

a platform for dialogue for regional Asian communities and global stakeholders

Combating 21st Century challenges and strengthening Public Policy capacity globally

Written by: Dinesh Ahluwalia for the **Macroeconomics, Trade & Investment Policy Group** at the **Asian Economic Forum**
July 21st, 2020

Summary: *Combating 21st Century challenges and ideological threats in capacity challenged countries globally by creating an alignment of shared interests for future economic prosperity. Making the argument for a knowledge sharing **Public Policy Scholarship** initiative as the vehicle to provide an 'alternative way' first within the Indo-Pacific region and thereafter to be extended to other US priority regions globally.*

Abstract: The purpose of this Paper is to make an argument that today's U.S. Foreign Policy of engagement with the billions of people in the Indo-Pacific region and globally is **missing** a key component for 21st Century challenges: the **alignment of shared interests** for future economic prosperity.

This Paper identifies **capacity** of the human resources of national bureaucracies to formulate, debate and implement Public Policy as the key area of investment and development that U.S. Foreign Policy must address for the **alignment of shared interests** for future economic prosperity.

From a *U.S. vantage point of view*, it is essential to protect U.S. trade and economic interests globally and to counter the potent ideology of the Chinese Communist Party (**CCP**) – an ideology that is laser focused on upending the Western-styled democratic liberal world order and that is gathering strength and momentum every day by geo-strategic intent, as evident with clarity on how it managed to suppress critical Public Health information from the global community related to the coronavirus outbreak in Wuhan, Hubei Province and thereafter managed to control the entire global narrative through the World Health Organization (WHO), which renamed this infectious diseases as 'COVID19', now a global pandemic.

The **CCP** ideology disguises its largesse of its version of Developmental Assistance on recipient countries with covenants on the terms of economic trade and geo-economic policy changes it enacts for its own self-serving geo-political interests and authoritarian ideologies, not seen since the height of the Cold War.

As an example, this Paper also examines the risk this ideological threat poses to incorporating digital standards that most developing countries across the world and especially those within the *Indo-Pacific region*, do not have the capacity to assess or the will to counter singlehandedly.

Conversely, *from a point of view of the billions of ordinary people* that reside in the non-privileged areas within the Indo-Pacific region and globally, none of the US concerns are of much consequence to them.

A majority of these people living outside the orbit of Western democratic countries, co-exist with direct exposure to some form of authoritarianism or police state controls that limit their many freedoms of choices. Not having the tools or resources to counter these forms of oppression without significant costs, most of these billions of people go around their daily lives, living in necessary compromises for survival.

The most immediate concerns to these billions, revolve around their need and that of their families to have access to affordable housing, water, schools, healthcare, sanitation, electricity and transportation.

This Paper asserts that the **missing ingredient** for positive outcomes from *both points of view* is capacity of the *'human resources of national bureaucracies to formulate, debate and implement Public Policy'*.

This Paper also looks back at a historical context when the US last faced a growing ideological threat post World War II and **President Harry S. Truman's** leadership in clearly identifying the objectives of victory.

In conclusion the Paper proposes a **Public Policy Scholarship** initiative supported by the knowledge resources at various US Universities that can help build the necessary capacity for the benefit of national bureaucracies *first within the Indo-Pacific region and thereafter to be extended to other US priority regions globally* that can counter the **CCP** ideological threat and simultaneously also accelerate the aspirations of billions of people and give them the tools for upward mobility and economic prosperity.

a platform for dialogue for regional Asian communities and global stakeholders

Repositioning US Developmental Assistance for 21st Century challenges

One of the many levers that the United States has within its toolbox to encourage positive Policy outcomes within the *Indo-Pacific region* and across the world, is within the many forms of *U.S. Developmental Assistance* it administers and by extension its funding commitments to various multilateral institutions.

Critical thinking would however ask the question if *U.S. developmental assistance* could be updated for 21st Century challenges and realities. Can *U.S. developmental-assistance* recipient countries be set on a **Public Policy** contemplation, formulation and execution trajectory to free them from perpetual cycles of failed economic policies and additionally provide them with the tools for an '**alternative way**'?

