

Opening the X-Files: A Case for Rejoining the Bureau International des Expositions (BIE)

April 2015

Prepared for | Mark Ritchie
Minnesota World's Fair Bid Committee

Prepared by | Toumil Reza Samonte Allen
Master of Public Policy Candidate
The Sanford School of Public Policy
Duke University

Faculty Advisor | Bruce Jentleson, Ph.D.

Disclaimer: The opinions and characterizations in this paper are those of the author, and do not necessarily represent official positions of the United States Government. This student paper was prepared in 2015 in partial completion of the requirements for the Master's Project, a major assignment for the Master of Public Policy Program at the Sanford School of Public Policy at Duke University. The research, analysis, and policy alternatives and recommendations contained in this paper are the work of the student who authored the document, and do not represent the official or unofficial views of the Sanford School of Public Policy or of Duke University. Without the specific permission of its author, this paper may not be used or cited for any purpose other than to inform the client organization about the subject matter. The author relied in many instances on data provided by the client and related organizations and makes no independent representations as to the accuracy of the data.

Executive Summary

Although world expositions—or world’s fairs—continue to captivate millions of tourists abroad, many Americans do not realize that these events still take place today. The United States continues to participate in world’s fairs by coordinating national pavilions; however, the last domestically-hosted world’s fair occurred in New Orleans, Louisiana in 1984. For more than 30 years, the U.S. was a member of the Bureau International des Expositions (BIE), a treaty organization that regulates and schedules world expositions. The U.S. withdrew from the BIE in 2001, raising a significant barrier for U.S. cities that wish to host a world’s fair of their own.

The Minnesota World’s Fair Bid Committee (MN-2023) is preparing a bid to host a three-month-long world’s fair in 2023. The fair is expected to attract 12 million visitors, to generate \$4 billion in tourism spending, and to spur further development of the light-rail system in the Twin Cities.

World’s fair hosts are selected through a bidding and voting process in the BIE’s General Assembly. As a non-member state of the BIE, a U.S. city’s bid to host a world’s fair must win 67 percent of the General Assembly vote, and the bidding city must pay higher registration fees than cities from member states. U.S. membership in the BIE would reduce the voting threshold to 50 percent and cut host cities’ registration fees in half. The U.S. would then be expected to pay around \$33,000 in annual dues to the BIE. To support MN-2023’s bid, this report examines how and why the U.S. withdrew from the BIE and its impact on hosting future expos in the US. This report also proposes a political strategy for rejoining the BIE.

Throughout the twentieth century, the U.S. frequently hosted world’s fairs, with varying degrees of financial success. Many of these fairs influenced the trajectory of host cities’ urban development, leaving physical landmarks and developing new sites for commercialization. However, the bankruptcy and mismanagement of the 1984 Louisiana World Exposition cast a long shadow over prospective world’s fairs in the U.S. This failure, as well as anti-internationalist sentiments and a focus on fiscal restraint throughout the 1990s, led Congress to slash funding for U.S. pavilions at expositions. When the culturally-oriented United States Information Agency merged with the State Department, expo participation became but a small cog in the State Department’s wide-ranging responsibilities. Congress stopped appropriating funding for BIE membership in 1998, prompting the State Department to recommend withdrawal from the organization in 2001.

A review of State Department regulations and interviews with former government officials indicate that Congress must first demonstrate support for rejoining the BIE, before State Department officials will recommend rejoining the BIE to the Secretary of State. However, interviews with world’s fair organizers, BIE officials and government officials also identified congressional apathy as an obstacle to promoting this issue. Given the negative impacts of non-member state status on MN-2023’s bid, MN-2023 should work to overcome congressional apathy and pursue their support in rejoining the BIE.

The following proposal provides a political strategy for how to rejoin the BIE. MN-2023 and its partners should mobilize public, private and congressional support to pass a “sense of the Senate” resolution supporting BIE membership. MN-2023 should then work the Departments of State and Commerce, and the White House to transform congressional support into a statement of federal commitment by submitting an “Instrument of Accession” to the BIE.

Acknowledgements

Advisor

Bruce Jentleson, Ph.D.

Committee Members

Nicholas Carnes, Ph. D.

Stephen Kelly, M.S.

Minnesota World's Fair Bid Committee

Sanford School of Public Policy

Robert Conrad, Ph. D.

Amanda Flaim, Ph. D.

Anna Gassman-Pines, Ph.D.

Mac McCorkle, J.D.

Candice Odgers, Ph. D.

Ryan Smith, M.P.P.

Tom Taylor, J.D.

