groups to combine forces powerfully—to plan together, to deepen their relationships, and to find ways to do the analysis necessary to really influence the debate. The collaboration, launched in 2012, came none too soon. President Barack Obama charged into the debate in the summer of 2012, when he signed an executive order called Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA). DACA
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allows undocumented immigrants who were brought to the country as children to live and work in the United States for renewable periods of two years without fear of deportation. Then, in November 2014, after immigration reform stalled in the Republican-controlled House, the president expanded DACA. He also added Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents (DAPA), which granted undocumented immigrants, whose children are American citizens or permanent residents, work authorization as well as temporary relief from deportation. These executive orders—expanded DACA and DAPA—are at the heart of United States v. Texas, the most important immigration case taken up by the U.S. Supreme Court in a generation. The case was argued before the court on April 18, 2016, and a decision is expected in June.

Out of the Shadows

While the legal questions may be narrow, the outcome of United States v. Texas will be far-reaching. If the court sides with Texas, nothing changes. The lives of an estimated 4.5 million immigrants across the country will remain in limbo, and their American-born children will live in fear that one or both of their parents will be deported. But if the court decides that Texas does not have standing, that it has not suffered serious fiscal injury, President Obama’s executive orders on immigration will move forward. Undocumented immigrants will gain the ability to work—legally—in the United States for renewable periods of three years, and they and their children will no longer live under constant threat of deportation.

Never have the stakes been higher for undocumented immigrants and their families. If undocumented immigrants can drive to work, legally, they will be able to buy a car, purchase automobile insurance, pay gas taxes, and find a better job match. With better jobs and increased earnings, they pay higher taxes. And—the evidence shows—they will integrate more quickly into American life. That is the case for bringing undocumented immigrants fully into the economy and developing policies that help them succeed.

But it remains to be seen whether the Supreme Court understands this “social math.” Without ever stepping into the courtroom, the Immigration Project played its role. They crunched the numbers that appear in the amicus briefs filed by a broad range of organizations and community leaders in support of the administration’s position. The friends of court—including business leaders, economists, faith-based groups, educators, mayors, county executives, current and former members of Congress, and 11 states and the District of Columbia—agree that the numbers demonstrate that Texas’s speculative harm pales in comparison to the concrete economic, financial, and social benefits to the entire country if millions of people are allowed to come out of the shadows to live and work without fear.
Marguerite Barankitse accepts the inaugural Aurora Prize from cochair of the selection committee George Clooney and prize cofounder Ruben Vardanyan. “Marguerite Barankitse,” said Clooney, “serves as a reminder of the impact that one person can have even when encountering seemingly insurmountable persecution and injustice.” PHOTO: CELESTE FORD

NYPL President Anthony W. Marx, Carnegie Corporation Board Chair Thomas H. Kean, Carnegie Corporation President Vartan Gregorian, and former New York City Schools Chancellor Dena Wilkoff attended NYPL’s 2016 Spring Dinner. The love of libraries? “We know it in our DNA at Carnegie Corporation,” said Governor Kean in his remarks that evening. PHOTO: JIM MASTOR

The New York Public Library was proud to honor Marguerite Barankitse, a member of the selection committee, with the inaugural Aurora Prize for Awakening Humanity. “When you have compassion, dignity, and love then nothing can scare you, nothing can stop you—no one can stop love. Not armies, not hate, not persecution, not famine, nothing.”

The first-ever Aurora Prize, honoring individuals who have made a significant impact on humanity, was awarded during a ceremony in Yerevan, Armenia, on April 24. Barankitse was honored for saving and caring for thousands of orphans and refugees during the Burundian civil war in central Africa, as well as for her current work with children and orphans affected by HIV/AIDS, war, and poverty. Barankitse accepted the award at an event that drew 400 distinguished guests, including Carnegie Corporation President Vartan Gregorian, a member of the selection committee.

Recipients of the Aurora Prize are awarded $100,000 as well as $1,000,000 to distribute to charitable organizations of their choosing. The prize will be awarded each year at the end of April as part of the 100 Lives initiative. Learn more about Barankitse’s work at: maisonshalom.org/en.
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The Aurora Prize is open to individuals who have made a significant impact on humanity. It is awarded to individuals who have engaged in actions in the face of seemingly insurmountable challenges, such as saving lives, providing education to children, or providing health and nutrition to orphans in need. The selection committee consists of prominent leaders in the fields of business, philanthropy, politics, and the arts.
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Above (left): Carnegie Corporation President Vartan Gregorian and actor and activist George Clooney during the inaugural ceremony of the first-ever Aurora Prize for Awakening Humanity, held in Yerevan, Armenia, on April 24. Photo: 100 Lives

Above (right): Judge Ann Claire Williams, Carnegie Corporation trustee (far left), and Deana Arsenian, Carnegie Corporation Vice President for International Affairs (far right), with Kuyasa Regional Library staff, gifting the portrait of Andrew Carnegie during the opening celebrations of the new model library in Cape Town, South Africa.

