

Progressive Foreign Policy Debrief

Intel for Advocacy

EDITOR'S NOTE: You may notice that every article, op-ed, essay, and blog post linked in this edition of our Debrief this week was written by a woman. As Women's History Month wraps up, we wanted to remind our readers that women are <u>greatly underrepresented</u> in national security and foreign policy (in fact, <u>there's a whole organization</u> dedicated to reversing this trend) and to demonstrate that whatever foreign policy issue you're reporting on or advocating for, there's no shortage of smart women with the expertise to guide you.

Win Without War is also making a commitment to be more inclusive that goes well beyond March. We hope you'll join us in doing better when it comes to listening to, quoting, citing, and amplifying women's voices on progressive foreign policy — including and especially women of color, trans women and nonbinary individuals, and women from communities most directly impacted by America's military-first foreign policy, both within our borders and beyond them.

TOPLINE TAKEAWAYS

- John Bolton's past doesn't bode well for hopes that he'll be an honest broker as Trump's national security advisor.
- As diplomacy takes root on the Korean peninsula, it's important to remember that withholding a peaceful vision just solidifies the status quo.
- Women show us that we don't need to spend \$700 billion a year for security.

TRUMP'S WAR CABINET: BOLTON'S HISTORY OF SUPPRESSING VIEWS HE DISAGREES WITH

What's perhaps most frightening about Trump naming John Bolton as his National Security Advisor -- in addition to his sordid history of war mongering and enabling extreme Islamophobia -- is that Bolton is also known from his time in government as being "willing to cherry-pick intelligence, steamroll analysts he did not agree with and end-run his State Department bosses in pursuit of an agenda considered bellicose even among Bush administration hawks."

The New York Times's Katie Rogers and Elizabeth Williamson <u>break the rest of it down</u>, reporting that Bolton targeted intel officers who disagreed with him for reassignment, and even with "vicious attacks," 'rumor campaigns' and 'infantile' character assassination." He also blocked key information on Iran policy from reaching then-Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and her predecessor, Colin Powell.



For more this week on Bolton, and Trump's other War Cabinet nominees Mike Pompeo and Gina Haspel, check out:

- "The Return of the Hawk: How John Bolton Solidifies Trump's Hard-line Foreign Policy" [LINK]
- "Bolton and Pompeo might unleash Trump on 'radical Islam'" [LINK]
- "John ('Bomb Iran') Bolton, the New Warmonger in the White House"
 [LINK]
- "What H.R. McMaster's exit and John Bolton's arrival mean for the next three dangerous months" [LINK]
- "John Bolton, Lover of Drama and Wars, Is a Terrible Fit for His New Job" [LINK]
- "John Bolton Told Israel: 'Condi Rice Sold You Out,' Ex-Official Says" [LINK]
- "The Bolton Pick Means Two Things, They're Both Mostly Bad" [LINK]
- "Trump and Bolton's Plan to Isolate Allies and Encourage Enemies"
 [LINK]
- "John Bolton's knife-fighting skills alarm his critics" [LINK]
- "John Bolton will probably be fine, and I will sleep well" [humor] [LINK]
- "Trump's most dangerous betrayal yet" [LINK]
- "What To Do About Bolton and Other Pro-War Appointees" [LINK]

DIPLOMACY TAKING ROOT ON THE KOREAN PENINSULA

Kim Jong-un traveled outside North Korea this week, for the first time as the country's leader, to meet with Chinese President Xi Jinping in Beijing, where Kim <u>reportedly</u> again expressed his commitment to denuclearization and the two leaders <u>sought</u> to repair their countries' increasingly soured relationship.

New America's Heather Hurlburt <u>writes</u> that the "most important takeaway from these diplomatic moves is that Xi has no intention of letting Kim and Trump walk off into the sunset with an agreement that disadvantages China — and Kim seems unlikely to cut a deal that meets the Trump administration's conditions."

Meanwhile, Kim and South Korean President Moon Jae-in have <u>agreed</u> to meet on the southern side of the demilitarized zone on April 27, meaning that Kim "could become the first North Korean leader in history to enter South Korea."

