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Truth, terrorism, AND TELEVISION
1. National Security and the Partisan Divide
Mike Rogers, former congressman and former chair of the House Intelligence Committee, spoke at RAND on how today’s political environment affects national security policy.
MORE AT www.rand.org/a150421

2. Heart Health
Making physical activity part of your daily routine now can pay off with a lifetime of health benefits. Sticking with one small change at a time for 4–6 weeks helps it become part of your daily routine.
MORE AT www.rand.org/t/IG118

3. Weaving Science into Government Decisions
As the City of Santa Monica’s research partner on The Wellbeing Project, RAND is helping to identify measurable social, physical, and economic conditions that cultivate communities that thrive and flourish.
MORE AT www.rand.org/b150429

4. RAND Center for Asia Pacific Policy
This video highlights how RAND is helping communities in China, Indonesia, Vietnam, and elsewhere in the region solve critical problems pertaining to environment, education, and mental health.
MORE AT www.rand.org/capp

5. Police–Community Relations
Criminologist Jessica Saunders presented testimony on performance metrics to improve police-community relations before a joint committee of the California State Assembly and California State Public Safety Committees earlier this year.
MORE AT www.rand.org/t/CT423
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Elba Ramirez added a turkey burger, healthy tacos, and other nutritious meals to the cheesburgers and chili dogs on the menu of her Los Angeles-area food truck. The healthier options have sold well enough that she’s considering adding a veggie burger and rice bowls. “I like to cook, I like food. I thought it would be good business,” she explained.
In the Interest of Justice

On May 16, 2015, K. Jack Riley delivered a commencement speech to graduates of the Department of Criminology at the University of Pennsylvania School of Arts and Sciences. Below are excerpts from his speech.

The line between criminal justice and national security is getting blurrier all the time. Many of the same issues that burden our communities also burden our foreign policy and our conduct of international affairs. Consider these issues that have been in the news lately: profiling, sexual assault, and apprehension and detention practices.

We are all familiar with profiling in the context of police stops of motor vehicles or in the context of TSA and Homeland Security officials trying to spot terrorists at airports. But profiling is used in many other efforts to counter violent extremism. Most notably, the president has the power, on the basis of behavioral and physical profiling of suspected terrorists, to authorize “signature strikes” with drones, meaning that the government can attack and potentially kill someone based not on trial and conviction but on behavior patterns alone.

The issue of sexual assaults affects our security institutions greatly. For example, in the absence of analysis, the issue of sexual assault in the military had become so heated that some members of Congress were proposing to overturn several decades, if not centuries, of precedent and move sexual assault offenses out of the military chain of command and into the civilian system.

We see the issue of police apprehension exploding nationwide because of the use of force against civilians in Ferguson and Staten Island and Baltimore and beyond. Likewise, in military detention over the past decade, we have seen deplorable acts of abuse committed by our own people at Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq and troubling methods of prisoner interrogation at Guantánamo Bay detention camp in Cuba.

These events could cause us to doubt the fairness of our systems of justice. In all of these cases, at home and abroad, personal security is at stake, liberties are at stake, and lives are at stake. How do we simultaneously ensure security, preserve liberty, and protect lives?

This is where I am looking to you for help. You will be the probation officers, the corrections officers, and the forensics experts in whose hands the liberty of many will reside. You will be the legal scholars, judges, journalists, and academics who will debate and tip the ever-shifting balance between security and liberty.

So, although I don’t have the answers to the many tough questions we face, I do have three principles that I think can help your generation of practitioners and scholars take us where we need to go.

**Principle No. 1: Commit yourselves to objective, dispassionate, scientific analysis.** Advocacy is laudable and necessary, but it must be grounded empirically before it can succeed.

Back in the mid-2000s, [two colleagues and I] became interested in drug sentencing. California and Arizona voters had passed ballot initiatives that were in large part motivated by the perceived oversentencing of low-level drug offenders, especially marijuana offenders. In both states, the initiatives were expected to divert these offenders, thought to be low-level, from prison to treatment.

We secured the cooperation of prosecutors in both states and traced the paths of individuals from arrest, through prosecution and plea-bargaining, to their ultimate sentence. We coded the quantities of drugs each person had been caught with, the absence or presence of a firearm, and other factors. We also traced what happened during the plea-bargaining process. As the graduates here know, plea-bargaining is the widely accepted practice under which prosecutors and offenders negotiate, typically for shorter prison sentences in exchange for sure convictions.