U.S. Department of State

Beatrice Camp

Friends and Colleagues

Zoe Bamberg

Valerie Jaffee

Vivian Kan

Justin Simons

Caitlin Skinder

Sachi Takahashi-Rial

Ashley Wagner

Family

Justin Allen

Audrey Lake Samonte Allen

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Table of Contents	iv
I. Policy Question	1
II. Problem Statement.....	1
III. Background.....	2
3.1 Minnesota World’s Fair Bid Committee.....	2
3.2 Historical expositions (1851 – 1928).....	2
3.3 Governance under the Bureau International des Expositions (1928 – present).....	2
3.4 Recent U.S. expositions (1968 – 1984).....	3
IV. Literature Review	4
4.1 Motivations to host mega events.....	4
4.2 Economic impacts of world expos.....	5
4.3 Economic impacts of mega events.....	6
4.4 Long-term impact assessments	6
V. Research Design.....	7
5.1 Research questions.....	7
5.2 Research methods	7
5.3 Interview subjects	8
VI. Analysis	9
6.1 U.S. withdraws from the BIE, (1989-2002).....	9
6.2 Impact of U.S. withdrawal (2002- present).....	10
6.3 Barriers to rejoining the BIE.....	12
6.4 The Bay Area Council’s expo bid	13
6.5 Circular 175.....	14
6.6 Lawmakers’ considerations.....	15
VII. Recommendation.....	17
7.1 Criteria	17
7.2 Assumptions	17
7.3 Political strategy.....	17
VIII. Conclusion	21
IX. Bibliography.....	22
X. Appendices	27
Appendix 1. Inaugural partners of the Minnesota World’s Fair Bid Committee.....	27
Appendix 2. Interview request letter	28
Appendix 3. Timeline of declining U.S. involvement in world’s fairs	29
Appendix 4. State Department position on rejoining the BIE	30
Appendix 5. Instrument for accession	31
Appendix 6. State Department Memorandum RE: Circular 175.....	32
Appendix 7. Minnesota’s Congressional delegates.....	36
Appendix 8. Senator Al Franken’s letter of endorsement.....	37
Appendix 9. Senator Klobuchar’s letter of endorsement	38
Appendix 10. Representative Tim Walz’s letter of endorsement	39
Appendix 11. Congressional actions in support of expo participation.....	40
Appendix 12. State Department Clearance for Publication.....	41

I. Policy Question

How and why should the Minnesota World's Fair Bid Committee, hereinafter referred to as MN-2023, persuade the U.S. government to rejoin the Bureau International des Expositions (BIE)?

II. Problem Statement

Despite their enormous popularity in the U.S. for most of the twentieth century, many Americans today do not realize that international expositions (expos) still take place. Domestically known as world's fairs, expositions are international, public events with the primary purpose of “[educating] the public” (BIE Convention, 1972, p. 7).¹ Expos continue to be popular abroad, with new corners of the world diving into the experience. The Shanghai World Expo in 2010 attracted a record-breaking 73 million visitors to explore pavilions developed by 192 countries (Camp, 2012). Dubai will host the first world expo by an Arab nation in the Middle East in 2020. The French Prime Minister recently endorsed Paris' bid to host Expo 2025 (Petrequin, 2014), underscoring that expositions remain relevant for developed countries as well. Minnesota, which has never hosted an international event of this magnitude, hopes to join these ranks through its expo-planning body MN-2023. For the last several years, expo organizers in Houston, Texas and California's Bay Area have also been developing plans to host a future world expo. USA250 of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, is also exploring how to incorporate an expo into the U.S.'s 250th anniversary celebration. They and MN-2023 recently formed Expo USA, a network to support U.S. expo bids.

Hosting an expo has the potential to bring significant economic benefits to the local economy. MN-2023 estimates that this event will draw 12 million visitors and will generate \$4 billion in tourism spending from overseas visitors. The event would also catalyze further development of a light-rail system in the Twin Cities, thereby expanding Minnesota's public transportation infrastructure. The working theme of the expo, “Healthy People, Healthy Planet” will promote Minnesota's leadership in medical care and research, public health, environmental care, and leisure activities before an international audience. Local organizers draw their experience from successful bids for the Super Bowl and Final Four, and an unsuccessful bid for the 1992 Olympics, among others. The planning and organizing experience gained from bidding and hosting this expo in turn helps Minnesota should they pursue a Winter Olympics bid (M. Ritchie, personal communication, April, 2, 2015).

Unfortunately, as a non-member state of the BIE, the governing body of world expos, a U.S. bid to host an exposition must clear a higher voting threshold to win the bid than other BIE member states. In order to host an exposition, a bid by a non-member state of the BIE must win more than two-thirds of the BIE General Assembly's vote to host, whereas a member state only needs to win over fifty percent of votes to host. Non-membership also incurs higher registration and participation fees for the U.S. By not being a member state of the BIE, the U.S. has raised a significant barrier for its cities with such aspirations.

¹ John E. Findling and Kimberly D. Pelle (2008) note that world's fairs terminology has varied throughout time and by country. This paper will use expo, world expo, international exposition and world's fairs interchangeably to describe this event. References to specific, BIE-sanctioned expo categories will be indicated in quotation marks (see Section 3.3).

III. Background

3.1 Minnesota World's Fair Bid Committee

Co-chaired by Marilyn Carlson Nelson and Lois Quam, the Minnesota World's Fair Bid Committee (MN-2023) is a private-sector group that is coordinating Minnesota's efforts to host a three-month-long world expo in 2023. The group's bipartisan honorary co-chairs include former Vice President Walter Mondale and former Minnesota Governor Arne Carlson (Egerstrom, 2013). MN-2023 lists 13 organizations as inaugural partners (See Appendix 1). Minnesota's former Secretary of State, Mark Ritchie chairs its advisory committee.

