



Partnership for Prosperity

A New Global Engagement

Co-founders: General James L. Jones and _____

April 2016

What do a four-star U.S. General and a renowned global development leader have in common?

They know that the interdependence of security, economic development, and good governance is the trinity of global prosperity and stability.

...and they share a driving passion to translate this belief into more effective methods of making the world safer and more prosperous.

Why does it matter? Without security and development catalyzed by good governance, extreme poverty will continue to rob hundreds of millions of our fellow global citizens of their dignity and the opportunity for a better life. Fragile areas of the world will grow weaker fueling insurgency, radical ideology, and conflict that threaten us all. Better living conditions in these zones—located in Africa, the Middle East, Asia and elsewhere—are essential to counter the despair that feeds conflict and instability felt globally in today's highly integrated world.

What's the problem?

- **Outdated approaches.** The mechanisms and methods of U.S. and allied global engagement are ill-organized and improperly geared for today's security landscape. Our approaches remain mired in the 20th Century, relying too heavily on military intervention to respond to crises rather than graduating to the well-integrated, whole of government, whole of society framework needed to prevent them.
 - U.S. foreign assistance programs, trade and commercial policies, security initiatives, and alliances remain un-coordinated and incapable of achieving desired end states abroad.
 - Our security strategies still fail to grasp the interconnectivity of security, development, and good governance, and the importance of integrating them to build stability in emerging hot-spots.
 - The U.S. public and private sectors do not work together effectively, even though harnessing their complementary capabilities is essential to drive sustainable prosperity in the developing world; and by doing so promote international stability.
 - Too many citizens of the developing world are denied a path out of poverty and an opportunity to define their own destiny by the lack security, development and strong governance in the countries and communities where they live.
- **Inaction.** Despite years of official rhetoric about fostering public-private partnerships and achieving a more integrated approach to U.S. engagement abroad, the United States lags badly in making this vision a reality.

What are the consequences? We are losing significant and difficult to recover geopolitical and economic leadership and influence. Human capital is being squandered. Would-be markets remain potential conflict zones.

What do we need? Action...driven by a more modern and comprehensive model of U.S. and allied global engagement capable of replacing poverty, insecurity, and conflict with prosperity in fragile, strategically critical regions around the globe.

What are a four-star U.S. General and a world-renowned development leader doing about it?

Partnering for prosperity.

Our Work

Partnership for Prosperity (P4P) is a 501(c)(3) cofounded by General James L. Jones and [Global development leader] that will inspire a more effective form of U.S. and allied global engagement based on the partnership of government, the private sector, and NGOs to build stability in the developing world.

P4P will employ three core lines of operation to accomplish this goal:

1. **Advocacy:** Promote support for modernizing and expanding global engagement tools with a focus on public-private sector partnership and the coordination of security, economic development, and good governance initiatives to create global prosperity and stability.
2. **Strategic development:** Create the intellectual capital, relationships, policies, and practices required for the new model of engagement to succeed.
3. **Operations:** Model the strategy by deploying engagement teams composed of government, industry, and NGOs to implement joint, complementary initiatives across the three domains in strategically vital and fragile countries.

P4P will draw upon the most senior and respected figures in the public and private sectors, producing a powerful network that harnesses world-class experience, convening authority, know-how, passion, and credibility.

Mission success will be measured by improved quality of life and stability in the target country, social conditions that are resistant to radicalism and insurgency, and positive attitudes about America and our allies.

P4P's success will create a template for broader and larger engagement efforts upon which our government and society can build.

To make this necessity a reality, P4P is seeking an initial funding of \$4 million to put this new strategy of global engagement into action.

A full business plan is available upon request.

Case Study: West Bank, 2008

As **Special Envoy for Middle East Regional Security**, General Jones was asked to help foster the conditions and arrangements necessary to advance a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

In assessing the full spectrum of U.S. and international programs at work in the West Bank to promote peace, development, and trust-building between the parties, it was clear that the pieces of the effort were uncoordinated and producing very limited results.

In one area of the West Bank, the U.S. was training Palestinian security forces while European sponsors were training police elsewhere. While the U.S. Agency for International Development was administering development and governance building programs targeted at one location, allies were implementing what should have been complementary initiatives in other locales. And the U.S. private sector, which has enormous power, resources, and know-how to bear, was generally ignored. The result was a lot of diffuse effort, expenditures, frustration, and lost opportunities, but not much in the way of peace, progress, and conflict resolution.