What we found surprised many people. Namely, the black boxes of prosecution and plea-bargaining had been obscuring the ground truth: The offenders who had been imprisoned on low-level drug charges had often pled down their cases from far more serious offenses, frequently involving substantial quantities of drugs.

Our analysis supported what the district attorneys were claiming in both states: that they would no longer have the incentive to plea-
We should never confuse the court of public opinion with the court of due process.

The moral of the story? Don’t be afraid to use your careers to look inside black boxes, to find out things that are counterintuitive, and to help us get to the ground truth as a first step in the prolonged process of creating lasting change. So gather your facts and illuminate what is dark, because real contributions are made when people challenge the conventional wisdom. Scientific rigor matters enormously in the field of criminal justice, where freedom and lives are at stake. Remain committed to scientific principles not in the interest of science, but in the interest of justice.

Principle No. 2: Hold your research and analysis up to the highest level of criticism you can. Virtually nothing you do in a professional capacity is likely to remain anonymous or undiscovered in the modern era. Whether your work ends up on the front page of the New York Times or on the homepage of Gawker or BuzzFeed, your analytic and scholarly efforts—and your motives—are increasingly likely to be dissected through crowdsourcing and searing public exposure. Rigorous peer review will help ensure that your work is ready for the harsh glare of public scrutiny.

Pick your harshest critics and have them test your assumptions and analysis. And don’t rely on the temptation to have just your final document reviewed. Invite criticism and new perspectives at interim stages of your work to help ensure that you don’t go off on the wrong track. Every aspect of your work should be subjected to extensive criticism and feedback, from beginning to end, before it is released. Because it will be after.

[For example, we] worked on the issue of racial profiling in Oakland, California. The Oakland analysis focused on the issue of potential racial bias in routine traffic stops. We helped design the data collection form. To make sure our data collection methods were widely credible, we involved the police, civil rights leaders, and community groups in designing the methods.

One result of the data analysis was counterintuitive to everyone: We found no overt pattern of racism in the initial decision to stop a motorist. However, the results did point to two trouble spots. First, there were individual officers whose patterns of traffic stops stood out as outliers compared with their peers who had conducted traffic stops in very closely matched circumstances. Second, community members and civil rights leaders had urged us to design data collection methods that included post-stop activities. It was a great lead. They strongly suspected, and our analysis later confirmed, that there were racial disparities in certain post-stop activities, with African-American drivers more likely to be detained longer and to be pat searched for weapons than were their white counterparts.

The moral of the story is to incorporate the key stakeholders into your work, to involve them in rigorous stakeholder reviews, and to adapt your course based on that input.

Principle No. 3: Don’t let heinous events and inflammatory rhetoric lead you astray from the principles our country and legal system were founded upon. Tone matters, and the tenor of a lot of public discourse today ... is far too often undignified and irresponsible. Irresponsible discourse can spill over into irresponsible behavior. Irresponsible behavior and coarse discourse erode the foundations of what I would call a civil society.

Our legal system is founded upon the core notions of a right to fair trial and of being innocent until proven guilty. As our chronological and psychological distance grows from the 9/11 terrorist attacks, which occurred in 2001 when many of you were quite young, the heat of that era’s rhetoric recedes, but the consequences linger.

This past December, more than 13 years after the 9/11 attacks, the U.S. Senate Intelligence Committee released a long-awaited report that makes clear that we have tortured people and that torturing them did nothing to help us gather intelligence from them. This is true of some detainees who were neither captured on a battlefield, nor even caught trying to evade police, but who turned themselves in believ-
Mentorship runs two ways. I am learning as much as, if not more than, my students are.

Krishna Kumar is the director of RAND Labor and Population and holds the distinguished chair in international economic policy at RAND. He also leads the Gene and Maxine Rosenfeld Program on Asian Development, which provides financial support for Pardee RAND Graduate School students and faculty to explore critical issues related to Asian economic, social, and political development.

Reaching the 80 Percent

Q You just returned from a four-day trip to Jordan. Many of your projects are international. What drives your interest in these research opportunities?

A Forty percent of the world lives on less than $2 a day. Eighty percent lives on less than $10 a day. I have always believed that, for RAND to have global impact, it needs to address the well-being of these people. The tough part is that the people who need our help the most are the people who can afford us the least. Finding funding to work in these areas is pretty difficult.