On October 30, 2014 Secretary Ritchie announced that MN-2023 plans to submit its bid to the BIE in June 2015 and plans to select a site around November 2015 (Voge, 2014). However, their timeline for bid submission will be mostly determined "by State Department's agreement to transmit our bid as either a member state or a non-member state (M. Ritchie, personal communication, April 2, 2015)." To date, no other competing bids have been submitted to host an expo in 2022 or 2023. If MN-2023 presents their bid first, they will trigger a six-month window for other cities to present competing bids. They expect the BIE to vote on bids for this cycle in November 2016.

3.2 Historical expositions (1851 – 1928)

Since the first international exposition in London's Crystal City of 1851 to the beginning of World War II, expositions served as launching pads for pioneering technologies and as public galleries of fine arts and cultural objects (Roche, 2003). After the dramatic debut of the American Colt Revolver at Crystal City (Swayze, 2013), expositions have helped disseminate technological innovations such as elevators, x-rays and telephones (Kerry, 2014). Cultural institutions such as public museums, theme parks, and shopping malls also developed from expositions (Roche, 2003). Like the Olympic Games or the World Cup, international expositions create unforgettable experiences for participants and spectators.

3.3 Governance under the Bureau International des Expositions (1928 – present)

Expositions were so popular during this period that several of international scope would take place in a given year, siphoning attendance and attention away from one another. At the 1928 Paris Convention, countries that participated in international expositions sought to limit their occurrences and to codify their governance. To these ends, they formed the BIE, an intergovernmental regulatory body to oversee the bidding, selection, and organization of expos (BIE, 2014).

The Paris-based BIE regulates two classes of expositions: "World Expositions" and "International Expositions" (BIE, 2014). "World Expos," which last for six months, occur at five year intervals on years ending with "0" or "5", and focus on a universal theme. "International Expos" on the other hand last only three months, have flexibility on when they occur between "World Expos" and have a specialized theme. A key distinction between the classifications lies with the host city's responsibility. In the larger "World Expos," participant countries design, build and finance their own pavilions. In "International Expos," the host city constructs all buildings and freely rents exhibition space to participating countries. MN-2023 is pursuing a bid for a three-month "International Expo."

3.4 Recent U.S. expositions (1968 – 1984)

The United States became a BIE member state on April 30, 1968 after the Senate ratified the 1928 Paris Convention treaty (15 CFR 310.1). Per U.S. Code 28 § 2801, Congress found in 1970 that properly financed, organized and executed international expositions have a “significant impact on the economic growth of the region surrounding the exposition” and that they are “important instruments of national policy.” The law then standardizes the criteria and procedures for the Federal Government to recognize domestically hosted international expositions and to determine the extent to which it will participate in them. To be recognized by the Federal Government, the President must first determine that the exposition serves the national interest, based on respective reporting by the Departments of Commerce and State. Respectively, they determine whether the proposal has sufficient financial support from the state and local governments, and business and civic leaders to be successfully developed; and whether the proposal qualifies for consideration for registration by the BIE. The President may then invite States of the Union and foreign governments to participate in the exposition once it is registered by the BIE. Although the U.S. withdrew its membership from the BIE in 2001, this law has not been repealed.

U.S. Code 28 § 2801 acknowledged varying levels of support from the Federal Government to assist and participate in previous international expositions. Variations in congressional appropriations and presidential support are evident when comparing BIE-sanctioned expositions hosted by San Antonio, Texas in 1968; Spokane, Washington in 1974; Knoxville, Tennessee in 1982; and New Orleans, Louisiana in 1984. Federal contributions reached as high as \$200 million, when the Federal Government financed an interstate highway project in support of the Knoxville Exposition (Kramer, 2008).

Two years later, the federal government unenthusiastically endorsed the Louisiana World Expo (LWE) in New Orleans. Although supportive of the Knoxville Expo, “the Reagan administration was not enthusiastic about the [Louisiana World] Exposition and voiced little support for the fair (Gotham, 2009, p. 202).” To demonstrate their lack of interest, the administration only approved \$10 million for the U.S Pavilion; and it prevented Louisiana’s expo organizers from inviting international participants until March 1992 (Ibid, p. 202-203). Furthermore, President Reagan declined to attend its opening ceremony, depriving the event of national publicity. Unfortunately the event’s financial success “totally depended on achieving [its] 12 million visitor projection (Ibid, p. 203).” The administration’s actions exacerbated the effects of poor planning and poor fundraising; and it contributed to the exposition’s \$120 million bankruptcy. The LWE was the first and only exposition ever to declare bankruptcy in the middle of its six-month run. Negative coverage of the LWE and its subsequent legal issues influenced the 1992 Chicago Exposition planning committee to abandon its bid (Gotham, 2009), despite federal recognition from President Reagan (Reagan, 1982).

IV. Literature Review

This literature review focuses on motivations to host a mega event and the economic impacts of mega events. Understanding what cities hope to gain and how it has been measured illustrates why this is, and will continue to be, a recurring issue for the U.S. Government.

Maurice Roche (2003) classifies world expos, the Olympic Games and the World Cup as mega events, which audiences perceive as ‘extra-ordinary’ because of their international scale, periodic occurrences, and changing host sites. Roche describes these mega events as “large-scale leisure and tourism events” (2003, p. 1) with a “dramatic character, mass popular appeal and international significance” (2000; cited in Gotham, 2009, p. 99). In the planning process for the Olympics and world expos, the host city must bid for the right to host, build the event’s facilities, stage the event, and deal with future economic and social impacts (Wilson and Huntoon, 2001). Expos and Olympics also have required public investments to create infrastructure and event space (Roche, 1994).