Left: President Gregorian watching Clouds over Sidra, the first film shot in virtual reality (VR) for the United Nations. Designed to support the UN's campaign to highlight the plight of vulnerable communities, the VR film follows a twelve-year-old girl named Sidra in the Za'atari camp in Jordan, currently home to 84,000 refugees from the bloody Syrian civil war. Photo: Natalie Holt

National survey leads straight to “Readiness Roadmap” for parents.

by Gail Ablow

Most parents of grade school students, regardless of income, education level, or ethnicity, believe that their children are on track academically. Most parents also believe that attending college is essential to their children’s success. But according to a new report, Parents 2016: Hearts and Minds of Public School Parents in an Uncertain World, there is a surprisingly wide gap between parents’ perceptions of how well their children are doing in school, and how well their children are actually doing.
Parents’ perception of how their kids are performing in school lags behind national data.

In today’s fractured world, parents have high expectations for their children. Across ethnicity, income, and education levels, parents see getting to and through college as key.

Parents worry greatly about situations where their child has to make choices or face difficulties on their own.

Parents see themselves as primarily responsible for their child’s success in school—more so than teachers, principals, or their child.

Reading performance data from the 2015 National Assessment of Educational Progress

Parents who believe their child is performing at or above grade level in reading: 90%

Parents who say their child is on track to meet learning goals and grade-level expectations: 85%

Eighth-graders reading at or above grade level, according to national data: 34%

Parents who say it is absolutely essential or very important that their child attend a 2- or 4-year college: 90%

Hispanic Parents: 90%

African-American Parents: 42%

White Parents: 67%

Hispanic Parents: 83%

African-American Parents: 37%

White Parents: 54%

Current rates of college entrance and graduation (within six years):

Hispanic Parents: 72%

African-American Parents: 37%

White Parents: 63%

The mission of Learning Heroes is to provide resources to help parents support their children’s success in school and to improve parent engagement. The report goes a long way toward understanding parents’ concerns and goals. The findings also illuminate new opportunities for parent engagement. The number one worry is paying for college, followed by peer pressure, emotional health and happiness, safe use of technology, and bullying. Learning Heroes published an online interactive Readiness Roadmap with supportive tools and resources for social-emotional wellness, college financial planning, and expectations for learning by grade. When their anxieties are allayed, the hope is that parents will be better able to navigate their children’s academic progress.

And while parents put great faith in their children’s teachers, they hold themselves most responsible for their children’s success. With better understanding of national benchmarks, they can learn to ask more of their schools. “They know that most of the good jobs require a college degree,” says Dan Weisberg, CEO of the New Teacher Project. Engaging parents’ priorities simultaneously—their concerns about social and emotional well-being, as well as college costs—will help overcome this communications gap.

“This report is helping us identify effective strategies to engage parents and other stakeholders,” says Ambika Kapur, an education program officer for Carnegie Corporation. Teachers, principals, and even district leaders must also help set a tone that invites parents into the process of determining their children’s learning goals, says Irma Zardoya, president of the New York City Leadership Academy, “to empower parents by bringing them into the schools, gaining their support, and making them part of the decision-making process.”
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Carnegie Forums

An event series highlighting issues of importance to Andrew Carnegie, viewed through a contemporary lens during this election season

Carnegie Forums will cover topics central to the Corporation’s philanthropic legacy and mission: immigration, foreign policy, education, and democracy. Distinguished panelists, with the assistance of a seasoned moderator, will debate the topic at hand before an audience of leaders in government, education, philanthropy, and journalism, among others.

September 2016
Foreign Policy and the Presidential Election

October 2016
The Future of K–12 Education in the United States

January 2017
Democracy in America: A Post-Election Forum

For more information and updates, please visit carnegie.org.
Armaments . . . so far from preserving Peace inevitably become in time one of the chief, if not the greatest of all, causes of war, since they sow the deadly seeds of mutual suspicion.

Andrew Carnegie
Armaments and Their Results (1909)