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Policymakers today face a world where unprecedented opportunities are emerging even as long-running challenges resist resolution. Rising flows of people, energy, information, and more across borders have deepened interdependence among nations, strengthening common interests and exposing new opportunities for enhancing international cooperation. At the same time, protests in emerging democracies and rising tensions in several geopolitical hotspots from China to Ukraine serve as powerful reminders that historical contests over territory, resources, and political representation are far from over.

In this issue of *New Perspectives in Foreign Policy*, young professionals take on some of these developments at home and abroad, offering their ideas for how policymakers can respond to the promise and perils of a rapidly changing global landscape.

Looking first at East Africa, Michelle Melton explores the opportunities for development of the region’s natural gas resources, arguing that, while uncertainty in global gas markets will complicate development of these resources, this could turn out to be a blessing in disguise for citizens in some of the world’s poorest countries.

Moving next to Turkey, Peter Vincze looks at root causes of the Gezi Park protests that began in May 2013, analyzing how the rise of a progressive youth demographic who largely do not identify with existing political parties and structures creates new challenges for Turkey’s political, social, and economic development.

In another look at the role of youth in politics, Minjun Chen takes us eastward to Asia, where youth nationalism in Japan and Korea over a territorial dispute is rising, and explores strategies for how people-to-people exchanges can help improve long-term prospects for cooperation between two key U.S. allies in Asia.

Finally, Clara Fritts provides a look at an issue closer to home, analyzing how an expanded role for the private sector can help address public concerns over federal government surveillance programs in the United States and begin the difficult process of rebuilding public trust in the wake of the Edward Snowden leaks.

Even as challenges to international cooperation and domestic stability appear to be mounting around the world, the benefits that can be realized from seizing emerging opportunities have never been greater. In this issue of *New Perspectives in Foreign Policy*, we are pleased to offer analysis and insights from leading young professionals on how we can understand today’s emerging challenges.

SINCERELY,

*New Perspectives* Editorial Board
The opportunities and challenges for natural gas development in East Africa are immense, and the stakes are high. Optimism about the prospects for natural gas development in East Africa has animated public interest in the region since 2010, when significant quantities of natural gas were discovered off the coast of Mozambique. Since that initial discovery (and an earlier oil discovery in Uganda), the pace and scope of hydrocarbon exploration in the region has accelerated and subsequently spread to Tanzania, Kenya, Ethiopia, Madagascar, and Somalia.

There is measured optimism that, if managed properly, these resources could be a game-changer for East Africa. These resources could be a potential lifeline for cash-strapped governments, providing significant revenue that could inject sorely needed investment into infrastructure, education, and agriculture. For a number of reasons, however, East African governments should not assume that the optimistic production forecasts will necessarily become reality—and certainly not in the near term. Following an early period of euphoria, the optimism and timeline has since been tempered. Even if the resources are developed, sustained revenue (beyond bonus payments) will not begin flowing to East African governments until companies recover their initial investments, unlikely before the end of the decade. In addition, it is likely that contract structure makes it such that market conditions at the time of production will significantly impact the size of the government take, exposing governments to both upside and downside risk.

Meanwhile, the challenges are considerable. As the estimated volume of conventional natural gas soars, exploration risk has virtually evaporated in Mozambique and Tanzania; at the same time, above-ground risks such as governance, cost, timing, and supply and demand in the global liquefied
The size of the global LNG market is likely to be the limiting or enabling factor for aspiring East African exporters. and the inexperience of national governments in managing natural resource wealth will lead to project delays and cost overruns at best. The challenge is not simply how to create an attractive enabling environment on paper—other countries have been able to do so—but how to strengthen institutions and resist the demands for immediate gratification from resource wealth. These concerns, while valid, are theoretically surmountable with adequate technical and managerial expertise and a commitment to transparency and good governance.

Ultimately, these above-ground risks are only one part of the equation. Even if East African governments do everything right, the size of the global LNG market is likely to be the limiting or enabling factor for aspiring East African exporters. The realities of the global LNG market—most importantly, demand growth and competitive potential suppliers in the medium term—will ultimately enable or hinder progress on the development of these resources. Viewed from this perspective, the outlook for East Africa gas is one of qualified optimism.