Differences between expos and the Olympics in duration and facilities may limit generalizations. For example, the Summer Olympics and Winter Olympics each run approximately two and half weeks, while “International Expos” and “World Expos” run three or six months, respectively. Large stadiums built for the Olympics have created “white elephants” in some host countries, most notably in Greece. The 2012 London Olympic Committee sought to avoid this phenomenon by creating temporary facilities. London’s strategy is similar to the planning strategy of six-month-long “World Expos”, where international participants erect temporary pavilions. MN-2023 is bidding for a three-month-long “International Expo;” an event that is hosted in one facility and participants customize designated areas within the facility for their country presentations.

4.1 Motivations to host mega events

Since potential host cities for expos campaign during the bidding process, their motivations are well documented. Hosting an expo or a mega sporting event can signal a host city’s ascendance onto the world stage. When the BIE selected Kazakhstan as the host of Expo 2017, President Nursultan Nazarbayev announced that, “This is the greatest achievement at the international level of Kazakhstan’s independence (Sieff, n.d., para 1).”

Scholars agree that cities bid to host mega events in order to bolster their international reputations, to create profits and to transform their urban infrastructures (Burbank et al, 2001, Horne and Manzenreither, 2006, Eisinger, 2000, Richard and Williams, 2004, Shoal, 2002; cited in Gotham, 2009; see also Broudehoux 2007, Essex and Chalkley, 2004; cited in Sun and Ye, 2010). Mark Wilson and Laura Huntoon (2001) describe how these motivations may apply more specifically to recent expositions:

- As expos generally focus on science and technology, EXPO70 in Osaka and EXPO93 in Taejon, Korea used the opportunity to “advertise advanced technical expertise” and signal economic achievements.

- EXPO88 in Brisbane, EXPO92 in Seville and EXPO2005 in Nagoya, Japan staged expos to help overcome their secondary city status through the focused media attention and increased tourism.
- The Olympic Games in Atlanta and EXPO92 in Seville used mega events to attract national public investment that would not have occurred otherwise (p. 378).

4.2 Economic impacts of world expos

Wilson and Huntoon (2001) describe the status of expo literature in academia, finding that the historical dimensions and pavilions' architectural designs are the most common research focus, that there is little written about expos' economic or urban policy impacts, and that Olympic research also informs analyses of expositions. Recent expo literature continues to reflect these trends.

Louis Wagner (1964) wrote one of the earlier impact assessments of expositions, examining the impact of the Seattle World's Fair on retail sales and services in Washington State. Wagner analyzed quarterly retail and services tax receipts from 1961 to 1962, finding that sales in Washington increased by \$412 million dollars, and in Seattle's King County by \$286 million dollars during the time of the World's Fair. However, he acknowledges uncertainty in how much of the increase he can attribute to the fair. Another limitation of his study is the lack of a control group for comparison.

Wilson and Huntoon found Lisbon's EXPO98 successful in enhancing transportation infrastructure for the metropolitan area, attracting tourists, raising Lisbon's profile, and redeveloping a brownfield site for commercial and residential use. However, the event also resulted in a loss of \$531 million, from cost overruns and poor management (Wilson and Huntoon, 2001, p. 391). From a social welfare perspective, they also found that newly created commercial centers from the expo had a negative public impact by repurposing public lands for private use, and by attracting investment away from the city's core to a more affluent region. The net impact was difficult to discern, benefitting some groups but not others. However, the authors agreed that expo site influenced the city's urban planning trajectory, with the redeveloped site having "the power to redirect the future development of the city (p. 392)."

Jian Sun and Lin Ye (2010) examined economic changes in Beijing prior to the 2008 Olympics, and in Shanghai prior to 2010 World Expo. Each city experienced greater growth in construction and tourism, increased economic development and restructuring, and an improvement in physical infrastructure; but did not grow in foreign trade and finance (p. 133).

The papers are similar in that they evaluate expos' successes within narrow time frames. Wagner (1964) focused the Seattle World's Fair assessment on sales growth for the year, while Wilson and Huntoon (2001) evaluated EXPO98's urban policy impacts three years after the event. Sun and Ye (2010) published their findings as the Shanghai Expo was still operating. Nonetheless, Sun and Ye state that the events should also be judged by "how much and for how long economic, environmental, infrastructural and social benefits can be delivered (p. 161)."

Their findings also reveal a limited ability to draw generalizations from across expositions. This is likely due to the lack of financial data from past expositions. Findling and Pelle (2008) note a strong lack of transparency in financial data reporting, and inconsistent reporting standards from what is reported. For comparison, U.S. state fairs, such as the Minnesota State Fair, operate annually and

must publically disclose their finances. By drawing from historical data and using consistent reporting procedures, state fairs can create more reliable financial forecasts and assessments than world's fair reports. The lack of data from world expositions makes it difficult not only to draw broader generalizations about expos' impacts, it also makes it difficult to create accurate predictions and assessments of an expo's performance.