At RAND, I lead the Rosenfeld Program, which provides financial support for Pardee RAND Graduate School students and faculty to explore issues related to development in Asia. This role, along with my distinguished chair, gives me the flexibility to explore new markets and countries where we can be of assistance.

They supplement the funding that I get for research.

What are three projects that the Rosenfeld Program has made possible?

Well, we just finished a three-year randomized trial in China assessing whether a training program to help farmers use fertilizers more optimally worked or not. The project was funded by 3IE, an international foundation, but it didn’t cover all of the costs. The Rosenfeld Program bridged the gaps.

And with the Indian School of Business, we got funding from the Rockefeller Foundation to evaluate a low-income housing project in India. The Rosenfeld Program enabled the groundwork we had to do for this project.

Finally, we are looking at informal labor markets in Bangladesh. More than 85 percent of the labor market in Bangladesh is informal, meaning workers might not have benefits, or might not have a contract. We want to know, Are they stuck there? Are they choosing to be there? What is the path forward for them?

What positive outcomes have you seen as a result of your research?

We found, for rice farmers in China, those who were not using fertilizer are now doing so; and those who were overusing fertilizer have cut down—bringing both “poorer” and “richer” farmers closer to optimal usage levels.

For our low-income housing project, the private sector in India is now entering the market to provide affordable solutions for the working poor, so that they can buy their own homes.

What role do students play in your research?

Part of the Rosenfeld Program is clearly aimed at working with Pardee RAND fellows. These fellows are part of the projects from start to finish—and beyond. Their dissertations sometimes spin off from the research projects.

It’s a well-kept secret that mentorship runs two ways. I am learning as much as, if not more than, they are. I wear many hats, but teaching and advising students is probably the most enjoyable part of my work.

Looking ahead, what issue do you think is most important, to our world and its people, to explore?

In the developing world, most people are very young. In Bangladesh, India, and Jordan there is a burgeoning young population. The question is, Will we reap the demographic dividend, or will it become a demographic disaster? These people will be in the labor force for another 40 to 50 years. Some of the best things that RAND could do, and I hope to be a part of, would be in the area of youth employment.
Terrorism and Television

A Conversation with Howard Gordon

Howard Gordon is the newest member of the RAND Center for Middle East Public Policy Advisory Board. As the award-winning writer and producer behind television’s 24 and Homeland, Gordon understands the need to tell a compelling story that will engage viewers over several seasons—and how polemicizing could undermine that objective. He recently spoke at a RAND Policy Circle event on how terrorism is depicted in entertainment and how entertainment influences life. Here are excerpts from that conversation.

On 9/11
We were shooting the third episode of 24 when 9/11 happened. After that, everyone thought the show would be canceled … that the audience would want comedies. As it turned out, the opposite happened. People were acutely interested in this story, and so was I. It changed everything. The show would have been vastly different had 9/11 not happened. It became the prism through which the audience viewed the show, and the one through which we wrote it.

On how the arc of the wars affected 24
Jack Bauer was an action hero—not unlike Bruce Willis, Sly Stallone, and Clint Eastwood, who do whatever it takes to get what they need to get. No one really took us to task for anything in those first four years. No one blinked. Jack did some pretty extreme things, and that was one of the delights that we had as writers, and that the audience had as viewers.

After Guantanamo and Abu Ghraib and two wars that were going less well, the cast of 24 became a lot darker and more complex. We became a Rorschach test, in many ways, for the so-called war on terror and its conduct.

On avoiding the incendiary
When we started 24, the show had a Muslim family living in Agoura or wherever they were living. The husband and wife were terrorists; the kid was, too, but had a change of heart. On the 405 freeway, unbeknownst to us, there was a giant lit-up billboard: “They could be next door.” We were contacted by the Muslim Public Affairs Council and by the Council on American-Islamic Relations, [who said], “We are afraid. This has implications for our lives here.” It was something that really made us think … it began a conversation. I began engaging, particularly with MPAC, on this very subject.

It’s just a very thorny thing. It made us open our eyes and be aware, anyway, that this show has an impact. As a creator, your first job is to tell an exciting, emotional, engaging story, a compelling story. But there’s a certain responsibility that comes with it. I started talking to groups and realizing I had this responsibility.

On TV’s influence
We’re perpetually in a dance with reality. We were visited by a general, a 24 fan, who said a lot of interrogators in the field in Iraq and Afghanistan are taking a page from Jack Bauer. Media is powerful. It is one of our greatest exports. And artists do have an opportunity to humanize each other and each other’s stories in a world that is really building walls and creating fear.