There is currently no LNG export infrastructure in East Africa, and building it will be tremendously expensive. LNG liquefaction facilities are some of the most capital-intensive projects in the world, with costs running upwards of $50 billion per facility. In addition to the liquefaction facilities, ports, storage, and other associated infrastructure are also needed. Accessing financing hinges on whether East African gas will have a guaranteed market with long-term contracts in place, which in turn depends on...
two factors. The first factor is supply: whether East African gas is competitive with other potential exporters. Some data indicate that East African gas is cost competitive with Canadian and Australian natural gas, but uncertainty remains. Second, and more importantly, is demand: whether global markets will be able to absorb the LNG (and the timing of East African LNG delivery relative to other LNG projects).

The LNG market is currently undergoing a period of change. Prices remain high in importing countries in Europe and Asia, and LNG demand has been growing at a rapid clip in the last few years, suggesting that there is ample room in the market for additional supplies. But there is significant uncertainty about the size of the LNG export market in the coming 10 to 20 years, and estimates vary widely. Factors affecting demand growth—primarily decisions about the role of nuclear in the energy sector, increasing gas penetration in the electricity and transport markets, and the medium- to long-term prospects for a climate agreement—are one source of uncertainty. Another is whether there will be sustained and strong enough growth to allow room for East African exporters (demand growth could outpace expectations, as it has the last decade). While at least some demand growth is a certainty, so is growth in the supply market, led by new gas discoveries and large volumes of gas coming online from the United States, Canada, Israel, Australia, and others. Supply could outpace demand not only due to weak demand growth, but due to surging supply. In this respect, significant uncertainty remains about the development of global shale gas resources. Even without East African resources, there are likely to be significant volumes of gas coming online in the next five years.

If supply does outpace demand, exporters that do not secure long-term contracts fast enough will effectively be shut out of the market for a time, at least at prices that make production commercially viable. As a result, timing is critical to the success of projects. It is likely that supply will be robust enough, and demand slack enough, that some—but not all—proposed LNG projects will be
able to be profitably sustained. It remains to be seen whether the projects in East Africa can be financed, built, and ready to export in time to lock in a share of the market, which is unlikely to expand dramatically in the near and medium term, short of dramatic growth from a robust economic resurgence or rapid and significant penetration of gas into the transportation sector. In short, a range of exogenous market and political factors will affect commercial decisions about developing natural gas resources, which in turn will determine whether East Africa will become a major gas exporter in the near or medium term.

While it generally does not matter to consumers where their gas molecules come from, how and whether natural gas development unfolds matters a lot for East African governments and their citizens. Whether the development of resources is a steady, ongoing process or one that unfolds intermittently has significant implications for East African governments’ revenues, resource management capabilities, and investments. In short, “when” and “how” matter. But regardless of if or when development occurs, governments and civil society should understand that monetizing these assets will not be possible for at least several years. East African governments should make resource management, budget, and planning decisions based not on resource optimism and rosy assessments, but on the principle that the only certainty about global natural gas markets is uncertainty. That may not be a welcome message among a population with raised expectations, but it is the only one that will result in prudent governance.

This can be a blessing in disguise, giving governments and civil society time to increase institutional capacity and put in place

How and whether natural gas development unfolds matters a lot for East African governments and their citizens.
adequate regulation. Properly managed, natural resource wealth can be a boon to local economies, but governments and companies should be wary of overpromising beyond what they can deliver—especially for resources like LNG that may not ultimately be developed (or at least not on the scale expected). The worst-case scenario for the general public in East Africa is not the absence of development, it is a scenario in which resource revenue fuels corruption and erodes the incentives for good governance and equitable development, and where Dutch disease undermines sustainable long-term growth. There is legitimate fear that East African gas producers could find themselves replicating the experiences of the continent’s significant oil producers, Nigeria and Angola, which have both failed to turn hydrocarbon revenues into equitable, broad-based development despite abundant resources. But this fate is not inevitable.

Michelle Melton is a research associate with the CSIS Energy and National Security program.