4.3 Economic impacts of mega events

The following economic impact analyses further reflect disagreements on how to evaluate the success of mega events. Economic impacts of mega sporting events, such as the Olympic Games and the World Cup are better documented than the economic impacts of world expositions. Kasimati's (2003) literature review of economic impact studies of the Olympics found studies dating back to the 1984 Games in Los Angeles.

Impact studies of mega events fall into two categories, *ex-ante* and *ex-post*. *Ex-ante* studies are often commissioned by planners; and project large cash inflows and positive long-term economic effects to attract public investment (Owen 2005; see also Kasimati, 2003). Andersson, Armbrecht, and Lundberg (2007) describe and critique three models used to determine economic impacts of mega events on an economy: the input-output analysis, cost-benefit analysis and computable-general-equilibrium analysis. They note that measuring the 'value' of mega events has been limited to financial values, excluding non-financial impacts such as excitement, traffic, air pollution or social well being (p. 164). Scholars are particularly critical of using multipliers in input-output analyses to analyze regional impacts, with W.J. Hunter going as far as to say, "economic impact studies based on multipliers are quite clearly an improper tool for legislative decision-making" (1988, p16; cited in Kasimati, 2003, pg. 436).

Jeffrey Owen (2005) states that *ex-post* studies on mega-events consistently do not find positive, long-term changes to the host economy. For example, Baade and Matheson's (2002) *ex-post* regression analysis found that the 1984 Olympic Games in Los Angeles created only 5,000 temporary new jobs, and that the 1996 Olympic Games in Atlanta only created 24,000 permanent jobs, or only 32 percent of jobs forecasted. Kasimati questions how sensitive Baade and Matheson's results are to alternative specifications in the model. But given the large discrepancy between rosy *ex-ante* forecasts and conflicting *ex-post* studies, Kasimati concludes that theories behind economic impact studies must be improved. Scholars say that they could be improved by considering the opportunity cost of public funding for the event, and crowding-out effects.

4.4 Long-term impact assessments

News articles indicate that legacy buildings from expo sites can still provide long-term returns to local economies. New Orleans' Ernest N. Morial Convention Center was the former Louisiana State Pavilion at the 1984 World's Fair. In 1999, hotel operators and developers credited it as a "major catalyst" for growth, bringing in more than one million out-of-town visitors each year (Kennedy, 1999). Redevelopment of the city's Warehouse District and Riverwalk during the fair, "spurred a cultural renaissance that included world-renowned restaurants, [art galleries, and museums], among others (Webster, 2005, para. 2)." Lorek and Robins (2006) characterized the 1968 HemisFair world's fair as "a growth spurt" for San Antonio, TX. In particular, "the success of the

HemisFair led to the first major expansion of [San Antonio's] River Walk in the 1960s and 1970s, and a boom in downtown construction (Lorek and Robbins, 2006, p. 5).”

Sun and Ye may have been referring to such effects when they said that mega events should be judged for how long they can continue to produce benefits. An *ex-ante* economic impact study for a proposed 2020 expo planned by the Bay Area Council in California acknowledges many of the aforementioned tensions and limitations in world expo economic literature and mega event impact analyses, but also tried to qualitatively capture the types of legacy effects described in New Orleans and in San Antonio (“World Expo 2020, Expo Impacts, Silicon Valley, USA”, 2011). Similarly, future scholarship on mega events could focus on quantifying and attributing such effects *ex-post* in order to produce a more holistic analysis of mega event impacts.

Scholars broadly agree upon cities’ motivations to host mega events, but disagree on the extent to which these events live up to their stated expectations. **Given the idiosyncrasies of each expo, host cities can still reap long-term economic benefits through careful, direct planning and strong integration of event venues and infrastructure into its regular economies (Wilson and Huntoon, 2001; Baade and Matheson, 2002; Owen, 2005).**

V. Research Design

5.1 Research questions

1. Why did the U.S withdraw from the BIE?
 - What factors did the U.S. consider in deciding to withdraw from the BIE?
 - How did the U.S. withdraw from the BIE?
 - How did the BIE and its member states react?
 - Who made the decision to withdraw?
2. What are the necessary mechanisms to reengage with the BIE?
3. What opportunities could advance MN-2023’s cause?
4. Which lawmakers might be inclined to support reengagement with the BIE?
5. What factors might lawmakers take into account when considering reengagement with the BIE?

5.2 Research methods

The research design for my thesis used exploratory qualitative methods to answer my policy and research questions. I researched an array of documents, including government memoranda, government reports, and news articles; and conducted in-depth interviews with expo organizers, BIE officials and U.S. Government officials.

Interviewees received an interview request letter (see Appendix 2) outlining the goals of my interview, why their input would be invaluable to my research, and what they could expect in terms of confidentiality. In my interview request letter, I requested permission to record the interviews in order to attribute information accurately. Because I wrote this paper for MN-2023, I did not seek IRB approval, as it does not fall under the IRB criterion of “contributing to a field of knowledge.”

All interviews were conducted by phone or e-mail. When permitted, I recorded the call with an iPhone audio recorder, and typed notes as a backup. Interviewees had an opportunity to review their quotes before I included them in the report.