On Friends
There’s a book called Who Speaks for Islam? What a Billion Muslims Really Think. Gallup conducted polls and said, “Do you like Americans?” “Yes.” The follow-up question was, “Have you met any Americans?” The answer was no. “Well, how come you like Americans?” And the answer was [the TV show] Friends. It’s not propaganda, Friends, it’s a reflection of who we are. I think there’s no greater export in some ways [than entertainment].

The RAND Policy Circle is a community of philanthropic individuals committed to supporting objective research and analysis that lead to smarter decisions and better outcomes. Members enjoy exclusive opportunities to interact with RAND’s leading experts and connect with RAND affiliates.

For more, visit www.rand.org/giving/policy_circle

Hear the full conversation at www.rand.org/a150506-tv
RAND partnered with a dozen Los Angeles–area food trucks to test whether healthier menu options would sell. The trucks, known as loncheras in the local Spanglish, have been a part of blue-collar Los Angeles for generations and often serve low-income neighborhoods where obesity rates are high.
Edwin Noguera had a few options as he considered lunch on a recent afternoon on a busy street corner near downtown Los Angeles. “Deep fried pork belly,” promised one nearby food truck; another offered a greasy vision of meat and white cheese oozing from a thick block of bread. But Noguera stopped instead at a truck decorated on its side with a ribbon of ripe-red tomatoes and dark-green broccoli spears. “I have to watch what I’m eating,” he explained. “I’m trying to get my abs.” He ordered a plate of watermelon, salad, and grilled meat—and became an unwitting participant in an unusual RAND experiment.

In recent months, RAND researchers have teamed up with a dozen Los Angeles lunch trucks to test healthier menu items—chicken breasts and grilled fish alongside the usual tacos and hamburgers. The results have been modest but promising. The healthy meals were never best-sellers, but they did well enough that a majority of the truck owners plan to keep them on the menu.

That’s important, because the trucks tend to serve working-class Latino communities, where obesity rates are high and healthy food can be scarce, lead researcher Deborah Cohen said. “It’s important that the providers are offering these meals,” she said. “I think what we showed is that it’s completely feasible.”
Cohen has spent years arguing that restaurants, grocery stores, and other food outlets should take more responsibility for the nation’s obesity epidemic, and more action to stop it. More than one-third of U.S. adults are obese, according to federal statistics, adding billions of dollars to the nation’s health care costs each year.

A lunch truck may seem like an unlikely testing ground for healthy menu items, the four-wheel equivalent of a fast-food joint. But most are mom-and-pop operations where cooks make food by hand, using fresh ingredients, and often for underserved communities. Cohen called them a “good lab.”

These aren’t the trendy food trucks that have started to sell fusion tacos and reimagined grilled cheese to hip, young urbanites. These have been part of blue-collar Los Angeles for generations, where they’re known as loncheras, after the Spanglish word lonche, for lunch.

Working with a $275,000 grant from the National Institutes of Health, RAND researchers enlisted nearly 20 loncheras for a six-month trial they named “La Comida Perfecta,” or “The Perfect Meal.” About a third of the truck owners later dropped out, leaving 12 who worked with a nutritionist, created their own healthy meals, and then put them on the menu.

Their creations had to include a cup of vegetables, half a cup of fruit, two ounces of whole grains, three ounces of meat, a cup of milk or its equivalent in cheese—and they had to come in under 700 calories. Within those guidelines, truck operators came up with plates of ceviche ringed with avocados; meaty tacos stuffed with cabbage and peppers and served with salads; chicken sandwiches; shrimp tostadas; and one “Crazy Good Quesadilla.”

Longtime truck owner Elba Ramirez added four healthy menu items, including a chicken salad and a “famous” turkey burger. She parks her truck in the shadow of a high-rise bank building not far from downtown Los Angeles and had enough success with the lunchtime crowd that she’s considering adding a veggie burger and a chicken-and-rice bowl.

“It’s been a good idea,” she said. “The people who try it keep buying it. The people are happy, then I’m happy.”

The six-month pilot program didn’t yield big sales numbers at most trucks, but it did yield some valuable insight into the challenges, big and small, of changing food habits, the researchers said. Truck operators had trouble swapping out their corn tortillas for whole wheat, for example, and their Latino customers especially didn’t care for the brown rice that replaced their traditional Mexican rice.

Nearly half of the truck customers were regulars, surveys found, and most knew what they wanted without even looking at the menu. In poorer neighborhoods and blue-collar work sites, that was usually a couple of $1 tacos, not a $7 plate with fruit and salad.