Over the ensuing months General Jones worked to coordinate and integrate U.S. security, development, and governance assistance programs – to synch them as mutually supporting elements of an overarching strategic objective: building peace, prosperity, and trust...and to do it by fostering home-grown capabilities (not just administering programs and providing hand-outs).

The more comprehensive and better harmonized effort was focused on the Jenin area in the West Bank. Benefiting from a holistic public-private sector approach, Jenin, once a hotbed of insurgency, rapidly stabilized and became a model of development and Israeli-Palestinian trust-building. Shops opened. Children returned to school. Life improved; and so did Israeli-Palestinian relations. What became known as “The Jenin Initiative” became hailed as one of the few examples of legitimate progress and hope in this troubled area.

The progress made in Jenin was not sustained and expanded, in part because this type of coordination is as foreign to the U.S. and allied governments as it is to those in the developing world. Without General Jones or kindred figures marshaling the effort and forcing inter-departmental and international coordination, the ingrained habits of bureaucratic turf protection, programmatic stove-pipes, and general lack of strategic and operational coordination reasserted themselves.

The failure to sustain and capitalize on the Jenin Initiative to improve conditions in this troubled and influential area of the world remains extremely costly not just to the Israelis and Palestinians, but to the United States and the cause of global security. Still today, not just in the Middle East but around the world, the United States and our allies remain uncoordinated in our engagement efforts, and remain more geared for conflict and emergency response than crisis prevention.

The West Bank experience spotlights the necessity of modernizing U.S. global engagement. 1) By adopting a prevention strategy and 2) by synching public and private sector initiatives to build peace, prosperity, and markets abroad in the only way that’s possible: melding security, economic development, and good governance rooted in the rule of law. This new approach doesn’t necessarily require us to spend more. It requires us to apply our resources more wisely.

If the U.S. and our allies in global security do not act proactively and apply our unique resources comprehensively, we will be required to respond to crisis and instability with our troops and arms.

P4P in Action—Engagement Mission Phase Chart

Phase 1: Planning

Country/zone selection: Identify the engagement mission target area (in consultation with appropriate officials, experts, and stakeholders) using merit-based criteria such as the country's critical needs and opportunities, level of instability, strategic importance, and host government support and cooperation.

Country analysis: Consult with U.S. and allied country teams (Ambassadors, geographic combatant commanders, etc.) and the host government authorities to assess needs and identify partnering opportunities across the three domains.

Hypothetically, the candidate country may cite needs as follows:

Security: Improve community policing tactics.

Economic and development: Identify the extent of its mineral wealth and agricultural potential and improve its emergency food distribution system.

Good governance and rule of law: Improve the efficiency of its court system.

Phase 2: Initiative Development

Team and initiative development: P4P will establish a public-private sector engagement team having interests, assistance capabilities, and assets aligned with identified needs and opportunities.

In this example the hypothetical team would be drawn from:

USG: NSC Country Director; representatives from the State Department, Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Department of Energy, Department of Homeland Security, and USAID; former personnel from the U.S. military and National Guard; and former police chiefs.

Private sector: security companies, mining and exploration companies, agribusiness firms, and law firms.

NGOs: Major Cities Chiefs Police Association, St. Mary's Food Bank, World Food Programme, CARE International, Mercy Corps, World Bank, Transparency International, Lawyers Without Borders

Engagement plan: In coordination with the engagement team and host country stakeholders, P4P will develop an engagement plan of potential joint initiatives and projects and a project plan for their implementation.

Phase 3: Execution

Engagement mission: The engagement team will be deployed to the host country. Based on in-person discussions, a comprehensive project plan will be established that sets forth objectives, benchmarks, and needed partnerships and resources to carry out agreed-upon projects and initiatives.

Implementation: P4P will track progress and marshal follow through to ensure that all engagement commitments are fulfilled and assist in eliminating impediments to project/program fulfillment.

Phase 4: Evaluation

Evaluation: P4P will track and regularly report the status of all projects and initiatives carried out under the engagement plan; evaluate success in achieving objectives; and document lessons learned.

In Their Words

“Promoting and operationalizing the joint deployment of government officials, business leaders, and NGO representatives abroad, through ‘engagement missions’ that will enable these individuals to reinforce their unique capabilities and value proposition. No other country is better suited to provide holistic approaches to comprehensive economic, political, and social problems than the United States. It is among our most potent comparative advantages and we must harness it.”