President Harry S. Truman's leadership and the 'alternative way'

As **President Harry S. Truman** wisely proclaimed, the '**alternative way**' is "one that is based on the will of the majority, and is distinguished by free institutions, representative government, free elections, guarantees of individual liberty, freedom of speech and religion, and freedom from political oppression."¹

In the 73 years since that proclamation, multilateral institutions have taken over the larger role for developmental assistance and loans to recipient countries both within the *Indo-Pacific region* and globally. After contributing immensely to advancing towards the founding charter and objectives over the first 50 years of their formation, there is growing evidence to support that most of these organizations have become organizationally inefficient and there is an increasing ideological divide within its generally independent management that is contributing to the most un-American type of investments.

A well-documented, May 2015 \$50 million loan for the benefit off the '*Xinjiang Technical and Vocational Education and Training Project*' is just one small example of questionable investments and the growing ideological divide that has permeated within the World Bank to advance the goal of political oppression of the deeply repressive authoritarian regime of the CCP.

What should multi-lateral institutional architecture and framework look like in the 21st Century?

The pride of post-World War II multilateral institutionalism that represented Western liberal democracies so well for decades, although yet staffed with incredible hard working and talented rank and file individuals are showing the limits of their organizational purpose. Without transparency of governance and outside audits to ensure accountability we must accept the reality that institutional reforms are long overdue and must commence immediately. An alternative approach would be the belated acceptance that a sunset period is upon these fine institutions as they near the end of their utility value and we must immediately prepare to create and invest in the next generation of 21st Century institutions.

While the U.S. policy establishment and their stakeholders contemplate this question, we would be encouraged if the answers also incorporated how these multi-lateral institutions operate within an emerging *Grand Strategy* for U.S. leadership to combat the challenges of the 21st Century.

For our part we see our role in this Paper to focus on a critical missing component within U.S. foreign policy architecture that should be incorporated to help counter the *competitive ideological threats* posed within *capacity challenged countries within the Indo-Pacific region* and globally.

Strengthening U.S. Development Assistance Architecture and Framework for 21st Century challenges

We are herein proposing a two-step process to help strengthen U.S. foreign policy goals for 21st Century challenges by re-purposing the U.S. development assistance architecture and framework.

As the first-step, we are making an argument that *U.S. development assistance* and ancillary negotiations for shared policy goals and outcomes can have further probabilities of successes over the long term by having an alignment of **shared interests** if they are explicitly aligned to the '**alternative way**'.

a platform for dialogue for regional Asian communities and global stakeholders

To further strengthen all current *U.S. development assistance* programs that are designed to help support the existing architecture and framework of longstanding U.S. policy goals and objectives, we are calling for the appropriation of the necessary funds to help administer a *strategic, long-term and sustainable Public Policy Scholarship initiative* to be initiated first within the *Indo-Pacific region* and thereafter to expand to other U.S. priority regions globally (with particular emphasis on helping build the human resource capacity for public policy in Afghanistan and Iraq as an integral part of nation-building).

As the **second-step**, we are making the recommendation for the implementation of a technology enabled platform by which U.S. policy makers are able to monitor data that all aid-recipient countries are making material and measurable progress to advance the various structural reforms and policy implementation processes that are needed to make them more responsible to all aid obligations and their own societies.

Additionally, since we live in the midst of the most innovative and technologically advanced society in the world, Silicon Valley companies should be engaged to help create these sophisticated measurement tools. The transparency from the dissemination of such data is highly recommended to enhance the benefits for policy makers, U.S. tax payers and also for the benefit of the societies of the recipient countries.

U.S. policy makers would be well served in calibrating measurement tools that would enable the collection of timely, meaningful and verifiable data to monitor the progress of both *U.S. developmental assistance* organizations and also include multilateral institutions where U.S. donor interests are substantive.

Silicon Valley companies can play the critical role in being tasked to design measurement tools that assist in the institutionalization of data analytics, *meritocracy, transparency and U.S. values* as the foundational pillars driving this *Public Policy Scholarship initiative*.

Alignment of shared interests

Lessons from a *Historical context of an older ideological threat* as cited in **Appendix A** and the *Observations Post Marshall Plan* as cited in **Appendix B** have us conclude that what is required today is in combating *21st Century challenges and ideological threats in capacity-challenged countries* is not a tactical adaption of an updated version of a Marshall Plan but a **complete strategic transformation**.