In all, the healthy menu items accounted for around 3.5 percent of all entrees sold from the lunch trucks during the six-month trial. The number was closer to 10 percent at the top-performing truck, which served a wealthier and more diverse business district; and closer to 2 percent for the lowest-performing trucks.

“It may not seem like a lot, but the number of meals sold is on par with sales of new items at more popular franchise
Everyone needs food, water, and shelter, yet society offers protective standards and regulations for just two of these three essentials. The EPA regulates 90 potential contaminants in drinking water. And there are hundreds—perhaps thousands—of regulations that control every aspect of home construction, from the size of nails and screws to the height of steps in stairwells. But laws regarding food come up short.

Science has proven again and again that obesity puts people at increased risk for heart disease, cancer, and other chronic diseases. But nowhere in law or regulation are restaurants held accountable.

Food providers should be expected to refrain from doing harm to consumers by serving portions that are larger than they are able to burn. Requiring standardized portions with reasonable calorie counts could make it easier for people to recognize and avoid meals that contribute to obesity.

A double cheeseburger, large fries, and a 20-ounce soda combo should not be thought of as a “value meal.” It should be considered negligence.

Holding food providers accountable: Do no harm

Commentary by Deborah Cohen

The study’s recipe for a healthy meal:

- 1 CUP VEGETABLE
- ½ CUP FRUIT
- 2 OUNCES WHOLE GRAIN
- 3 OUNCES MEAT
- 1 CUP EQUIVALENT MILK (OR 1½ OUNCES CHEESE)
- <700 CALORIES

restaurants,” Cohen said. She pointed to another statistic as evidence that the program was at least a limited success: Two-thirds of the truck owners plan to keep the healthy meals on their menus. “If we can do it with loncheras, nobody has an excuse,” she said.

Her research partner at RAND, Ben Colaiaco, stopped by one of the food trucks on a recent afternoon to deliver a $250 check for participating in the program. He found Benjamin Hernandez and his wife, Yolanda, closing out another long day on the truck they have driven for 29 years.

Hernandez knows many of his customers by name at the work sites he frequents east of Los Angeles. He also knows which ones are diabetic, like he is. He said he joined the RAND program to offer them a healthier variety of food—grilled fish, ceviche, Yolanda’s Famous Chicken Salad. And, he added, he wasn’t shy about redirecting customers who needed it toward those healthier options.

“We didn’t make much, but we didn’t lose anything,” he told Colaiaco. “I think it was a good experience, really. Variety for the customers is a positive.”

“Are you going to continue to offer these dishes?” Colaiaco asked.

Hernandez seemed surprised at the question. “Yes,” he said. “Yes, of course.”

Excerpted from The RAND Blog. Read the full commentary here: www.rand.org/b150408food
A groundbreaking analysis reveals what’s at stake for both Israelis and Palestinians

By Doug Irving, Staff Writer

The cost of ten more years of stalemate in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict: $173 billion.


It took a team of RAND economists and policy experts more than two years to come up with and verify that number, the first time researchers have managed to pin such a complete price tag on the conflict. Their aim was simple, even if their math was not: to show both sides how much they stand to lose from the enduring conflict, and how much they could gain in peace.
### What each side has to gain or lose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Israelis</th>
<th>Palestinians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEACE</strong> (Two-state solution)</td>
<td>+$123 billion to economy</td>
<td>+$50 billion to economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COORDINATED UNILATERAL WITHDRAWAL</strong></td>
<td>Negligible gain</td>
<td>Eventual +$1.5 billion annually following tough early years. Comes mostly from opportunities in areas vacated by settlers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNCOORDINATED UNILATERAL WITHDRAWAL</strong></td>
<td>-$22 billion</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NONVIOLENT RESISTANCE</strong></td>
<td>-$80 billion to Israeli economy, in large part because of perceived instability in the region, as well as Palestinian-led boycotts</td>
<td>-$12 billion from Israeli restriction to movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIOLENT UPRISING</strong></td>
<td>-$250 billion in lost opportunities and direct costs, including:</td>
<td>-$46 billion to the economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-$800 million in 2024 for health, education, and other basic services to West Bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Estimates over a 10-year period, unless otherwise noted; all costs are denoted in constant 2014 U.S. dollars.