1. The discoveries were preceded by contract negotiations and exploration that began long before 2010.
2. The U.S. Geological Survey estimates that the region holds more than 440 trillion cubic feet (Tcf) of recoverable natural gas resources, along with 28 billion barrels of oil and 14 billion barrels of natural gas liquids (NGLs). Recent discoveries by Anadarko and ENI in Mozambique have bolstered optimism, with the companies announcing ever-larger discoveries (totaling over 100 Tcf, with more potentially yet to be discovered). Tanzania also has significant volumes of natural gas, although its reserves, estimated between 18–40 trillion cubic feet, are modest relative to Mozambique’s. Anadarko also recently announced that it has discovered gas deposits off Kenya’s coast.
4. Floating LNG may at some point be a commercially viable alternative for offshore producers, but it has not been demonstrated and the technology and cost are still somewhat uncertain.
5. Because the infrastructure is so expensive to finance, investors need to know that a potential project will have a steady stream of guaranteed revenue. Guaranteed revenue comes through locking in supply via long-term (typically 30-year) contracts.
7. This is due not only to the demand and supply growth, but also to the changing nature of LNG delivery contracts. However, even if the market was composed of a significant proportion of spot transactions, securing financing in such a market for large-scale infrastructure projects would be exceedingly difficult.
8. If a deal between Iran and the P5+1 is struck, Iran is also a competitive potential LNG supplier.
9. In the long-term, significant fuel-switching in electricity generation and a growing share of natural gas in the transportation sector may change the dynamics of the market and ensure a much larger demand for LNG than previously projected. However, this is not likely in the medium-term.
Turkey’s New, Progressive Youth: The Case of the Gezi Park Protests

Peter Vincze

Turkey’s Gezi Park protests last summer exposed the inability of the country’s current political parties to appeal to the newly emerging Western-oriented and educated Turkish youth and revealed the absence of a credible political force for this educated young population to follow. If not properly addressed, this political void could have serious repercussions for Turkey’s recent economic miracle as well as its fragile democracy.

In late May 2013, a small group of non-violent students and environmentalists began a protest in downtown Istanbul to voice their disagreement with a government initiative to redevelop Taksim Gezi Park. The sit-in initiated by the environmentalists began peacefully, but soon led to large-scale protests in Istanbul, Ankara, Antalya, Izmir, Adana, and other major Turkish cities, as police responded forcefully. Demonstrations continued through the end of July, when suspension of the Gezi Park redevelopment, a brutal police crackdown, and mass arrests subdued the protests. In the end, eight people died, thousands were injured, police detained more than 5,500 protesters, and the upheaval caused approximately $63 million in damages. Demonstrations on this scale had not been seen since the “lost decade” of the 1990s, a period characterized by political turmoil, short-lived coalition governments, heated debates about laïcité, vehement fighting with Kurdish separatists, and economic crisis.

Analysts of the region widely agree that while the ferocious government response ignited the initial sit-in, two main grievances incited the protests. First, Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan’s government had engaged in large-scale projects directly affecting the lives of many citizens without sufficient public consultation. Second, the ruling Justice and Development Party (AKP) had instituted policies, such as restricting alcohol consumption and expanding religious education in primary and secondary schools, which some segments of society perceived as intruding into their private lives and infringing on
their personal freedoms. While these factors undoubtedly sparked the protests, the underlying causes are more deeply rooted.

For more than 11 years, the governing AKP has instituted numerous political, social, and economic reforms. These not only pulled Turkey out of the economic and political malaise of the “lost decade,” but, as a side effect of these modernizing initiatives, also led to the emergence of a vibrant and “Western-like” social group, mainly associated with the country’s youth. These progressive youth demand respect toward fundamental human rights, including freedom of speech and individual autonomy; advocate for inclusionary politics bridging ethnic, religious, and social lines; believe in constant political dialogue between the government and the public; and oppose political micromanagement. They follow a secular lifestyle and tend to live in the urban areas of Western Turkey.

The attributes of this new generation of Western-oriented Turkish youth overlap significantly with those of the Gezi Park protest participants. The core Gezi Park protesters were young, well-educated, environmentally conscious professionals and students, many of whom had never taken part in demonstrations before. They tended to view AKP policies unfavorably, and some (especially the Alevi population) saw these policies as threats to their ethnic and sectarian identities, and typically supported the AKP’s main opposition, the Republican People’s Party (CHP). However, several polls conducted among Gezi Park protesters highlighted that the CHP did not necessarily represent their ideal political affiliation. Rather, they see the party as the lesser evil and the only force that can effectively counter the AKP.