We draw inspiration from the historical context in the form of '**alignment of shared interests**' between the US and sixteen Marshall Aid countries of Europe that stood resolute in its fight during the Cold War.

Moving forward to the 21st Century, we observe that apart from the robust security and trade alliances that the US has with its friends and allies within the Indo-Pacific region and globally, **we do not see any new** long term institutional building programs or capacities in national bureaucracies that help create and foster and '**alignment of shared interests**' amongst U.S. policy makers and their counterparts.

The stakes today using Digital Standards as an example

To use digital standards as an example in today's environment, we observe how sophisticated 'next generation' mobile infrastructure standards are being developed by CCP-affiliated companies such as Huawei and ZTE for global domination. As the adoption of 5G equipment and standards set by these companies accelerate globally, their access to formidable subsidized capital and the blessing of the CCP's political statecraft to influence national bureaucracies, companies, financiers and key decision makers within the *Indo-Pacific region* and globally have been thrown into the spotlight for all to see and observe.

At stake are not only privacy issues related to the data integrity of entire digital networks, but also the oversized influence that non-democratic ideology imposed on digital standards would have on entire countries and their societies. Overseeing and authenticating every aspect of trade, digital and otherwise would be at risk. Supported by advancements in **artificial intelligence tools** to monitor data to keep a check on any form of criticism or dissent, its influence on social and consumption behavior would be devastating to the detriment of every known competitive U.S. and Western company.

a platform for dialogue for regional Asian communities and global stakeholders

We can summarize the economic challenges that are posed by this CCP-sponsored *competitive ideological threat* as follows:

1. China's authoritarian leadership has within its economic architecture both carefully chosen and vetted for geo-economic dominance private sector companies and state-owned enterprises that are exempt from all universally accepted norms of transparency within their home markets and surprisingly, also in globally competitive financial markets.
2. It holds an oversized hand of influence to gather informational intelligence of nations, societies, companies and individuals on a scale unparalleled in human history. The significance of CCP's ideology is already well demonstrated within its own borders where it polices its own Chinese citizens to submission to a censored, socially scripted authoritarian way of its own rules based order.
3. The CCP's aggressive muscular posture in geo-economics, to enforce its digital standards via "next generation" mobile infrastructure architecture to capture the digital footprint of entire societies, especially within capacity-challenged countries within the *Indo-Pacific region* is now for all to see openly.

The canary in the coal mine and what's missing

If we were to use the "canary in the coal mine" analogy, we observe the disposition shown by policy makers of most sovereign nations within the Indo-Pacific region (and even amongst some of our most trusted partners and allies globally) in favor of mobile infrastructure standards promoted by CCP's sponsored companies purely on price considerations with total disregard to the security and integrity of their digital networks while making policy considerations. We wonder if the canary has stopped singing.

By implication, that intrusive mobile infrastructure standards would have on the functioning of public institutions, representative government, free elections, guarantees of individual liberty, freedom of speech and religion, and freedom from political oppression, within the countries that adopt these standards as their default digital standards could potentially be crippling.

What's missing in this conversation, is deeply analyzing our inabilities in bringing about shared positive policy outcomes, and more critically our failures in **'Addressing corruption in capacity challenged environments'** as observed in **Appendix C**.

We are therefore making the argument, to have long-term successful policy outcomes for all capacity challenged countries seeking the 'alternative way' to *counter competitive ideological threats*, we need to invest in creating the architecture and mechanisms by which we can first have an omnipresence of qualified policy experts with deep institutional knowledge and technical capacity, however also provide them with the institutional building capacities to combat serious corrupt practices and compromises.

We conclude by reinforcing our message that a *Public Policy Scholarship initiative that helps support national bureaucracies in capacity challenged countries that can help provide knowledge tools to combat corruption* can also augment the most immediate concerns of a social contract that involve societal needs such as access to affordable housing, water, schools, healthcare, sanitation, electricity and transportation.

An alignment of shared interests for future economic prosperity will be further enhanced when the US is also seen as contributing to the transfer of knowledge and institutional building for society in aid recipient countries to help combat corruption and all forms of authoritarianism and police controls.

