

CENTER FOR SECURITY POLICY NATIONAL SECURITY VOTER GUIDE FOR 2020



CENTER FOR
SECURITY
POLICY

National Security Voter Guide

1. Support & defend the US Constitution	Trump: STRONG	Biden: WEAK
2. Confront violent extremism at home	Trump: STRONG	Biden: WEAK
3. Make Americans safe from biothreats	Trump: STRONG	Biden: WEAK
4. Restore American sovereign leadership	Trump: STRONG	Biden: WEAK
5. Strengthen our national defense	Trump: STRONG	Biden: WEAK
6. Defend America against Communist China	Trump: STRONG	Biden: WEAK
7. Defend America against Putin's Russia	Trump: STRONG	Biden: WEAK
8. Reduce the threat of North Korea	Trump: STRONG	Biden: WEAK
9. Help align the Middle East with US interests	Trump: STRONG	Biden: WEAK
10. Restore Monroe Doctrine & secure borders	Trump: STRONG	Biden: WEAK

See details at CenterForSecurityPolicy.org.

October 6, 2020

NATIONAL SECURITY RATING #1: BIDEN AND TRUMP ON DEFENDING THE CONSTITUTION



Of the 10 main issues the Center for Security Policy has identified for its [2020 National Security Voter Guide](#), commitment to the Constitution ranks #1.

This piece marks the first of 10 articles to explain how the Center evaluated the national security records of President Donald Trump and his challenger, former vice president Joe Biden.

“Support and defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic” is part of the oath of office for every federal official. Article VI of the Constitution requires an oath.

The oath is not to protect the nation-state, the country, the government, or even the American people, but the Constitution itself. The oath is the cornerstone of American defense and national security, for without the Constitution, we have no country. And so

we rate adherence to the federal oath of office as the top national security candidate criteria for 2020.

Originally, the oath was simply a pledge to “support” the Constitution. As noted in the *Washington Post* five years ago, “The Civil War changed that, though, with oaths during and afterwards mandating or implying an oath of loyalty to the Union and against insurrection.”

The oath shows that all federal officials recognize that enemies of the Constitution are not only foreign threats to the nation at large, but are also domestic enemies – including American citizens. These domestic enemies seek to subvert or overthrow the Constitution from within.

Both Trump and Biden have taken the oath.

Joe Biden. As a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee and as vice president, Joe Biden built a record of being a constitutional revisionist, and not as a constitutionalist. He took a flexible view of the Constitution, supporting judges and justices who kept redefining its meaning and application and expanding central big government power. He tended toward policies that expanded the power of the central government at the expense of the states. There is no memory or record of Biden using the committee to require the FBI to return to its legal role of monitoring domestic enemies of the Constitution.

During the 2020 campaign, Biden has not disclaimed the support of those who explicitly do advocate the overthrow of the Constitution, so he has, in effect, contravened his oath. During the campaign, Biden and his political allies – offering no credible evidence – accused Trump of harboring dictatorial intentions. Biden and others went so far as to suggest that Trump will have to be removed from office by military force. House Speaker Nancy Pelosi declared Trump and his Republican supporters to be “domestic enemies” of the Constitution – an unprecedented, scripted, extremist abuse to which Biden consented with silence.

Donald Trump. In 2020, Trump has faced two national emergencies – the pandemic and the Antifa/BLM insurrection – that allowed him extraordinary executive powers to impose on the nation.

Trump mused publicly about many options. At first he appeared uncertain about how to use his powers in both extreme situations. He took short-term actions in several directions, but ultimately opted to limit his legal powers by following the principles of

the Founding Fathers. Rather than abuse the Constitution by centralizing power, Trump purposefully left it to the states to determine their own anti-pandemic and anti-insurrection policies, and provided federal aid and reimbursements for the states to request as they saw fit.

Support and defend the Constitution verdict – Trump: Strong. Biden: Weak.