ICYMI: CAP's Kelly Magsamen recently <u>laid out</u> "the basic ingredients of a sound strategy": Clear and consistent strategic messaging; Sustained high levels of international pressure;



Diplomatic persistence, clarity and creativity; Strong alliance management; Credible deterrence with responsible risk management; and, Healthy skepticism about the intentions of China.

And Catherine Killough <u>reminds us</u>: "If we were to allow ourselves to imagine that an 'Olympic Truce' is not just a one-off event, that every gesture toward unity is not mere performance, we might be able to prioritize, and begin, a genuine process of reconciliation in Korea. **Withholding a vision of peace only makes permanent the status quo**."

HOW TO ACHIEVE SECURITY WITHOUT SPENDING MORE THAN \$700 BILLION PER YEAR

Trump signed a \$1.3 trillion spending bill late last week and, you guessed it, the Pentagon was the big winner, getting \$61 billion more than what was allocated last year, with an eye-popping top line of around \$700 billion (much of which will go to waste, fraud, and abuse).

But of course, there are more effective and less costly ways to lead the free world and make it more secure, and women have largely been at the forefront.

As our own Erica Fein <u>pointed out</u> in a story in January about a delegation of women participating in a Summit on security on the Korean peninsula, "[r]esearch finds that women are more likely to advocate for more inclusive and representative solutions [to conflicts], often because they understand the community on whose behalf they represent."

Indeed, women experts and activists -- like FCNL's Kate Gould, Indivisible's Elizabeth Beavers, MoveOn's Iram F. Ali, STAND's MacKenzie Hamilton, Win Without War's Kate Kizer and Erica Fein, and many others -- recently led the charge in pushing the U.S. Senate to finally vote on — and nearly end —the U.S. military's role in war, famine and humanitarian catastrophe in Yemen.

(For more on women's role in war in Yemen, <u>check out this story</u> by Sarah Aziza about how a collective of women street artists in the war-torn country are coping with the destruction.)

Prominent women in the peace and security community have recently <u>raised their voices</u> in support of, for example, a House bill aimed at reducing global violence via reforms in U.S. foreign aid. And City Lab <u>wrote this week</u> that:

A broad coalition of representatives, delegates, and state senators from eight states (California, Georgia, Vermont, Maryland, Illinois, Massachusetts, Minnesota and Iowa) have begun pushing <u>resolutions</u> that put additional pressure on Congress to stop the president's first-strike powers. And cities such as Northampton, Massachusetts; San Francisco, California; Santa Fe, New Mexico; and counties across Washington State have drafted local resolutions of their own.



As it turns out, almost all of them are sponsored by women. This is no coincidence. In fact, women have been leading nuclear deterrence efforts since the height of the Cold War.

As the City Lab piece points out, Women's Action for New Directions has been one of the leaders. "This is not a man's issue, it's a human issue," said Nancy Parrish, the executive director of WAND. Echoing Erica Fein's point above, she added, "But we have research and studies that prove that we are much more likely to achieve peace, and a sustainable peace, when women are in the discussions and in the negotiations."

(Be sure to check out this week's profile of <u>Lovely Umayam</u> from WAND's weekly tribute to pioneers of policy and peace.)

BURIED LEDES

The U.S.-led coalition fighting ISIS has acknowledged killing at least 855 civilians.

Thousands of Ghanaians protested a <u>deal</u> to expand the U.S. military's presence in their country.

Peacekeeping? Who needs that?

Take DOD cash and use it to build a border wall? Not a good idea. But hey, at least Trump admitted the Pentagon has more money than it knows what to do with.

More than 200 diplomats signed a <u>letter</u> to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee expressing "the urgent need to restore the power and influence of American diplomacy."

Trump is throwing U.S. Russia policy for a loop.

<u>ICYMI</u>: It's not just Devin Nunes; **How the House Intel Committee's decline has been decades in the making**.

And finally: What should you wear to a nuclear war?