—General James L. Jones, USMC (Ret.)

“The challenges we face in America and around the world are increasingly complex, and neither the private nor the public sector can solve them alone. Public-private partnerships were a hallmark of Mike Bloomberg’s approach as Mayor of New York City. Bloomberg Philanthropies takes a similar approach, bringing together people, ideas and resources from across sectors toward a common purpose and amplifying their impact.”

—Bloomberg Philanthropies

“What we need is an independent unit — made up of people from governments, the private sector and civil society — to track pledges and progress, not just on aid but also on trade, governance, investment... The promise we made at the start of this century was not to perpetuate the old relationships between donors and recipients, but to create new ones, with true partners accountable to each other and above all to the citizens these systems are supposed to work for. Strikes me as the right sort of arrangement for an age of austerity as well as interdependence.”

—Bono

“The United States’ interagency tool kit is still a hodgepodge of jury-rigged arrangements constrained by a dated and complex patchwork of authorities, persistent shortfalls in resources, and unwieldy processes.”

—Robert M. Gates, former Secretary of Defense

“Person-to-person diplomacy in today’s world is as important as what we do in official meeting in national capitals across the globe. It can’t be achieved, though, just by our government asserting it. It can only be achieved by the kind of public-private partnerships that the United States is uniquely known for...people and groups working across sectors, industries; working together with persistence and creativity to fulfill that promise of a new beginning and translate it into positive benefit.”

—Hillary Rodham Clinton, former Secretary of State

“One of the more promising developments in recent years has been the increasing use of private-public partnerships to provide foreign assistance in more effective and creative ways.”

—Bill Gates

“Private sector and civil society exhibit enormous ingenuity and innovation...And we must tap [this] ingenuity...through strategic partnerships with the private sector, nongovernmental organizations, foundations, and community-based organizations. Such partnerships are critical to U.S. success at home and abroad, and we will support them through enhanced opportunities for engagement, coordination, transparency, and information sharing.”

—National Security Strategy, May 2010

Economic competitiveness and U.S. national security

The United States must bolster the presence of America's highly capable but under-deployed private sector in strategically key regions of the world in order to enhance diplomacy, improve foreign relations and, in turn, safeguard U.S. national security



By General James L. Jones, Jr.

As America considers its global strategy in this still young and opportunity-filled century, we have the chance to deploy a potent but under-utilized asset. This is our nation's vast and highly capable private sector. U.S. businesses and NGOs can help to enhance diplomacy and improve foreign relations, filling the vacuum as our uniformed presence is readjusted after a decade of military and civil reconstruction in Iraq and Afghanistan.

In 'pivoting' ourselves to better face emerging global trends and

an evolving security environment, it is logical to attempt to increase America's influence by capitalizing on the enormous potential of our private sector. Doing so is imperative in this era of global economic integration in which prosperity and security are inseparable. Today, entrepreneurs, investors and innovators are as instrumental as diplomats, generals and politicians in winning friends and influencing attitudes at the all-important grass-roots level of the global community.

Background

Many allies, friends and influential parties in strategically vital regions of the world (the Middle East, South Asia and Africa) remain eager for economic engagement with the U.S. More often, however, they find the Chinese knocking at their door. China's 'go-out' strategy is increasing its global influence and competitiveness in up-and-coming regions while America's economic engagement in many of these areas is slipping behind. Increasingly, leaders in these regions are asking: "Where is America?"

President Barzani of Iraq's Kurdistan region gave powerful expression to the dynamic recently,

noting that "four American companies (in Kurdistan) are worth two Army divisions" when it comes to building goodwill and sustaining influence. Yet he remains frustrated by the relative absence of the U.S. private sector and by obsolete U.S. policies that impede greater American business engagement in a region which has been defined by many as "the next Dubai."

Partly, the absence of America's private sector from less-developed but strategically key areas is the result of market factors and a high level of risk aversion on the part of mature enterprises. The problem, however, is deepened significantly by 20th century impediments erected by the federal government for a world that no longer exists. These range from specific policies, such as over-restrictive travel restrictions that discourage economic interaction, to more general and pervasive problems such as the reflexive distrust and adversarial approach that government too frequently adopts in dealing with the private sector.

In today's global economy and complex security environment, our public and private sectors must work together to advance U.S. interests and

values abroad. This memo suggests strategic areas where we should focus on bolstering U.S. private-sector presence and identifies steps that we can take to foster better positioning.