*Waiting for change in the Palestinian territories*

(Above) Two young men in Dheisheh refugee camp in the West Bank; Palestinian women passing an Israeli checkpoint in Al-Shuhada Street in Hebron in the West Bank. (Below) A Palestinian child sits in broken concrete near the Mediterranean Sea in the Gaza Strip.
“We hoped RAND could provide, with its analytical methods, some kind of new perspective,” said C. Ross Anthony, a senior economist at RAND who helped lead the Costs-of-Conflict Study Team that authored the report. “No one had ever done that,” added Charles P. Ries, vice president at RAND and co-leader on the project.

The team’s findings shed new light not only on the possibilities of the future, but also on the knotted realities of the present.

The Israeli economy gains the most from peace with a Palestinian state.

For the Palestinians, the benefits of a new and independent Palestine, alongside but apart from Israel, are obvious: self-governance, freedom of movement, international trade, and an economic boom. But the RAND analysis found that, strictly in terms of dollars and cents, Israel stands to gain the most.

Ten years of peace with a Palestinian state would be worth $123 billion to the Israeli economy. Trade would surge in both areas as new markets opened to Israel across the Arab world; foreign investors would put their money into Israeli and Palestinian companies without fear of losing it to violence. Israel also would save hundreds of millions of dollars by withdrawing from its controversial West Bank settlements, a certain condition of any peace deal.

The Palestinians, meanwhile, would need heavy international private and public support to start growth in their new state. But the changes in their economy would be fundamental: $5 billion a year in new trade; $730 million in new agriculture made possible by unrestricted access to water. In all, ten years of peace would add $50 billion to the Palestinian economy, a transformative figure for an area with a struggling economy to start with.

A successful two-state solution “would be profoundly positive, for both sides,” Ries said. “There are not so many macroeconomic policies that countries can support that have that kind of impact.”

At the individual level, average Palestinians stand to gain more than average Israelis.

All those billions of dollars in new trade and investment would add up to a per capita boost for the average Israeli of around $2,200—roughly equivalent to a 5 percent raise—after ten years. An average Palestinian in the West Bank or Gaza Strip, meanwhile, would see an additional $1,000 after ten years—and there, that’s the same as a 36 percent pay hike.

Those percentages underscore an economic fact of the conflict: Palestinians have much more incentive to move toward peace. Israelis can better afford the status quo, especially given what they see as the tradeoff, entrusting more cross-border security to a fledgling Palestinian state in a region garrisoned by terrorist groups like ISIS and Hezbollah.

As a recent headline in the Jerusalem Post put it: “Will a peace deal bring a huge economic dividend, (or) will the only boom be that of rockets bringing down the economy?”

For the average Israeli, “the bottom line is, the economic benefits of peace may not be fully appreciated or sufficient to overcome the perceived costs,” Anthony said.

But that overlooks some very real economic dividends that peace would pay even at the neighborhood level, the RAND analysis concluded. All those billions of dollars coursing through the economy could fund tens of thousands of new homes and schools, greatly easing the persistent lack of housing that Israelis and Palestinians list as a top quality-of-life concern.

A Palestinian uprising carries heavy costs for both sides.

A Palestinian uprising, a return to the violence of the past, spreading across Gaza and the West Bank, could drain the Israeli economy of $250 billion over ten years. But it also would shatter Palestinian society.

Israel’s expected response to such an uprising—such as squeezing off the tax revenues it collects for the Palestinians and impeding their trade—would likely bring down the limited Palestinian self-government, the Palestinian Authority. Israel’s military would level buildings and destroy infrastructure; and its almost certain move to cut off work permits would cut off the economic lifeblood of the Palestinians.

Total cost to the Palestinian economy: $46 billion over ten years. That translates into more than a 45 percent cut to the already-meager income of an average Palestinian in 2024.

Israel would lose five times as much—up to $45 billion some years, and $250 billion over a decade—as foreign investment, trade, and tourists flee the conflict and its own security costs soar. Israel also would have to
Neither economy gains much from a unilateral Israeli withdrawal.

That has emerged as a possible solution to the continued deadlock in the peace talks. What if Israel just pulls back from some of the West Bank, without waiting for the creation of a Palestinian state? The answer, according to RAND’s analysis: The economics don’t add up.

Israel could save a little by evacuating its West Bank settlements. But decoupling from the Palestinians would also cost Israel a steady supply of cheap labor, nullifying any economic gains.

Even that assumes an orderly and slow withdrawal, with a carefully coordinated handover of territory to the Palestinians, and with international support and approval. Anything less would drive up Israel’s security costs, leave it with the large expense of moving settlers, and likely damage its international image and trade.