NATIONAL SECURITY RATING #2: CONFRONT VIOLENT EXTREMISM AT HOME



Item #2 in our 10-point [2020 National Security Voter Guide](#) focuses on how presidential candidates Donald Trump and Joe Biden confront violent extremism at home.

Before considering any foreign national security commitments or threats, an assessment of the candidates must include their policies to protect the American constitutional way of life, and American citizens personally, in the homeland. Our second point of evaluation is about how well Donald Trump and Joe Biden keep the people safe from violent extremism here at home.

The domestic national security apparatus – FBI, Department of Homeland Security, other federal agencies, and state and local investigative and police forces – has been poorly equipped to handle the organized mob-style violent extremism at home. It has excelled at fighting traditional terrorism of the white supremacist and Islamist/jihadist varieties, but have done so at the expense of understanding, collecting and analyzing

intelligence on, and acting against mob-style violent extremism along the lines of Antifa/BLM. This is a system-wide problem.

Joe Biden: In his decades on the Senate Judiciary and Foreign Relations committees and as vice president, Joe Biden has shown almost no interest in combating revolutionary, mob-style violent extremism at home – with the exception of a few years during the 1970s when he was aligned with the Dixiecrats to suppress New Left urban terrorists, cop-killers, and rioters. He has been tough on crime and sentencing. In his eight years as vice president, he showed no interest in confronting the reincarnated New Left from the '70s and its Antifa/BLM descendants. As a senator and vice president, Biden has supported the appointments of federal judges who are weak on such lawlessness.

Biden was part of the Obama policy to support the [Muslim Brotherhood](#) and other radical Islamists in the United States. In 2020, Biden actively considered radical Congresswoman Karen Bass (D-TX), a thirty-year veteran of the Cuban Communist Party's [Venceremos Brigades](#) and regarded as a controlled Cuban government asset, to serve as his 2020 vice presidential running mate.

At the Democratic National Convention, the violent protests that were raging in American cities and the anarchist groups behind them were not mentioned by any speaker, including Biden. When Biden finally discussed the violent protests after the convention [he blamed Trump, not Antifa](#) or BLM. Biden has joined the BLM/Antifa demands to [de-fund the police](#), though he has [waffled](#) on the issue. Biden has supported FBI abuses under Comey and calls Trump's criticism anti-American. As of this writing, [Biden has not](#) explicitly denounced Antifa by name. He sat silently for 94 days of rioting before deplored the violence.

Donald Trump: President Trump [denounced](#) the Antifa rioters by name. Trump strongly supports funding the police. Trump has been critical of an FBI that has damaged its own effectiveness and the public trust through politicization and abuse of power. Trump reportedly is considering the [designation of Antifa as a terrorist](#) entity but has not yet acted. Trump has been naming federal judges and justices who are tough on anarchism, vandalism, destruction of public property, looting, and arson.

Confront violent extremism at home verdict – Trump: Strong. Biden: Weak.

NATIONAL SECURITY RATING #3: MAKE AMERICANS SAFE FROM BIOTHREATS



The pandemic of 2020 makes defense against bioterrorism a third metric on the Center for Security Policy's [National Security Voter Guide](#).

The human and physical costs to every single American have been incalculable. Hostile foreign powers and terrorists have been studying the routes the pandemic took in spreading from its source and around the world, the means of its spread, public reaction to the threat, and the damage itself. Bioterrorism is a problem unlikely to go away for a long time.

In the case of any bioterrorist or other mass destruction, good leadership requires blame to be fixed squarely on the perpetrator. Placing blame is not deflection of presidential responsibility. Placing blame is to ascertain the party that allowed the bioterrorist to spread out of control, in order to get to the source of the disaster and demand full cooperation in mitigating and eliminating the spread. As a matter of national security, placing blame is important to develop countermeasures and deterrents to ensure that

such a disaster never happens again. Placing blame is also vital to determine who must pay for the American people's pain, suffering, and economic hardships after the fact, as well as reparations.