Kurdistan: the people of Iraq's Kurdish region love America. Kurdistan is a stable, secure and flourishing semi-autonomous region that possesses significant natural resources. America has a long history with the Kurds dating back to Operation Provide Comfort in 1991, when a U.S.-led international military mission rescued the Kurdish population from possible genocide at the hands of Saddam Hussein. The Kurdish Regional Government, now the governing authority in Kurdistan, very much desires the investment and presence of U.S. companies. But with only a few exceptions the response has been disappointing.

In pulling our troops out of Iraq, where we have sacrificed so much, without a comprehensive strategy to fill the vacuum of influence that is left, we would suffer a monumental loss of face. The vacuum would be filled by those who are in opposition to our interests. This would be a grave strategic error.

Our interests in the Middle East are today more significant than ever. The Arab Spring can change the region in a positive way for a long time to come. The potential benefits, however, bump up against numerous dangers, including those posed by Iran's nuclear ambitions, threats to the flow of oil from the Persian Gulf, and the abject failure of the Middle East Peace Process to date.

It is in America's national security interest to obtain influence on every front possible in this strategically consequential region – from Kurdistan to Arab Spring countries such as Libya and most certainly in Syria when the ruling tyrant is forced to depart. The engagement of our private sector with Middle East countries and regions

hungry for economic partnership with the United States can help to increase our influence by building relationships at the grass-roots level where they are most enduring and conducive to international harmony. The risk lies in not having a strategy to deal with each instance as it happens.

Security, economic development, and a rule of law that reflects the will of those that led these revolutions are the three pillars upon which long-term success must be built. The United States has a great opportunity to lead an international effort that can rapidly respond to the demands of the people and avoid the Arab Spring upheavals being captured by radical elements that happen to be better organized, but do not represent the will of the people.

African opportunity

In the case of Kurdistan, fears that the engagement of American-owned companies will undermine America's 'One Iraq Policy' are ill-founded. On the contrary, the ability of the Kurdistan Regional Government to demonstrate what is possible when government and society create a safe, stable and welcoming environment for domestic enterprise and foreign partners will serve as an instructive and inspirational model for the whole of Iraq. At the very least, it represents an opportunity to send a strong message to the Maliki regime that its flirtations with Iran and support of Syria are not what we had in mind when we liberated Iraq from Saddam Hussein.

Africa: The strategic importance of Africa is clearly on the rise. The region is rich in human capital and natural resources, and offers unmatched potential. Recognizing these realities, the Chinese, in particular, are highly active diplomatically and economically on the continent. While China applies a full-court press for influence and economic engagement,

we are perceived as content to adopt a relatively passive posture with regard to competing on the continent. As President Kagame of Rwanda commented recently, "It's interesting to note that as America pivots towards Asia, Asia is pivoting toward Africa." If America ignores the staggering opportunity in Africa, others will fill the void. The consequences of our inertia will be felt in still more losses of American jobs, an increasing absence of strategic relationships, and the erosion of goodwill that could otherwise be within our grasp. Let there be no mistake: Africa wants the United States to be "present and not absent."

This is a pivotal time for Africa. It is an enormous continent that can be influenced either by China offering a troublesome model of state capitalism and the subordination of human rights to political objectives, or by the United States and Europe, possibly offering a better future based on free enterprise, competitive markets and fundamental human rights. The decision to establish the U.S. Africa Command (USAFRICOM) was based on an understanding of the continent's strategic importance and the need for us to engage more rigorously at both the civilian and military levels. If this engagement is to be successful, it must include the energetic participation of the U.S. private sector, which is uniquely suited to bring beneficial investment, trade and economic development to the table.

Africa, every bit as much as Asia, represents the competitive battleground of the future. The sooner we realize this fact, the sooner we can adjust our global strategy to commit the full weight of our national influence to this continent.

Eastern Europe: NATO has welcomed into its fold new members from Eastern Europe, countries that love freedom, respect America and



U.S. private sector involvement can help to prevent radical elements from exploiting the Arab Spring

are eager to participate in the global economy and embrace modernity. The United States has enormous national interests at stake in fostering the maturation of these countries and solidifying our political and economic ties with each of them. The nations of the former Soviet Bloc have wide-ranging needs and offer tremendous opportunities as their people continue their journey from oppression and poverty to freedom and prosperity. Again, our private sector can play an instrumental role in facilitating this journey, developing closer strategic ties and winning for America greater influence that will pay dividends for many years to come.