5.3 Interview subjects

The majority of my interview subjects were referred from my client, my advisor, and my internship supervisor at the Department of State. I used snowball referral techniques, where I asked interview subjects to suggest other individuals I may interview. **Table 1** lists the interview subjects, their affiliations, and the research questions (see Section 5.1) that I solicited their input on. I selected individuals with different affiliations, from the BIE and the U.S. government to expo organizers in order to triangulate stories and “confirm the accuracy of documents and information” (Goldstein, 2002).

Table 1. Interview Subjects

Interviewee	Title	Organization	Research Questions
Gilles Noghès	President, 1999 -2003	BIE	1, 2
Paul Foldi	Former Foreign Service Officer, Senior Professional Staff Member of the Foreign Relations Committee for Senator Richard Lugar (R-IN)	Congress	1, 3, 4, 5
James Ogul	Retired Foreign Service Officer	Dept. of State	1
Gordon Linden	World Expo Consultant	Gordon Linden Architects	1, 3, 5
John Grubb	Chief Operating Officer	Bay Area Council	2, 3, 4
Jon Herrmann	Executive Director	USA250	2, 3, 4
Anonymous	Senior Congressional Staff Member		4, 5
Anonymous	Senior Congressional Staff Member		4, 5

VI. Analysis

6.1 U.S. withdraws from the BIE, (1989-2002)

In 1989, Senator Ernest F. Hollings (D-SC) and Representative Neal Smith (D-IA), chairmen of the Senate and House Appropriations subcommittees led a charge to reduce federal funding of world's fairs ("Blocked Funds Put U.S. Role in Seville World Fair in Doubt," 1990). "I don't have anything against world's fairs, but I don't think the Federal Government should be paying for them," said Representative Smith to the New York Times ("Debate Flares on U.S Role at a World's Fair," 1990). Through a conference committee, they cut the Bush Administration's \$15 million appropriation for the U.S. Pavilion at the 1992 Seville Expo.

The United States Information Agency (USIA) responded to the budget cut by 'reprogramming' \$15 million from its own budget to fund the pavilion and attract \$15 million in donations from the private sector. This was the first time such a funding model was used to fund U.S. pavilions (J. Ogul; cited in Rubin, 2013). Not to be deterred, Congress retaliated by prohibiting USIA from obligating its budget to fund pavilions and other exhibits at world's fairs, "in excess of amounts expressly authorized and appropriated for such purpose" through a budget bill (Ibid, para. 4). As a result, the U.S. Pavilion at the 1993 Taejon Exposition in Korea was the first U.S. Pavilion fully financed by the private sector (Ogul, 2014a).

In 1997, at the request of former Senate Committee on Foreign Relations Chairman Jesse Helms (R-NC), the General Accounting Office (GAO) issued a report on U.S. membership in special-purpose international organizations. In Senator Helms' request for the report, he "expressed concern about the level of U.S. spending to support international organizations in light of the stringent budgets the federal government is facing (GAO, 1997, pg. 1)." The GAO then examined whether U.S. membership in 25 special-purpose organizations, including the BIE, continued to serve U.S. interests and what steps the State Department had taken to keep government contributions low. James Ogul confirms the report's findings that the U.S. achieved its primary policy objective of reducing the frequency of expos, by saying that "The U.S. was in fact a major force in getting the BIE rules changed to reduce the proliferation of World's Fairs such as happened in the 1980s (J. Ogul, personal communication, January 23, 2015)." GAO described the U.S. \$33,000 annual dues as "modest", but expressed concern that the U.S. paid the highest assessment rate of all BIE member states. BIE dues are calculated using the U.N. scale of assessments and with consideration to the member state's size and economic production (GAO, 1997).

Also in 1997, the 105th Congress passed a House bill encouraging full U.S. participation at Expo 2000 in Hannover, Germany. Representative Douglas Bereuter (R-NE) sponsored the bill along with four other representatives. It passed through the House by a vote of 415-2 and was referred to the Senate Committee of Foreign Relations. Senator Richard Lugar (R-IN) introduced a concurrent bill to the Senate Committee of Foreign Relations. However, the motion never made it out of Helms' committee.

By 1998, Congress had stopped appropriating funds for BIE membership, forfeiting the country's right to vote in the BIE. Paul Foldi, a former Foreign Service Officer and a former senior professional staff member of the Foreign Relations Committee for Senator Lugar, says that many point to USIA's absorption into the State Department in 1999 as the "tipping point" that accelerated

declining federal interest in expos. In contrast with State’s “staid, but tried and true establishment,” “USIA dealt with culture, and journalism and interactions between the public...[USIA] was a little edgier for lack of a better expression (P. Foldi, personal communication, December 23, 2014).” In 2000, private sponsors for the U.S. Pavilion in Hannover failed to raise enough money after two years of fundraising. The U.S. pulled out of Expo 2000, disappointing German allies (Ogul, 2014a).

In 2001, the Department of State, with concurrence from the Department of Commerce, wrote a memorandum to then Secretary of State Colin Powell encouraging withdrawal from the 1928 Convention, thereby ending U.S. membership in the BIE (J. Ogul, personal communication, January 23, 2015). State cited the lack of appropriations from Congress, along with the perceived ineffectiveness of expositions in promoting business and national interests as reasons for withdrawal. In summer 2001, Secretary Colin Powell wrote a letter to the French Government announcing U.S. withdrawal from the treaty. U.S. membership in the BIE ended in 2002. Appendix 3 provides a timeline of the events described above.