Joe Biden. Biden [condemned](#) President Trump's January travel restrictions on China: "This is no time for Donald Trump's record of hysteria and xenophobia, hysterical xenophobia, to uh, and fear mongering," House Speaker [Nancy Pelosi called](#) the China travel restrictions 'outrageous, un-American,' a threat to 'our security, our values, and the rule of law,' 'callous,' 'cruel,' 'dangerous,' 'bigoted,' hateful, and more.

Biden publicly maintained a globalist Obama-style approach, treating all countries as equals and not looking out for US interests first. Biden and his allies refused to blame the Chinese Communist Party. Instead he blamed Trump personally, with House Speaker Nancy Pelosi politicizing the disease the "[Trump Virus](#)."

Donald Trump. President Trump was in office at the time of the pandemic, and it was clear that neither he nor any of his critics had the answers to avert the crisis. The Obama administration built on a Bush foundation in its [National Strategy in Countering Biological Threats](#) of 2009, but it was not strategic or whole-of-government in nature, and emphasized a globalist arms-control approach rather than an America First approach to protect U.S. citizens. The Trump Administration produced a more comprehensive [National Biodefense Strategy](#) in 2018.

When the pandemic hit, President Trump and his administration first tried to be charitable toward China and not make its national disaster a policy issue. When it became clear that the regime helped spread the pandemic, Trump placed blame squarely on the perpetrator: the Chinese Communist Party. The CCP has absolute control of the labs in Wuhan where the virus originated. The CCP covered up and allowed a local epidemic to become a global pandemic. The CCP continued to disinform the United States and the world about the nature of the plague. For a while, Trump even called the disease the "Chinese Virus," in a manner consistent with decades of practice to label a new epidemic by its origin.

For protection and recovery, Trump settled quickly on leaving domestic power and policy to each state as each state governor saw fit under their individual circumstances, and to configure the federal government to support those states. He fast-tracked innovation and allowed for flexible and even experimental solutions. Biden recently reiterated a centralized government approach, saying he would decree a "mandate" that would force every American citizen to wear face masks regardless of circumstance.

Trump has developed an economic and global diplomatic strategy to isolate the Chinese regime and hold it morally, legally, and financially accountable for the pandemic. Biden has issued no criticism of the Chinese Communist Party at all.

Make Americans safe from biothreats verdict – **Trump: Strong. Biden: Weak.**

NATIONAL SECURITY RATING #4: RESTORE AMERICAN SOVEREIGN LEADERSHIP



Nothing says more about a strong national security strategy than restoration of sovereign American leadership worldwide.

Under previous administrations of both parties, the United States has seen the international institutions it created for its own interests degenerate into globalist governmental bodies that diminish American strength and elevate the power of our adversaries.

Restoring American sovereign leadership is topic #4 on the Center's [2020 National Security Voter Guide](#).

Globalism erodes and destroys American sovereignty, as well as the sovereignty of all other countries with representative government. Globalism has also facilitated the rise of the Chinese Communist Party and stretched American defense resources beyond

their limits. Consequently, restoration of sovereign American leadership worldwide is another metric for the 2020 election.

We look at the following factors: pursuit of an America First agenda worldwide, while supporting others seeking to strengthen their own sovereignty; help other countries to help themselves instead of the US intervening needlessly; challenging and breaking up the globalist strategies, institutions, and policies that have ceased to serve the American interests for which they were designed (United Nations and its subsidiaries, International Criminal Court, multilateral lending organizations, etc.); pushing adversaries out of the nodes of control of international organizations that can be salvaged for US interests, or, failing that, withdrawing from those organizations; and keeping the US dollar supreme, to ensure that nothing competes with the petrodollar.