Currently, the center-right AKP dominates the Turkish Parliament. The party’s traditional support base is in the conservative, Islamist circles of central Anatolia, as well as the working class, artisans, small
urban traders, and slum dwellers of major cities. The main opposition, CHP, is a center-left, social democratic, secularist, “Kemalist” force supported by the middle- and upper-middle classes, including leftist intellectuals, white-collar workers, civil servants, labor unions, and military personnel. Two other parties represented in parliament are the Nationalist Movement Party (MHP) and the Peace and Democracy Party (BDP). The far-right MHP, chiefly popular in the rural areas of central and eastern Anatolia, advocates a Turkish nationalist and pan-Turkish agenda. The BDP, which promotes Kurdish nationalism, draws its support from the Kurdish-inhabited territories of eastern and southeastern Anatolia.

There is thus a significant vacuum in the country’s political landscape. The AKP’s modernization efforts led to the emergence of a new political constituency that, for the time being at least, does not feel that any of the existing major political parties represent its values and interests. As recent protests related to the corruption scandal and the amendments to the judiciary, Internet, and national intelligence laws showcase, Prime Minister Erdoğan’s polarizing rhetoric and leadership style have only turned this new social group even further away from the AKP. So far, the CHP has resonated with the needs and views of this newly emerging group the most. However, these individuals vote for the party more because they lack any alternative than out of real conviction. The worse-than-expected performance of the CHP and all other opposition parties in the March 30, 2014, municipal elections gave an indication that such a wobbly support base can easily falter.
The Gezi Park protests highlighted the societal need for the establishment of a credible political force representing this new generation. Whether initiatives like the recently founded Gezi Party, which proposes to be a “genuine alternative to the traditional parties,”9 or other political forces are (or an AKP without Erdoğan were) able to fill the political void will determine whether Turkey’s social cohesion will be maintained and whether the country will remain an influential economic and political actor in the region and beyond. ■

2. Observers generally use the French term for “secularism” to describe the Turkish tradition of enforcing state secularism by banning overt public displays of religiosity (such as head scarves), a practice modeled on the French conception of the separation of church and state.
4. I use the term “core Gezi Park protesters” to label the group of individuals who initiated the Gezi Park protests. This terminology endeavors to distinguish them from other groups, for example, extremist and even terrorist organizations that consequently joined the events.
7. Ibid.
8. Kemalism refers to the political ideology of Founder of the Modern Turkish Republic Mustafa Kemal Atatürk built on the sixpartite principle of republicanism, populism, nationalism, secularism, statism, and reformism. The ideology emerged in the post–World War I era with the intention of transforming Turkey to a modern Western state and separating it from its Ottoman past.
OVER THE LAST FEW DECADES, peace in East Asia has been a core foreign policy priority for Washington that has paid enormous economic dividends for both the United States and the countries of the region. But at a time when tensions are rising across East Asia, a territorial dispute between Japan and Korea has helped to inflame historical tensions, chill relations, and undermine efforts to deepen cooperation on vital defense and economic issues between two key American allies. While the dispute itself is decades old, one troubling new consequence of recent actions is a resurgent nationalism in both Japanese and Korean youth. Despite their differences, both countries have an enormous interest in working together to promote regional security and prosperity. In order to ensure youth nationalism does not undermine long-term prospects for cooperation, the Japanese and Korean governments should work to expand and improve existing youth exchanges that provide opportunities to facilitate mutual understanding.

The dispute in question revolves around ownership of a cluster of small, uninhabited islands and their surrounding exclusive economic zones in the sea between Korea and Japan, which Seoul refers to as “Dokdo” and Tokyo as “Takeshima.” Despite a total surface area of less than half a square kilometer, one 2013 survey showed that 80 percent of Korean high school students view the dispute as a serious issue, and several groups of college students have set up youth organizations, such as the “Dokdo Racers,” to campaign in favor of Korea’s claims. Young Japanese have also become increasingly frustrated and vocal over the issue and what they view as Korean overreaction to both the issue of history and the dispute itself. Primary school textbooks in both countries have also been altered to reflect the countries’ competing sovereignty claims, further...
entrenching the dispute in the minds of youth.