Main Thesis of a Public Policy Scholarship initiative

As its main thesis, this Paper proposes a Plan wherein we are advocating for the for the appropriation of the necessary funds to help administer a program for a *Public Policy Scholarship initiative* to be initiated first for the benefit of qualified candidates from within the *Indo-Pacific region* and thereafter to be

a platform for dialogue for regional Asian communities and global stakeholders

extended to other U.S. priority regions globally (with particular emphasis on helping build the human resource capacity for Public Policy in Afghanistan and Iraq as an integral part of nation-building).

We would recommend that priority considerations should first direct qualified candidates towards a "Masters in Public Policy Scholarships Program", or equivalents thereof wherein candidates can travel to U.S. universities of excellence for a period of no more than one (1) year to receive the skills and knowledge necessary to formulate, debate and implement Public Policy.

The objective of recommending the creation of no more than one (1) year, maximum stay period within the United States is to explicitly message the expectations to the potential candidates and their stakeholders (within their home countries capacity challenged countries within the **Indo-Pacific region** and globally) that this **Public Policy Scholarship initiative** is:

~ an investment by the people of the United States to help create positive outcomes for the recipient countries society's shared economic prosperity with the United States and not uniquely directed at one particular individual

~ an investment in qualified candidates that demonstrate a desire to be change agents for the advancement of economic structural reforms and policy implementation processes in their own countries

~ an investment in countries that are committed to working towards the goal of the '**alternative way**' as envisioned by President Truman in compliance with the respect for human rights and international law

~ an investment by the U.S. taxpayer and **not** as a U.S. immigration opportunity

This Paper draws its conclusions by advocating that this **Public Policy Scholarship initiative** is the most direct and efficient pathway to the creation of a long-term sustainable **alignment of shared interests**.

An **alignment of shared interests** wherein the United States and its policy makers can have an omnipresence of like-minded knowledgeable "next generation" policy professionals working actively as counterparties in as many countries as possible globally to *counter the competitive ideological threat* that currently exists today in all its imbedded and complex manifestations.

A **Public Policy Scholarship initiative** that is by design, **focused on building capacity** to foster long term alliances based on shared values, shared interests and the pursuit of shared economic prosperity.

Recognition, Recommendations and Conclusion

This Paper recognizes that the United States is in the midst of a new strategic competition and therefore makes a cost efficient argument as one of the many solutions needed to counter a powerful adversary and its ideologies. Failure to intelligently counter these ideologies globally, especially in the sphere of where the United States has been seen traditionally as a benefactor, will create vulnerabilities for the United States to an adverse set of economic Policies that will impact trade and commerce in the 21st century, especially within the Indo-Pacific region.

Inactions today, will accelerate and perpetuate conditions of a competitive ideology with economic Policy outcomes, that will reshape the digital and commercial standards of tomorrow.

This Paper furthers recognizes, that U.S. national and security interests are well served when the world has reasonable economic growth and prosperity, where markets operate under a Western styled democratic liberal rule based order. However, the challenges associated with *wars and natural disasters* in different regions across the world brings forth complex questions related to U.S. leadership and the timing of appropriate form of interventions, nation-building and aid. In all such cases, we would make the argument that *U.S. humanitarian assistance* should also be marshalled to help these countries in

a platform for dialogue for regional Asian communities and global stakeholders

building capacities within their own national bureaucracies for public policy formulation and institutional building, for the betterment of their own societies.

This Paper additionally recognizes the macro-economic challenges faced by most developing countries globally coupled with their own limitations of capacity to formulate, debate and implement public policy, to further counterbalance ideologies not in their societal & national interests and therein this Paper makes an argument to help them bridge the knowledge gap with this *Public Policy Scholarship initiative*.

Finally this Paper would like to recognize and honor **President Harry S. Truman** and the principles by which he adhered to the '**alternative way**' along with the foresight for the deployment of the **Marshall Plan** and other mechanisms to pursue the **alignment of shared interests** in countering the powerful Communist ideology of the Soviet Union that eventually helped the United States win the Cold War.

This Paper proposes a **Public Policy Scholarship initiative** with the following recommendations for the benefit of advancing US Policy goals and objectives in *capacity challenged countries globally*:

1. An appropriation on the **scale** of the Fulbright Program be considered to launch this initiative.
2. To include **at least 50 US Universities of Excellence** that have nationally recognized Schools and Curriculums of Public Policy, as the knowledge destination centers for this initiative.