Joe Biden. Biden has spent his entire career in federal government – especially on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and as vice president – promoting and funding globalist organizations and policies that have eroded American sovereignty and built up adversaries like Russia's gangster state and China's Communist Party. He has been an outspoken supporter of the European Union that rose from a sensible common market to a superstate that rivals the US in international institutions, undermines NATO, and fuels the Kremlin and Beijing. He has promoted policies like the Iran Deal that gave China the window to work with Saudi Arabia to rival and defeat the petrodollar.

Donald Trump. Trump has spent his 3-1/2 years as president pursuing an unabashedly [America First strategy](#) that builds up friends and allies by helping them help themselves to assert their own sovereignty. He is the first president in 39 years not to start a war or send combat troops into foreign conflicts. He has been challenging, defunding, and even withdrawing from certain globalist organizations that no longer serve US interests. He supported Brexit against the EU and strengthened NATO by pressuring its members to live up to their alliance commitments in the interests of mutual security. He has beaten back attempts by others to compete with the petrodollar.

Restore American sovereign leadership verdict – Trump: Strong. Biden: Weak.

NATIONAL SECURITY RATING #5: STRENGTHEN OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE



Supporting the military has been a standard campaign position for most national politicians since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. For the most part, though, “supporting the military” or “supporting the troops” have been little more than slogans with little meaning beyond appropriating more money.

Strengthing our national defense is general topic #5 of the Center for Security Policy's [2020 National Security Voter Guide](#).

The Bernie Sanders wing of the Democrat party is unabashed about slashing America's national defense. Joe Biden, by contrast, has been a consistent supporter of the military and has supported increases in military spending and development and deployment of advanced military systems. Donald Trump has also been a strong supporter of the military and national defense in general.

For this criterion, it's the details that matter. The 2020 Voter Guide has considered the following elements to evaluate each candidate: breakout from the legacy Cold War and Global War on Terror defense strategies; modernization of the concept of national defense; advancement of US defense in outer space; stopping endless wars in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere; ending needless subsidies of foreign allies and making allies pay their fair share of mutual defense; modernizing and strengthening traditional alliances; building new strategic relations with interests and abilities to counter common threats; and helping other countries to exercise their own sovereignty and defense in order to enhance US interests while reducing US commitments and costs. Regionally based threats like Russia, China, North Korea, and the Middle East are treated as separate points of evaluation.

Joe Biden. Biden's defense positions in general have been along the conventional post-Cold War legacy lines, combined with the Obama adaptation of the George W. Bush Global War on Terror configuration of American defense. He has shown few if any differences with the Obama defense policies from when he was vice president.

Donald Trump. Trump's stated positions are more visionary and the president has worked toward achieving many of them. He has redefined the concept of national defense away from the globalism and interventionism of his Democrat and Republican predecessors. He created a new military service, the US Space Force. He has demonstrated a commitment to extracting the US from endless wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, while destroying ISIS in the process. He dealt vigorously with military allies in Europe and Asia that had not paid their fair share of defense commitments. He treated NATO with the tough love it needed to become a stronger alliance by making each member pay 2 percent of its GDP for the alliance, favored Poland over the morally weaker Germany as a staunch continental ally, and helped European allies by slowing and stopping refugee flows from the east and south. He built the strongest-ever US relations with India against China. He also led a strategic rebalance of the Middle East to strengthen the sovereignty of friendly countries and resist Iran, which we discuss in a separate section.

Strengthen our national defense verdict – **Trump: Strong. Biden: Weak.**

NATIONAL SECURITY RATING #6: DEFEND AMERICA AGAINST COMMUNIST CHINA



The rise of Communist China so fundamentally threatens the United States from almost every conceivable angle that defense against it is a core criterion for evaluating American leadership. The presidential candidates' stances on defense of America against Communist China is the next on our [2020 National Security Voter Guide](#) list.

Mainland China is ruled by a one-party regime with no checks and balances to its power. The Chinese Communist Party (CCP) poses an existential threat to the United States.