Ambassador Gilles Noghès of Monaco was the sitting president of the BIE when the U.S. withdrew. According to him, the BIE viewed this as “in line with U.S. withdrawals from other international organizations, caused by financial considerations and domestic political trends (G. Noghès, personal communication, November 30, 2014).” Similarly, Vicente Loscertales, Secretary General of the BIE judged that his organization “was ‘collateral damage’ of U.S. unilateralism” during that time (Michaels, 2009, para. 23).

6.2 Impact of U.S. withdrawal (2002- present)

BIE and State Department officials said that U.S. withdrawal from the BIE had relatively small impacts on their respective operations. When the U.S. withdrew, the BIE was implementing changes from a newly adopted Convention and reorganizing its management. Given these “big changes,” the U.S. withdrawal did not seem “well-timed (G. Noghès, personal communication, November, 30, 2014).” But within a decade, membership in the BIE had grown from 90 to over 160 member states, increasing the BIE’s financial stability and international prominence. Withdrawal also bore no impact on coordinating funding for U.S. pavilions. James Ogul, a retired State Department official with 30 years of world’s fair experience, states that, “[State Department’s] work of raising money for and having a pavilion designed, built and operated was totally outside of the BIE both before we left and after (personal communication, January, 23, 2015).” But in regards to pavilion content, Paul Foldi lamented the influence of private sponsors. When asked what he would like to see at U.S. pavilions, he replied, “more American flags and less corporate logos (personal communication, December 23, 2014).”

The U.S. has continued to participate in expositions by hosting a \$32 million pavilion at the 2005 Expo in Aichi, Japan (Ogul, 2014d); a \$60 million pavilion at the 2010 Expo in Shanghai, China (Camp, 2012); and a \$9.2 million pavilion at the 2012 Expo in Yeosu, Korea (J. Ogul, cited in Rubin, 2013). These pavilions, including the currently planned \$45 million pavilion for the 2015 Expo in Milan, Italy, have been fully financed by the private sector, through public-private partnerships coordinated by the Department of State (Ogul, 2014b).

However, U.S. withdrawal from the BIE has had strong, adverse consequences for states and localities that wish to host an exposition on U.S. soil. Organizers in at least four states have prepared bids, or are exploring the possibility of preparing bids to host a BIE-affiliated expo. These states include California, Texas, Minnesota and Pennsylvania. Cities in Nevada, Florida and North Carolina have also expressed past interest. Section 6.4 recounts the travails of California's bid to host an expo, and how the issue of BIE membership ultimately ended its bid.

Non-membership status hurts the United States' chances of winning a bid. Ogul notes that, "The BIE gives preferential treatment to bids from its members (personal communication, January 23, 2015)." Ambassador Noghès framed Minnesota's chances more starkly by saying, "If the United States does not reengage in the BIE, the Minnesota bid has practically no chance to succeed. It will never reach the voting threshold of 66.7 percent if there is another candidate or more, which has been the case with recent votes (personal communication, November 30, 2014)." To date no other country has seriously proposed a bid to compete with Minnesota to host a 2022 or 2023 expo, but each exposition since 2000 has had two or more cities competing to host the event.

Non-membership status also complicates expo organizers' financial considerations. Sponsors have expressed reluctance to commit funding to proposed expos, given our country's non-membership status in the BIE. This increases the difficulty for MN-2023 to prepare a financially viable and competitive bid. The Bay Area Council experienced the same difficulties during their bid to host Expo 2020. As John Grubb recounts:

"The problem for us was getting large chunks of money. As soon as people started researching it, before they put money into our bid, they'd ask 'Why aren't we members of the BIE?' or 'How are you going to win the bid?' Then they would talk about how you need to get that done. With that doubt and indecision, they're not going to give you the money. The type of bid that Minnesota is going for, you could conceivably do it without being a member of the BIE, but it is still harder (personal communication, April 1, 2015)."

If MN-2023 overcomes the hurdles of winning a bid without BIE membership, it must then pay double the registration fee that other member states pay. Given our country's non-member status, MN-2023 would have to pay 1,100,000€ (\$1,213,000) in registration fees to host an international exposition, rather than the 550,000€ (\$606,500) registration fee that member states pay (M. Ritchie, personal communication, August 8, 2014).

Furthermore, negative sentiments from within the BIE community may threaten MN-2023's financial performance through decreased country participation. Ambassador Noghès posits, "Supposing the bid [as a non-member state] was successful, the participation of foreign countries would not be large (personal communication, November 30, 2014)." More than 30 years have lapsed since the Louisiana World Expo, but member states' negative experiences from the event may still dissuade them from participating in another U.S. expo. During its bankruptcy, the government placed liens on the Louisiana World Expo's properties. International participants were padlocked out of their own pavilions. Due to those legal and financial impositions, participants from that Expo "may not have a very positive attitude about the U.S. hosting again (J. Ogul, personal communication, January 23, 2015)." Perhaps the most damning indication of how some people may view U.S. participation in expos came from Ted Allan, former President of the BIE. As he said to

World Expo Consultant Gordon Linden, “Your countrymen tried to kill expos (G. Linden, personal communication, November 5, 2014).”