The Schools should be given the flexibility needed for the creation tailor made programs in the absence of a structured Masters in Public Policy Program (where none exist) that can be administered in no more than a one (1) year academic year to teach the "**craft of government**" by incorporating an interdisciplinary approach to include core courses in *Economics, Political Science and Public Health*.

Specific emphasis should also be given to include the study of the *Management of Contemporary Public Organizations, Human Rights, Conflict Resolution along with the study of Law and Society*.

Furthermore, to help the advance just and equitable societies with an adherence towards sustainable economic development courses in *Ethics and Environmental Sciences* should be made compulsory.

3. Aid-recipient countries within the *Indo-Pacific region* be prioritized for the launch of this initiative and *thereafter extended to other US priority regions globally* (with particular emphasis on helping build the human resource capacity for Public Policy in Afghanistan and Iraq as an integral part of nation-building) and simultaneously advance the principles of the '**alternative way**'.

4. **US State Department**, be named as the key administrator, supplemented by the *Political and Economic Sections* at various *US Embassies* in helping play a key role in identifying potential Candidates for the Admissions process, deferring the Admission decisions to the various U.S. universities of excellence.

5. This initiative be named in Honor of **President Harry S. Truman** and the recipients who graduate from this **Public Policy Scholarship initiative** be recognized as **Truman Scholars** only after having returned to their countries of origin and thereafter successfully completed at least 4 years in public policy service in their home countries in advancing the principles of the '**alternative way**'.

In conclusion this *Public Policy Scholarship initiative* serves the dual-purposes of advancing US objectives in *countering ideological threats in capacity challenged countries globally for the 21st Century* and simultaneously also accelerate the aspirations of billions of people with an '**alternative way**' and give them the tools for upward mobility and economic prosperity.

Additionally, this initiative also serves the vital purpose of empowering the human resources of recipient

a platform for dialogue for regional Asian communities and global stakeholders

countries to help them counter all forms of authoritarianism and corruption and transform their economies for their own societal needs and conversely also leverages the strengths of the best intellectual assets human history has ever assembled to date, **U.S. universities of excellence**.

Finally, with the benefit of observing lessons of history and respect towards all those who sacrificed over many generations, we have formulated this Paper as our contribution towards what we see as the **missing** component, i.e. formulate, debate and implement Public Policy in capacity challenged countries globally, in the creation and **alignment of shared interests** and to *counter an ideological threat* to the United States, its friends, partners and allies in this 21st Century. We also see our aspirational goal of this Paper to help advance and strengthen the intangibles of US "**soft power**"² for the 21st Century in the *Indo-Pacific region* and globally by the recommendation of this **Public Policy Scholarship initiative**.

Appendix A, B & C in subsequent Pages.

Notations:

¹ *President Harry S. Truman addressing a joint session of Congress on March 12th, 1947.*

² *As coined by the acclaimed political scientist Dr. Joseph S. Nye Jr., and expanded upon in his book 'Soft Power, The Means to Success in World of Politics'.*

Acknowledgements:

I am truly grateful to the knowledge I have gained in the journey of research from friends in Myanmar, Malaysia, Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam, with particular emphasis on their each helping me understand various 'capacities' that have been largely unaddressed within their national bureaucracies. My sincerest appreciation to William Flens, Political/Economic Chief, U.S. Embassy Burma (Myanmar) who read through many editions of the Paper and provided some invaluable advise. Finally, my thanks to my children and friends back home in the United States who have given me the moral encouragement to move ahead with this Paper.

The Asian Economic Forum (a nonprofit organization) is an economic focused 'think tank' with a research interest in public policy. Our long term goal is to highlight economic policies that enable economic growth, stability, transparency and free markets in Asia and also enable global stakeholders to have more engagement opportunities in Asia in addition to their traditional points of interaction. The conclusions and recommendations of any Asian Economic Forum Policy Paper(s) are solely those of its author(s), and do not reflect the views of the Asian Economic Forum, its management, or its other Research Resident or Non-Resident Fellows or Scholars. Funding Requests are written independently and in consultation with its Board of Governors, Chair of Committees or its duly appointed Officers.