Every president since Nixon has, for differing reasons, assisted the rise of the CCP. Early goals in the 1970s and '80s were to take the "enemy of my enemy is my friend" approach and use the People's Republic of China to place the Soviet Union in a box. This was also the period when American businesses built relations with the CCP, and parlayed those relations to influence policymakers in Washington. The CCP expanded those relations to reverse roles and corrupt American policymaking. Both political parties were and remain complicit.

The issues we considered are: strengthening the CCP to become a threat to the United States, and continuing to strengthen the CCP after that threat had become established; depleting American industry of jobs and infrastructure, and transfer US strategic industries to the CCP; enriching the CCP financially and permitting it to infiltrate and influence American financial institutions; permitting the CCP to wage aggressive political, military, economic, and industrial espionage against the United States through exchanges, scholarships, study and research programs, and other means; permitting the CCP to compromise US capital markets; technology transfer to provide the CCP with a qualitative military advantage over the US; policies toward the CCP's global Belt and Road initiative; policies to help China's neighbors defend their sovereign interests without undue US involvement; CCP subversion of international organizations; and response to the CCP's spread of the 2020 pandemic.

Joe Biden. On the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and as vice president, Joe Biden was an energetic promoter of building ties with the CCP, and said and did little if anything to counter CCP power and influence against American interests in any of the above areas. He even praised the rise of the Chinese Communist Party as a good thing. As the pandemic spread, Biden opposed President Trump's travel restrictions on China as "nakedly xenophobic" until he changed his mind and agreed with Trump. And then there's the scandal of his son Hunter taking \$1.5 billion in CCP money apparently as part of a influence op to shape US policy. Joe Biden is weak on China. Fewer American leaders have a worse record.

Donald Trump. President Trump in less than four years has started to turn those problems around. He is the first American president to attack the Chinese Communist Party as an institution. He properly blamed the CCP for the pandemic and held it responsible. He has embargoed CCP products and services, imposed sanctions and tariffs, begin a broad interagency counterintelligence offensive against CCP espionage networks embedded in American institutions; cracked down on CCP disinformation, propaganda and influence operations; expelled Chinese military personnel and spies from US universities; started to tackle the problem of the CCP in US capital markets and government pension investments; squeezed the CCP hold on critical minerals and directly attacked the CCP's "Made in China 2025" strategy for global manufacturing superiority.

Trump stopped CCP penetration of 5G telecom in the US and among key allies by attacking Huawei. He began to stem the spread of Belt and Road and to strengthen China's neighbors, not only traditional allies like Japan and South Korea, but increased recognition of Taiwan and built new and powerful relations with India. Once the pandemic began his administration held the CCP specifically accountable and began

withdrawing the US from CCP-subverted international groups like the World Health Organization. He also reconfigured the US military, expanding the US Pacific Command to become the US Indo-Pacific Command. And he challenged the [Republican party establishment](#) about its fetish toward Beijing.

Defend against Communist China – **Trump: Strong. Biden: Weak.**

NATIONAL SECURITY RATING #7: DEFEND AMERICA AGAINST PUTIN'S RUSSIA



Russia policy has been a volatile issue since the 2016 election cycle, when Democrat presidential nominee Hillary Clinton accused Donald Trump of “collusion” with the Kremlin. That allegation set off a chain of events that led to Trump’s impeachment, yet were found to be specious and fabricated.

Item #7 on the Center for Security Policy’s [2020 National Security Voter Guide](#) is how each candidate would defend America against the Putin regime in Russia.

Russia under Vladimir Putin remains important thanks to the country’s vast, modernized strategic nuclear weapons arsenal. That arsenal, with more modern nuclear warheads, ICBMs, and other platforms than the US, presents an existential threat to America (see illustration of 2019 Russian ICBM test launch). The Putin regime is a gangster state, with powerful internal security and foreign intelligence services still built upon the old Soviet KGB, and a revived GRU military intelligence service that is now heavily engaged in offensive political intelligence against the US and its allies. Russia continues to supply rogue regimes including Iran. And it [interferes in America’s](#)

politics as it has since the 1920s, exploiting our political, cultural, and social differences to turn us against one another.