The U.S. government has the need, the opportunity and the capability to foster greater private-sector engagement in strategically vital areas around the globe. Here are some specific steps the U.S. government can take to facilitate economic diplomacy as an enabler of national influence and foundation for goodwill abroad:

- Better integrate the private sector into diplomatic strategic planning, programs, priorities and operations;
- Ensure that the private sector has a forum for providing input and support to combatant commands and U.S. country teams;
- Bolster State Department efforts

to identify market opportunities and partnership for the U.S. private sector in key strategic areas abroad;

- Improve the Commerce Department's process for approving ambassadorial advocacy for firms seeking work and contracts overseas;
- Sponsor regional trade and investment fairs at home and abroad with an emphasis on areas where the U.S. private sector is underrepresented and our strategic interests are significant;
- Increase the tempo of U.S. trade missions to key strategic areas;
- Vigorously pursue trade promotion, market access, and investment liberalization arrangements between the U.S. and strategically vital countries;
- Improve the agility and resourcing of our export promotion and financing effort to expand economic engagement abroad energetically, appropriately and sustainably;
- Exercise presidential leadership to set a tone strongly supportive of government's legitimate and important role in promoting the U.S. private sector's interests and engagements internationally;
- Embark on a complete overhaul of our Export Control laws and

policies to enhance American companies' ability to compete with the globalized world.

Conclusion

In sharp contrast to the 20th century, we now live in a multi-polar world, one which we largely created as a result of the enormous sacrifice of two World Wars and the vision that ensued. With the demise of the Soviet Union, the 20th century world has disappeared. We now face new challenges to our accustomed role, but these do not mean that we cannot be just as successful in this new century as we were in the last.

It will take work, discipline, tenacity and vision by all of us. For those upon whose shoulders falls the mantle of leadership, more will be asked. The nation will demand that our leaders make decisions for the common good and that they set the example by how those decisions are made. There is no doubt that the world still wants and needs America; the question today is whether America is able to rise to that challenge. The answer will be determined by our elected leaders and by the courage that they demonstrate in tackling issues that all Americans know must be addressed.

When a nation cannot bring itself to take on the issues it knows it must address for its own good, then surely that is the first true sign of decline. We should never let that happen. ■

General James L. Jones, Jr. is chairman-designate of the Scowcroft Center on International Security at the Atlantic Council. He most recently served as national security advisor to President Barack Obama. General Jones was also supreme allied commander Europe and commandant of the Marine Corps

Rebranding America

By BONO

Published: October 17, 2009

NEW YORK TIMES

A FEW years ago, I accepted a Golden Globe award by barking out an expletive.

One imagines President Obama did the same when he heard about his Nobel, and not out of excitement.

When Mr. Obama takes the stage at Oslo City Hall this December, he won't be the first sitting president to receive the peace prize, but he might be the most controversial. There's a sense in some quarters of these not-so-United States that Norway, Europe and the World haven't a clue about the real President Obama; instead, they fixate on a fantasy version of the president, a projection of what they hope and wish he is, and what they wish America to be.

Well, I happen to be European, and I can project with the best of them. So here's why I think the virtual Obama is the real Obama, and why I think the man might deserve the hype. It starts with a quotation from a speech he gave at the United Nations last month:

"We will support the Millennium Development Goals, and approach next year's summit with a global plan to make them a reality. And we will set our sights on the eradication of extreme poverty in our time."

They're not my words, they're your president's. If they're not familiar, it's because they didn't make many headlines. But for me, these 36 words are why I believe Mr. Obama could well be a force for peace and prosperity — if the words signal action.

The millennium goals, for those of you who don't know, are a persistent nag of a noble, global compact. They're a set of commitments we all made nine years ago whose goal is to halve extreme poverty by 2015. Barack Obama wasn't there in 2000, but he's there now. Indeed he's gone further — all the way, in fact. Halve it, he says, then end it.

Many have spoken about the need for a rebranding of America. Rebrand, restart, reboot. In my view these 36 words, alongside the administration's approach to fighting nuclear proliferation and climate change, improving relations in the Middle East and, by the way, creating jobs and providing health care at home, are rebranding in action.

These new steps — and those 36 words — remind the world that America is not just a country but an idea, a great idea about opportunity for all and responsibility to your fellow man.