Author: Dinesh Ahluwalia is a US Citizen, currently living in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. The founder of the Asian Economic Forum, an economic focused public policy think tank, Dinesh can also be reached at dinesh@ahluwalia.us or on Twitter @dineshahluwalia

Copyright © Asian Economic Forum. All rights reserved

Appendix A

Historical context of an older ideological threat

Historical context would serve us all well, especially as the US now faces a *competitive ideological threat* that is well-financed and that straddles through both its own ideology of authoritarian rule in its home market and has also rapidly increased its multilateral and commercial spheres of influence globally.

To bolster our thesis on the **first-step approach** on combating this *competitive ideological threat* of our times, although completely different in capabilities, we look back at an older ideological threat and some of the key success factors and building blocks of the Policy architecture in post-World War II Europe.

The appropriation of the military and economic assistance for Greece and Turkey in 1947 and thereafter the Economic Recovery Act in 1948 subsequently known as the **Marshall Plan** remain collectively as one of the biggest achievements of a *Grand Strategy* that eventually helped the US win the Cold War.

However, a lesser known fact was the intense planning, mapping, sequencing, negotiations and statesmanship that went towards orchestrating and executing the various structural reforms and Policy implementation processes that were **ratified** amongst as many as sixteen European countries as conditions to receiving the necessary aid¹ from the **Marshall Plan**.

Almost forgotten today, from the early days of the **Marshall Plan**, were also the geo-political events that followed in rapid succession in 1948. The coup that overthrew a democratically elected government in Czechoslovakia to the Berlin Blockade that were also unfolding at rapid speed.

With these unfolding events in both Czechoslovakia and Berlin, at risk was the emerging framework of various monetary and economic policies that were necessary to integrate Western Europe into a cohesive manufacturing and trading region. However, deeply woven interconnected factors holding back European economic revival was not only **consumer confidence** but also the lack of any long-term visible **security commitments** in the face of the growing ideological threat of the Soviet Union.

That recognition of that key 'missing' security commitments came quickly, although grudgingly as first because of the financial cost implications. However, US leadership soon recognized, that without a robust, sustainable and long-term '**security architecture**' in place there would be no success in the European theater and similarly the odds of success of the Marshall Plan were limited.

Unified leadership, recognition, foresight and commitment within all spheres of the US Government within a remarkably short period of time quickly gave way for the creation of **NATO** and some would argue the very act of NATO, paved the way for the successful creation of the **European Union**. The rest is history.

Notations:

¹ Sixteen European countries that participated in the Marshall Plan received \$13.2 Billion in aid over a 4 year period from 1948 through 1952 (approximately \$15 Billion inflation adjusted in 1952 terms).

Appendix B

Observations Post Marshall Plan

In studying the period immediately post the appropriations of the Marshall Plan from 1948-1952, we note there has **not** been any comparable successes for the benefit of various structural reforms and Policy implementation processes for the '**alternative way**' in exchange for any substantial development aid within the *Indo-Pacific region* or globally. The exceptions of Japan and South Korea post World War II and the Korean War respectively notwithstanding.

Over the course of the past 70 years and especially since end of the Cold War, they have been numerous calls to create a **Marshall Plan** for every major cause or region in crisis globally. Noble and well intentioned as these calls have been, it is worth remembering that the conditions by which the Western governments of post war Europe agreed and implemented the reforms necessary for the **Marshall Plan** funds to be appropriated, has not been practically feasible in much of the *Indo-Pacific region* or amongst other underdeveloped countries or regions emerging from the various conflict and wars, primarily because these countries and regions lack the educational capacity within their national bureaucracies and institutions capable of executing major Policies and programs let alone structural and economic reforms.

It is also important to highlight that the **Marshall Plan** did not come out of a "Development Assistance" package by itself. It was rather a creation of a specific reconstruction, economic, trade and investment objectives to aid a war ravaged Europe by Secretary of State George C. Marshall Jr. to further the goals of the '**alternative way**' so that the US could also preserve the peace after the many years of sacrifices a War brings upon its people and simultaneously also fight the communist ideology of the Soviet Union.