We assess each candidate's position on defense against Russia on several criteria: supporting or opposing Putin's regime; policies toward Russia's strategic nuclear weapons modernization programs and defense against Russian missiles; policies affecting the Putin-dominated economy; helping Russia's threatened neighbors defend their sovereignty without US entanglements; blunting destructive interference in areas of US interest; strengthening of FBI counterintelligence against Russian espionage offensives; and preventing Moscow from interfering in American internal affairs.

Joe Biden. In the Senate, Joe Biden took a rather benign view toward Moscow. He was considered soft toward the USSR and did not distinguish himself with trying to help it collapse during the Reagan years. After the Soviet collapse, he became a top proponent of massive US aid programs that led – as current Center staff warned at the time – to the creation of the KGB/gangster-state that it has become under Putin. Biden supported Putin's rule at first in the early 2000s, then backed away to support Putin's powerless opposition. Biden raised few issues over the past 30 years about Russia's strategic nuclear modernization, and indeed voted to subsidize it with US tax dollars under an arms-control rubric. As vice president he supported Russia's western neighbor Ukraine, where his son landed a million-dollar-a-year position with a Russia-connected Ukrainian gas company as part of an influence operation aimed at the Obama administration. But he opposed sending lethal aid to help Ukraine's defense. The Obama team [knew since 2014](#) that Russia was trying to subvert US elections but did nothing until late 2016. Over the past several years, Biden has been rhetorically tough against Putin and supportive of his internal opposition, and supported Magnitsky sanctions against Putin-allied oligarchs. He opposes defenses to shoot down Russian missiles aimed at the United States and has broken with Obama to embrace a "[no first use](#)" nuclear weapons policy.

Donald Trump. On Russia, it has been a matter of [what Trump does](#), not what he says. Trump has hemmed in Putin and by enforcing Magnitsky sanctions, and imposed further sanctions for Moscow's attempted murder of Sergei Skripal in the UK, a former Russian double agent ransomed in a 2010 spy swap. He named a [hawkish arms control chief](#) to cut Russian strategic weapons advantages, while modernizing America's outmoded strategic weapons and building [advanced missile defense systems](#) that Biden opposed. While strengthening NATO in a forceful way to make each ally pay its commitment to the alliance, Trump has sought to deprive the Kremlin of foreign exchange from gas revenue from the [Nordstream-2](#) pipeline to Germany. He enlisted Middle Eastern cooperation to force Moscow to subsidize its gas exports, while he

promoted cheaper American gas exports. He sent lethal aid to help Ukraine defend itself from Russia. He has worked to push Kremlin influence out of the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America. [Since 2017](#) he has implemented policies to prevent Russian interference in US elections and challenge “malign activities.”

Defend against Putin’s Russia verdict – Trump: Strong. Biden: Weak.

NATIONAL SECURITY RATING #8: REDUCE THE THREAT OF NORTH KOREA



North Korea has plagued the United States for nearly 70 years, with the Korean War still legally unresolved. The impoverished country with its rogue regime is no longer a mere threat to American interests and allies in Asia, but has been developing an ICBM force capable of firing nuclear weapons at the United States.

The North Korean threat requires a huge expenditure of American troops in South Korea, and places stresses on the US Navy and Air Force. It is a problem that has to be solved without resort to full-scale war, which is why it appears on the Center for Security Policy's [2020 National Security Voter Guide](#) list.

Joe Biden. Joe Biden generally took the middle-of-the-road status quo approach throughout his career as United States senator and vice president. In nearly half a century since entering public service, Biden has said or done little to distinguish himself in solving the North Korea problem.

Donald Trump. Donald Trump took an especially brash, innovative approach to test North Korean leader Kim Jong-un, a strategy he called Maximum Pressure. During his first year in office, Trump significantly increased pressure on North Korea by successfully enlisting other nations to enforce UN sanctions against Pyongyang and warning North Korea that its surging missile and nuclear weapons programs could lead to war. This included an unprecedented warning by the president in his September 2017 speech to the UN General Assembly in which he the US would “destroy North Korea” if it threatened US security or the security of our allies.