The Palestinians would eventually see an additional $1.5 billion annually in expanded trade and economic opportunities if they went along with a coordinated Israeli withdrawal, as new opportunities open up in lands vacated by settlers. But the early years would be tough, as they race to take over responsibility for security from the departing Israelis.

Palestinians can make Israelis pay through nonviolent resistance, but at a cost.

Palestinian leaders have started to press the international community for formal recognition, as well as criminal investigations and boycotts against Israel. Earlier this year, Israel responded by freezing $127 million in tax revenue it collects for the Palestinians, putting the Palestinian Authority in an economic chokehold.

In an extended standoff, Palestinian-led boycotts could pare $80 billion from the Israeli economy over ten years, the RAND analysis concluded. In response, Israel might further freeze tax revenue, restrict the movement of Palestinians, and cut off work permits—costing the Palestinians $12 billion over ten years, a proportionally harsh blow given the smaller size of their economy.

That cycle of continued stalemate, resistance, action, and reaction appears to be the direction the conflict has taken in recent months.

The decisions needed to break through the impasse will only continue to get more difficult and expensive as the conflict drags on. But with the economic benefits of peace so large, and the potential costs of violence so deep, RAND researchers held out reason for hope.

“Even gridlocked highways,” they noted, “have exit ramps.”
Taking It to the Streets

RAND Experts Share Their Findings in Jerusalem, Ramallah, and Europe

While our findings make a strong case for the two-state solution, this hardly makes it the most likely outcome. Economics are but one factor in a complex political dynamic.

Today, more than 90 percent of Israelis and Palestinians were born after 1948 and have known nothing other than some version of the impasse. Our analysis shows that both sides could be better off with a stable two-state solution and that prolongation of the impasse for another generation would have real costs.”

Charles P. Ries and C. Ross Anthony, excerpted from a commentary that originally appeared on newsweek.com on June 9, 2015
Bridging the Civilian-
A funny thing happened when these military officers and academics got together. The officers were intimidated by the fancy degrees and four-star friends. The scholars were intimidated by the uniforms, medals, and deployments. Here’s how they learned to trust each other.
This exercise suggests, first, the importance of building personal relationships earlier in a career. If this is left until they are full professors, general officers, or assistant secretaries of defense, it is too late.

When commentators talk about the civilian-military divide, they often mention the dwindling number of Americans who serve in uniform, the high costs of sustaining an all-volunteer force, and the myriad stories of senior military officers who act as though they are beyond civilian control. Another facet of the problem is the mutual opacity of two influential communities that should have much to offer each other: military officers and civilian academics.

As the scenario unfolded over two days, it revealed something very human: Before the civilian-military divide can be bridged, personal doubts need to be quieted.

Civilian academics confessed to being unsettled at times by those in uniform. To them, military members might have remarkable life experiences; they wear medals and colored ribbons; and they appear aloof, even intimidating, in their uniforms. But their military counterparts were no less unsettled by the academics, who possessed prestigious advanced degrees, had been awarded impressive fellowships, and had notable connections in the national defense policy circles. Indeed, some had worked closely with icons of the national security world whom the military members knew only by reputation.

When the group was assembled and asked to address a geopolitical problem, the academic and military players quickly realized they needed each other. The military brought the ability to disaggregate a big problem into manageable pieces; look at different options to address them; and dive into the details of implementing one of the options. This greatly impressed the academics. Moreover, the civilians learned about the personnel and logistics limitations of pursuing various military options. Similarly, civilian insights proved equally invaluable. The military participants realized the limitations of their understanding of the best way to think about critical con-
cepts such as deterrence, escalation, and crisis management, and how best to use military resources to prevent a conflict.

After the exercise, while the players’ actions were being evaluated, something simple yet powerful happened. Civilian participants asked military players about their uniforms and associated accouterments. Among other things, this facilitated questions about past deployments, future ship assignments, and overseas tours in peace and war. In return, the military participants asked about their cutting-edge, interdisciplinary research. This simple gesture started a conversation based on mutual respect. It seemed a small, unplanned yet instrumental step in bridging the civilian-military divide.

In fact, this tabletop exercise suggested that the best way to bridge the civilian-military divide, especially at the senior levels of government, is not via large conferences or formal papers. Instead, it can be done by building trust, one person at a time, over time.