Any attempt to solve this issue will inevitably require a multifaceted approach, but one tool that has proven helpful in establishing foundations for deepened cooperation between nations with difficult historical relations is youth exchanges. Officials in both Seoul and Tokyo have recognized youth exchanges as an important component in a comprehensive approach to cooling tensions and strengthening long-term relations. At a September 2013 cultural ministers meeting, high-level Korean and Japanese leaders reemphasized the need to supplement high-level talks with bottom-up approaches of revitalizing youth exchange programs to improve youth understanding and communication. But in order to maximize the positive effects of these efforts, serious improvements to the content, timing, and structure of current exchange programs are necessary.

From a design perspective, exchange programs should incorporate dialogue on political issues. Since the first Korea-Japan official youth exchange in 1987, programs have focused primarily on cultural engagement. While these programs are valuable in their own right, the expansion of existing programs or the creation of new initiatives that incorporate facilitated dialogues on issues such as the Dokdo-Takeshima dispute can help lead participants to reflect on and examine the factors that make up their political perceptions on the territorial disputes. These types of programs have had significant success in the past. The United Nations Development Program used this approach in 2007, when they brought together Iraqi leaders for a series of dialogues aimed at bridging the sectarian divide in that country. This ultimately helped participants agree on 17 principles for integrating and bridging the differences between different groups in their society. Existing Korea-Japan exchange programs should recognize that having youth directly engage each other on sensitive political topics, such as the islands dispute, can promote more nuanced understanding of the perspectives of both sides. Trilateral programs have already demonstrated this is possible: for example, the Japan-America Student
Conference and Korea-America Student Conference held a joint conference in January 2014 on improving trilateral ties.  

Second, youth exchanges should occur on a consistent basis, rather than being discontinued when tensions are high. Both sides have repeatedly canceled planned youth exchanges in response to actions deemed provocative, such as Korean Prime Minister Lee Myung-bak’s visit to the islands in August 2012. This undermines the gradual buildup of goodwill and strong people-to-people ties that is a natural outcome of regular exchanges. For example, the majority of donations from the United States to Japan in the aftermath of the devastating triple disaster that country suffered in March 2011 came from grassroots organizations, the result of more than 50 years of continuous people-to-people exchanges between the two nations. If the goal of youth exchanges is to develop these ties, holding programs hostage to the vagaries of day-to-day events clearly renders them less effective.

Third, it is important to develop channels to continue to engage alumni of youth exchange programs in dialogues after the programs are completed, and to facilitate contact between alumni. Having been exposed to different viewpoints during a short program, participants are prime ambassadors to return to their communities and share their experiences. The effects of interpersonal connections can be multiplied when experiences are shared and impact is spread beyond the ring of actual participants. In addition, programs should be developed to help encourage the participants to stay in touch with one another. The connections made during a short program can easily be lost if they are not maintained. If there are not platforms for continued connection, the effects of these programs will fade. Thus, youth exchanges should include post-programming to ensure that participants maintain connections.

Finally, a long-term goal for both governments should be to incorporate more monitoring and evaluating into existing and future programs to measure the effectiveness of these programs on changing youth perceptions and political attitudes toward the other country. Currently, few studies measure either changes in perception after exchange programs
or their long-term impact. Measuring youth perceptions right at the conclusion of the program can complement existing qualitative data and help pinpoint the impact of these programs, in addition to helping in the development of more effective programs over time. Further, because the impact of youth exchanges is ideally a lasting one, longitudinal studies could usefully be developed to build upon and measure the long-term impact of these exchanges on participants’ views, providing policymakers a valuable tool for evaluating their effectiveness.

The Dokdo-Takeshima dispute will continue to be a sticking point between America’s two strongest allies in East Asia for the foreseeable future. But while there is no easy fix available, both countries should embrace policies designed to diffuse tensions and promote cooperation over the long term. Consistent, well-designed youth exchanges that incorporate facilitated discussions on political issues can play an important role in this overall policy mix. Just as the Korean participants of the December 2013 “envoy exchange” visited Japan and retraced the steps of Korean envoys to the Tokugawa shogunate in the 17th and 18th century,7 by reviewing and gaining a fuller understanding of each other’s history and perspective, youth in both countries can become powerful ambassadors for understanding in their respective homes.