Trump’s Maximum Pressure strategy convinced North Korea to agree to talks in 2018. Taking a calculated risk, Trump met personally with Kim in the first meeting between an American president and a North Korean leader. Trump deliberately met with Kim one-on-one, cutting out China and Russia which have a history of acting as advocates for North Korea in multilateral talks and blocking America’s tough demands of Pyongyang. They discussed improved relations, with Trump educating Kim on how a capitalist economy in North Korea could revitalize the country and Kim agreeing in principle to denuclearization. This extremely unconventional approach won Trump a mix of strong criticism and reluctant praise from critics, and was credited for stopping or slowing Kim’s nuclear weapons and ballistic missile program, halting nuclear tests and tests of long-range missiles. While the verdict is still out, the fact is that Trump has gone further than any other president to address the threat from North Korea.

By negotiating from a position of strength and his personal diplomacy with Kim Jong-un, President Trump lowered tensions on the Korean peninsula and opened the door to peace. Joe Biden plans to abandon this progress by returning to multilateral talks that include and empower China. Biden’s weakness as a leader likely will lead North Korea to resume its nuclear and long-range missile tests to extract concessions from the US.

Reduce the threat of North Korea verdict – **Trump: Strong. Biden: Weak.**

NATIONAL SECURITY RATING #9: HELP ALIGN THE MIDDLE EAST WITH US INTERESTS



The greater Middle East – Arab and North African countries plus Israel, Turkey, and Iran – has been the source of immense American investment in military commitments since World War II. Its many cultural, ethnic, religious, tribal, economic, and geopolitical challenges, and the immense energy wealth in the region, have challenged America's best diplomats and strategists for decades.

Helping align the greater Middle East with American national interests is therefore on the Top 10 of the Center for Security Policy's [2020 National Security Voter Guide](#).

We assessed the candidates' Middle East approaches as follows: mitigation of large-scale threats posed by state-sponsors of jihadist terrorism and subversion (Qatar, Turkey, and Iran); destruction of violent jihadist movements (ISIS, Hezbollah, Libyan jihadists and others); withdrawal of US forces from endless war (Syria, Iraq, and by extension, Afghanistan); support for a sovereign and self-sufficient State of Israel;

support for reforms in Arab countries, especially Egypt and Saudi Arabia; effective subjugation of the Islamic Republic of Iran and its military aggression; and the Iran Deal.

Joe Biden. Joe Biden supported a premature withdrawal from Iraq that resulted in the creation of the ISIS terrorist caliphate in northern Iraq and Syria, resulting in a new war in Syria in which the Obama-Biden administration felt force to resort to Vladimir Putin in Russia for assistance. [Biden opposed the raid](#) to capture Osama bin Laden that resulted in his death. As part of the Obama administration he supported the US alliance with the Muslim Brotherhood and defended Qatar, the Islamist state sponsor of terrorism. Biden is a longtime supporter of Israel, favoring the socialist coalition and generally opposing the Likud coalition of Benjamin Netanyahu. Biden's support for "reform" in Arab countries was to support the Muslim Brotherhood to topple the pro-US government of Egypt and destabilize Saudi Arabia, and to destabilize the fractured Saudi government internally and against its resistance to Iranian-backed forces in Yemen, while at the same time backing the Iran Deal to provide the mullahs with cash in exchange for promises. *Politico* referred to Biden as "[more dovish](#)" than Hillary Clinton.