All right ... I don't speak for the rest of the world. Sometimes I think I do — but as my bandmates will quickly (and loudly) point out, I don't even speak for one small group of four musicians. But I will venture to say that in the farthest corners of the globe, the president's words are more than a pop song people want to hear on the radio. They are lifelines.

In dangerous, clangorous times, the idea of America rings like a bell (see King, M. L., Jr., and Dylan, Bob). It hits a high note and sustains it without wearing on your nerves. (If only we all could.) This was the melody line of the Marshall Plan and it's resonating again. Why? Because the world sees that America might just hold the keys to solving the three greatest threats we face on this planet: extreme poverty, extreme ideology and extreme climate change. The world senses that America, with renewed global support, might be better placed to defeat this axis of extremism with a new model of foreign policy.

It is a strangely unsettling feeling to realize that the largest Navy, the fastest Air Force, the fittest strike force, cannot fully protect us from the ghost that is terrorism Asymmetry is the key word from Kabul to Gaza Might is not right.

I think back to a phone call I got a couple of years ago from Gen. James Jones. At the time, he was retiring from the top job at NATO; the idea of a President Obama was a wild flight of the imagination.

General Jones was curious about the work many of us were doing in economic development, and how smarter aid — embodied in initiatives like President George W. Bush's Emergency Program for AIDS Relief and the Millennium Challenge Corporation — was beginning to save lives and change the game for many countries. Remember, this was a moment when America couldn't get its cigarette lighted in polite European nations like Norway; but even then, in the developing world, the United States was still seen as a positive, even transformative, presence.

The general and I also found ourselves talking about what can happen when the three extremes — poverty, ideology and climate — come together. We found ourselves discussing the stretch of land that runs across the continent of Africa, just along the creeping sands of the Sahara — an area that includes Sudan and northern Nigeria. He also agreed that many people didn't see that the Horn of Africa — the troubled region that encompasses Somalia and Ethiopia — is a classic case of the three extremes becoming an unholy trinity (I'm paraphrasing) and threatening peace and stability around the world.

The military man also offered me an equation. Stability = security + development.

In an asymmetrical war, he said, the emphasis had to be on making American foreign policy conform to that formula.

Enter Barack Obama.

If that last line still seems like a joke to you ... it may not for long.

Mr. Obama has put together a team of people who believe in this equation. That includes the general himself, now at the National Security Council; the vice president, a former chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; the Republican defense secretary; and a secretary of state, someone with a long record of championing the cause of women and girls living in poverty, who is now determined to revolutionize health and agriculture for the world's poor. And it looks like the bipartisan coalition in Congress that accomplished so much in global development over the past eight years is still holding amid rancor on pretty much everything else. From a development perspective, you couldn't dream up a better dream team to pursue peace in this way, to rebrand America.

The president said that he considered the peace prize a call to action. And in the fight against extreme poverty, it's action, not intentions, that counts. That stirring sentence he uttered last month will ring hollow unless he returns to next year's United Nations summit meeting with a meaningful, inclusive plan, one that gets results for the billion or more people living on less than \$1 a day. Difficult. Very difficult. But doable.

The Nobel Peace Prize is the rest of the world saying, "Don't blow it."

But that's not just directed at Mr. Obama. It's directed at all of us. What the president promised was a "global plan," not an American plan. The same is true on all the other issues that the Nobel committee cited, from nuclear disarmament to climate change — none of these things will yield to unilateral approaches. They'll take international cooperation and American leadership.

The president has set himself, and the rest of us, no small task.

That's why America shouldn't turn up its national nose at popularity contests. In the same week that Mr. Obama won the Nobel, the United States was ranked as the most admired country in the world, leapfrogging from seventh to the top of the Nation Brands Index survey — the biggest jump any country has ever made. Like the Nobel, this can be written off as meaningless ... a measure of Mr. Obama's celebrity (and we know what people think of celebrities).

But an America that's tired of being the world's policeman, and is too pinched to be the world's philanthropist, could still be the world's partner. And you can't do that without being, well, loved. Here come the letters to the editor, but let me just say it: Americans are like singers — we just a little bit, kind of like to be loved. The British want to be admired; the Russians, feared; the French, envied. (The Irish, we just want to be listened to.) But the idea of America, from the very start, was supposed to be contagious enough to sweep up and enthrall the world.

And it is. The world wants to believe in America again because the world needs to believe in America again. We need your ideas — your idea — at a time when the rest of the world is running out of them.