Minjun Chen is a former research intern with the Freeman Chair in China Studies at CSIS.

**Revisiting Surveillance: Using Private-Sector Engagement to Rebuild Government Trust**

Clara Fritts

**THE EDWARD SNOWDEN LEAKS** have set off a robust public debate over the nature and extent of U.S. government surveillance, but promises of reform and a plethora of hearings have—perhaps fairly—done little to stem rising mistrust of existing federal programs. There are real benefits when government employs technologies to meet national security needs that can balance privacy concerns with the need to improve efficiency in an otherwise sluggish bureaucracy. But the true nature of these technologies and their benefits are often obscured by technical jargon, and carry little weight in what has become an emotionally charged public debate. As Washington continues the difficult task of restoring public trust, officials should consider relying more on the private sector, which has so far proven more effective in the eyes of the public in managing the privacy concerns engendered by mass data collection and storage.

One of the main issues in this debate is the tension between a public desire to keep the government from directly controlling metadata filled with personal identity information (PII)\(^1\) and the government’s need for rapid access to pertinent data during a national security crisis and as a tool for prevention. Many in the intelligence community fear that limiting government access to such metadata would lead the system back into pre-September 11 inefficiency, where information sharing was hindered by bureaucracy and contributed to intelligence failures. On the other hand, public concern is understandable, given the extent to which analysis of patterns in metadata can reveal details of a person’s day-to-day activities, and perhaps it is to be expected, given the general distrust of government long prevalent in U.S. political culture.

To address these concerns, the 2014 Presidential Policy Directive (PPD) on signals intelligence,\(^2\) the formal reaction to the Snowden leaks, recommends the creation of a uni-
With privacy protections and national security on the line, it is essential to choose the right system moving forward.

A better solution is possible: surveillance databases could be kept in the private sector, where companies already collect and store substantial quantities of PII and have developed a set of best practices for ensuring consumer protection, such as limiting individuals’ access to PII and committing to only keep data for a publicly disclosed length of time. This is important for ensuring public trust, as the Snowden leaks have highlighted a general discomfort among Americans with individuals—even a limited pool of highly trained individuals—being able to access PII. Meanwhile, despite companies’ use of the data they gather to target advertising, track movements online, and even follow physical movements, private companies have yet to suffer significant backlash. Of course, this is due partly to the differing natures of the public and private spheres:
private companies provide services in exchange for, or as part of, gathering PII, and do not have the power to arrest, which reduces users’ aversion to submitting this information.\textsuperscript{4}

In developing software to utilize such a “federalized database” that would draw from existing private-sector resources, the government could also incorporate elements within the platform architecture that would ensure transparency regarding rules for accessing PII and ensure increased protection of Americans’ privacy and civil liberties. Here, again, the private-sector experience can be instructive: companies have been using privacy and civil liberty recommendations from nonpartisan groups to incorporate legal frameworks into their products for years, such as limiting and maintaining records on who accesses PII. Moreover, the technological capacity required to construct this federalized system already exists within the intelligence community (IC), and by obviating the need for the third-party body recommended in the PPD, building this system would address IC concerns that an additional layer of bureaucracy would impede the system’s usability. On top of the architecture, the IC has access to the technological capacity to federalize data and pull from different databases, mitigating the need for a third party, as recommended in the PPD, while keeping the system moving efficiently.

Admittedly, this still leaves the issue of creating the actual platform where information can be accessed safely and quickly. In this scenario, the IC faces a technological hurdle of federalizing, or creating a system of access management for, the data in a secure way that incorporates privacy protections. This is not an impossible challenge, and cases exist where federalizing databases has in fact created a more efficient and safer system, despite its being more difficult than moving the data to a third-party database.\textsuperscript{5}

Some might argue that incorporating additional measures to protect PII and increase transparency would create vulnerabilities for the IC, but in fact, strengthening public understanding of program infrastructure could go a long way toward rebuilding trust between
Clara Fritts is a former program coordinator and research associate with the Strategic Technologies Program at CSIS.
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