Donald Trump. Donald Trump inherited the wars in Iraq, Syria, and Afghanistan. After giving the military carte blanche to wipe out ISIS, he vowed to wind down the wars and withdraw US forces in an orderly way to make the most of bad situations. His historic "Drive Them Out" speech in Riyadh exhorted Arab countries to stomp out Islamist movements and regimes, aimed at the Muslim Brotherhood and Qatar. He is arguably the strongest supporter of Israel of any American president. He has been a strong supporter of the anti-Islamist and pro-Israel government in Egypt. He destroyed ISIS on the ground in Syria and Iraq, severely crippled Hezbollah by killing its main sponsor, the charismatic Iran Quds Force leader Qassem Soleimani; and is presently helping Israelis and Arabs bring Hamas somewhat to heel under the unfolding normalization of relations between Israel and the United Arab Emirates and Bahrain. He helped stabilize Saudi Arabia with a lenient policy that Biden opposed. His elimination of Soleimani was a bold and shocking blow to Iranian regime capabilities. He pulled out of the Obama-Biden Iran Deal and squeezed the Iranian economy further, helping foment further unrest against the mullahs.

Help align the Middle East with US interests verdict – Trump: Strong. Biden: Weak.

NATIONAL SECURITY RATING #10: RESTORE THE MONROE DOCTRINE & SECURE BORDERS



The Monroe Doctrine to keep other powers from encroaching in the American hemisphere had been United States policy from 1823 until the Obama administration, which renounced it.

Enforcement of that doctrine is crucial to the sovereignty of the United States, which is why restoration of the Monroe Doctrine and securing America's borders is in the Top 10 of the Center for Security [2020 National Security Voter Guide](#).

While the Western Hemisphere is neither a popular campaign issue nor policy topic, it is nevertheless extremely important to US security. Therefore we include it as one of the 10 national security criteria for judging 2020 candidates.

The criteria for assessing the candidates include: views toward the Monroe Doctrine, and by extension, pushing back the subversive influences of China, Russia, Qatar, Iran,

and others in the region; the larger goal of pushing the Chinese Communist Party's economic and political influence from the hemisphere; encouragement of regional countries that still recognize Taiwan to continue to do so; assisting our neighbors to assert their own sovereignty from globalist forces and trends; partnering with large countries like Brazil and against the socialist regime in Venezuela without the use of US forces; taking back control of regional financial institutions that the US had created to reinforce the Monroe Doctrine; and finally, stopping illegal immigration into the US from across the Mexican border, building the border wall, denying benefits to illegal aliens our country, sending illegal aliens back home, and developing new ways for migrant workers and others to boost the American economy.

Joe Biden. As a top figure on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the most experienced foreign policy leader on the Obama team, Joe Biden was part of the renunciation of the Monroe Doctrine. He was passive as Communist China spread its influence throughout the hemisphere. He promoted globalist policies that deprived countries of their sovereignty and imposed unwanted cultural changes upon them that rejected Christian civilization. He did nothing of substance to oppose the Hugo Chavez/Nicolas Maduro narco regime in Venezuela. He supported the normalization of US relations with the Communist regime in Cuba while demanding no concessions. He welcomed mass illegal immigration into the United States, supported taxpayer subsidies for those living in the country illegally, and supports Sanctuary Cities.

Donald Trump. President Trump announced restoration of the Monroe Doctrine. Though his Latin America teams have been weak, he has begun to isolate Communist China's encroachments in the hemisphere. He has urged hemispheric nations to restore their own sovereignty, but has done little to terminate Obama-Biden aid programs and policies that promote cultural Marxism and hostility to Christianity. He aided Venezuelans in a diplomatic effort to help them regain their own sovereignty against the Maduro regime but was hampered by feckless Venezuelan partners. On the positive side, he has built a strong relationship with the Bolsonaro government of Brazil, and a surprisingly productive one with the leftist government in Mexico. He installed an American as head of the Inter-American Development Bank. He decisively fulfilled his campaign promise to build a wall along the US-Mexican border to stop illegal immigration, is trying to reverse the illegal immigration problem, and has cracked down on Sanctuary Cities.

Restore Monroe Doctrine & secure borders verdict – Trump: Strong. Biden: Weak.