This exercise suggests, first, the importance of building personal relationships earlier in a career. If this is left until they are full professors, general officers, or assistant secretaries of defense, it is too late; they will have less time to learn and will tend to be more certain in their views. Second, it highlighted the importance of a safe learning environment where ignorance can be disclosed, questions asked, and mistakes made. This can be done intensely through an immersion process over the course of a few days, but it requires personal, professional, and intellectual commitment. And third, it revealed the importance of informal conversations based on mutual respect during the inevitable down times of a tabletop exercise. Trust and reliance seemed to follow in short order.

The limitations to this approach are important to note. It is built around small groups; it is labor intensive; and it requires civilian and military participants to devote some of their valuable professional time to it. But even with these limitations, the effort is worthwhile. National defense is a team endeavor; it requires the trust, devotion, and expertise of military and civilian leaders at many levels to make it work.

Paula Thornhill is a senior political scientist at the RAND Corporation and serves as a RAND representative to the Stanton Foundation. She is a retired U.S. Air Force brigadier general, having last served as commandant of the Air Force Institute of Technology.

This commentary originally appeared on defenseone.com on April 3, 2015.
As Millennials make their mark on the workforce, philanthropic giving, and public policy, RAND has launched a new program, RANDNext, to engage early- to mid-career professionals on the issues that are shaping our world. As a global organization with 1,800 staff members hailing from 46 countries, RAND is uniquely positioned to do this. Since its inception, RANDNext has invited members to engage on such topics as space policy, farmworkers and the food supply chain, and artificial intelligence and technology.

Still less than a year old, the program has attracted a range of committed young professionals, each with a distinct career path and interest in RAND.

Edahn Small is one such RANDNext member. An “early adopter” of the program, Edahn’s interest in RAND and RANDNext stems from a desire to keep learning—to connect with and grow from the other professionals and experts whom RANDNext attracts. As a professional, Edahn’s path has been varied. He has a J.D., as well as an M.S. in counseling psychology. Currently, Edahn works as the creative director at the Hypothesis Group, a creative and consumer insights agency. Edahn’s focus and expertise is data visualization—creating imagery that teaches and informs.

When Edahn was asked why he joined RANDNext, he responded, “Our formal education stops at college or graduate school, and we have very few opportunities to learn for the sake of learning. RAND makes learning post-graduate school available through its RANDNext program. I support RAND because I believe this organization is doing great work. I want both to be a part of that, and to help RAND advance its mission: to improve policy and decisionmaking through research and analysis.”

As RANDNext grows, it will engage and involve more professionals like Edahn, individuals whose curiosity and energy drive them to seek more—to learn more, to engage more, and to contribute to the conversation on policy and policymaking. 

To learn more about RANDNext, or to join, visit www.rand.org/randnext.
The researcher’s nose was pressed against the door to the women’s restroom. Partially blind, he couldn’t read the sign. “Why are you smelling the restroom doors?” a RAND security guard asked. That’s when Sam Genensky knew he had to do something.

So the mathematician, who joined RAND in the 1950s, invented the now common triangle and circle signs (raised so they can be discerned by touch) that became the standard for women’s and men’s restrooms in California and across many other parts of the country—just one of Genensky’s visions for how to help the partially sighted.

Injured as a newborn by incorrectly administered eyedrops, Genensky was blind in one eye and had 20/1,000 vision in the other. He spent one year in a high school for the blind, but he resisted learning to live as a blind person instead of making the most of the sight he had.

When he returned to public school, Genensky realized he could use binoculars to see the chalkboard. Attaching a second lens created bifocals that let him see both the board and his textbooks—a method he then used at Harvard and Brown. At RAND, Genensky expanded on the binoculars technique in a 1973 report, and similar vision aids are still sold today.

However, it was an invention called RANDSIGHT, developed with his researcher friends, that brought Genensky a flood of recognition—and a new career. A sort of closed-circuit television system that magnified and sharpened text, “Sam Genensky’s Marvelous Seeing Machine” was featured in Reader’s Digest in 1971. Soon he was flooded with requests from people hoping to replicate it, and RANDSIGHT became the model for the video magnifiers that still help sight-impaired people be more self-sufficient. “I couldn’t turn my back on them,” he said later, and in 1978 Genensky founded the Center for the Partially Sighted.

Though he went completely blind before his death in 2009, Genensky had a corneal transplant in 1993 that improved the vision in his partially sighted eye for a decade—marking the first time he realized he was married to a redhead instead of a brunette.
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