Furthermore, some may however make the argument, that Policy prescriptions handed down by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) post the many international debt crisis over the decades, did result in various structural reforms and Policy implementation processes in the recipient aid countries and serves as a multilateral model for Marshall Plan type responses in times of crisis.

Our observation however concludes that in almost all cases, these IMF Policy prescriptions were a result of economic factors and market-event based interventions with limited long-term effect on strengthening institutional capacities. One may also conclude that as reforms were targeted for immediate fiscal discipline and with detrimental societal impacts, the long term structural reform process has not always been sustainable especially when observed within the *Ease of Doing Business Index* rankings.

We do however commend investments made by the IMF for the benefit of institutional capacity building to help recipient aid countries, create institutional mechanisms for sustained economic recovery. Our larger point is that investments in the institutional foundations of a country and within the human resources of their own professional branches of governments need to be considered as the foundations of nation building and not just prescriptions to prevent market contagion.

Our final observation in looking back at the success of the Marshall Plan, we isolate one key success factor that was omnipresent in the Europe of the late 1940's in committing itself to the '**alternative way**'. Despite the internal ideological divides in each of these sixteen Marshall aid recipient countries, they all had within their national bureaucracies, reasonably sophisticated human resources and 'capacities' that were capable to formulate, debate and implement Public Policy by focusing on the creation and alignment of shared economic interests. We would conclude by observing that this key success factor of 'capacity' **does not exist today** amongst the national bureaucracies of most of our aid recipient countries globally.

Appendix C

Addressing corruption in capacity challenged environments

Corruption is often **defined** as the “abuse of public power for private benefit”. By implication it holds private beneficiaries as ultimately culpable to these illegitimate activities along with all the supporting participants as supplemental players of perhaps equal or lesser importance. We would however like to probe the question, what if all the mechanisms of ‘corruption’ have been incorporated into the fundamental play book to help advance a threatening ideology in *capacity challenged countries*, how does one enforce accountability or create a pathway one day for more positive outcomes?

Another important question that emanates from the Digital Standards example and the larger issue in *countering competitive ideological threat in capacity challenged countries* is proposed herein.

*How could any US or Western company **compete** in the Indo-Pacific region or globally where almost all aspects of the Policy making apparatus are subject too **serious corrupt practices and compromises**, the absence of deep institutional knowledge and technical capacity issues notwithstanding?*

To answer this question, we must first recognize that this current *competitive ideological threat* is extremely well financed and operates within our financial, trade and investment framework unlike from the days of the advent of the Cold War when the Soviet Union itself was struggling to recover from the ravages of World War II and had shut itself off from most forms of Western financial market intermediation and trade flows and therefore was not competitive globally by its own strategic mistakes.

Next as we look at the issue of anti-bribery provisions and corrupt practices globally, one can observe that apart from a few notable exceptions outside the Western democratic oriented countries, there exists no equivalent standards of the US Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977, as amended. Prosecution and enforcement of corrupt actors remains very distant imaginary goals. Societal pressures can only work when there is access to Public Policy capacity within national bureaucracies, the absence of which will ensure that mechanisms to build such legislative and creditable judicial frameworks, will remain distant.

We are therefore making the argument that a **Public Policy Scholarship** initiative serves not only as an effective tool in combating 21st Century economic challenges and ideological threats as demonstrated in the example on Digital Standards (mentioned within the Paper), however it is imperative in strengthening and augmenting critical capacities to advance Policies for anti-bribery provisions and anti-money laundering compliance issues both key components in the battle against corrupt environments.

We conclude by recognizing that corruption has an inequitable impact on the most vulnerable members of society globally by increasing costs of everyday necessities of life along with the hurdle rates to justice. We can then deduce the causality between forms of authoritarianism and or police controls in most capacity challenged countries globally and the ‘lack of space’ given to formulate, debate and implement Public Policy as a public good. This ‘lack of space’ is key in understanding how Public Policy is easily manipulated to serve the goals of outside non-state and state actors to stifle out dissenting voices.

Author: Dinesh Ahluwalia is a US Citizen, currently living in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. The founder of the Asian Economic Forum, an economic focused public policy think tank, Dinesh can also be reached at dinesh@ahluwalia.us or on Twitter @dineshahluwalia