In short, a non-member status does not preclude a country’s ability to host a BIE-affiliated exposition. However, it effectively eliminates a non-member state’s chances of winning its bid, if a BIE member state enters a counterbid. In the unlikely possibility that the U.S. passes the voting threshold, additional registration fees and potentially low participation from other countries threaten the financial performance of the event.

6.3 Barriers to rejoining the BIE

Interviewees were skeptical about the prospects for U.S. re-engagement with the BIE. With fading memories of U.S. participation in world expos, Gordon Linden described rejoining the BIE as “opening the X-files all over again (Ibid).”

Since the U.S. has not hosted a world expo in over 30 years, world’s fairs have been relegated as an antiquity or a punch line. In a 1996 episode of *The Simpsons*, Bart Simpson and his friends take a road trip to visit the Knoxville World Expo, only to find that they’re 14 years too late and that the iconic Sunsphere is now a wig warehouse (“Bart on the Road,” 2015, para. 3-4). Recent expos in remote locations such as Yeosu, Korea in 2012 and Aichi, Japan in 2005 drew minimal coverage from U.S. media outlets. An aspiring Las Vegas expo organizer once said that “the universal reaction to the suggestion of a new expo is: ‘Wow, do they still have those?’ (Michaels, 2009, para. 11).” As a result, many Americans don’t realize that world’s fairs still exist, despite record-breaking attendance at the 2010 Shanghai Expo. A 2014 segment on National Public Radio’s *All Things Considered* even suggested that a modern world’s fair might resemble the Burning Man festival, or a “real-world version of Wikipedia,” without mentioning that world’s fairs still happen today (Henn, 2014).

The transitory nature of expos severely limits their ability to create steady, politically active constituencies. Infrequent, rotating host sites create no incentives for consistent geographic-based support. Furthermore, city-selected expo themes create no incentives for consistent support within industries. The importance of this dynamic becomes evident when contrasting the fates of membership in the BIE and the International Cotton Advisory Council (ICAC). In 1995, the State Department attempted to withdraw the U.S. from ICAC. GAO noted that membership in ICAC and other commodity organizations seemed “especially important to specific industry groups, which participated actively in them at their own expense (GAO, 1997, p. 10).” These industry groups provided strong bases of support for participation in their respective international commodity organizations. As a result, the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 included a provision to continue membership in ICAC (Ibid, p. 6). The State Department then rescinded its notice of withdrawal to ICAC, despite considering membership in international commodity organizations the “least defensible (Ibid, p. 4).” In contrast, when the U.S. withdrew from the BIE, “No one stood up. No one (G. Linden, personal communication, November 5, 2014).”

The debate over BIE membership did not leave a lasting impression. A senior Congressional staff member reports that a Congressman who served on the appropriations committee in the 1990s did not remember the BIE issue specifically, but remembers the broader debates about participating in international organizations (personal communication, March 13, 2015). These debates ran as the United States reassessed its role in the post-Cold War world and the post-1994 Republican-led

Congress asserted U.S. sovereignty over binding international commitments (personal communication, March 13, 2015).

Former State Department officials also described congressional apathy severely. “There’s no point asking Congress for money, there’s not sufficient congressional support for the effort,” says Paul Foldi (personal communication, December 23, 2014). James Ogul, states that there’s “too much apathy” in Congress to support BIE membership and world’s fair participation. Until that changes, he says there’s “little point in belonging in the BIE (J. Ogul, personal communication, January 23, 2015).”

Currently, within the State Department, “there has been discussion each time a U.S. entity has approached State to rejoin [the BIE] and the interdepartmental consensus has been that we should not (Ibid).” Events described in Section 6.4 corroborate these sentiments. The State Department explained its position on rejoining the BIE to Mark Ritchie of MN-2023 in the e-mail excerpt below:

“The viability of any U.S. bid to host a world’s fair depends more on the commitment of significant financial resources and expertise than it does on membership in the BIE, which is not an absolute prerequisite for a successful bid. The United States was not a member of the BIE at the time of the Seattle World’s Fair, which was sanctioned by the BIE. Therefore, the State Department believes that a decision on membership in the BIE should follow a strong bid that reflects substantial commitments of resources from the private sector and support from the Department of Commerce, as well as from Congress (M. Ritchie, personal communication, October 10, 2014).”

The State Department’s position overestimates MN-2023’s ability to win an expo given the public apathy engendered by the U.S.’s long absence from the BIE, and lingering negative sentiments surrounding its most recent expos. State’s assertion that strong financial commitments should precede consideration of BIE membership also creates a negative feedback loop. As evidenced in Section 6.2, the U.S.’s non-membership status in the BIE undermines expo organizers’ ability to generate financial commitments. Finally, using the 1962 Seattle World’s Fair as an example that it is feasible to host a BIE-sanctioned world’s fair as a non-member state ignores global changes over last 50 years. BIE membership has expanded beyond Western nations, and includes 168 member states to date. The international system has morphed from one dominated by Cold War politics, to a multi-polar system where countries pursue their own national interests. These changes reduce U.S. influence, making it harder to win a bid than the State Department implies. See Appendix 4 for a longer excerpt of the State Department’s position.

6.4 The Bay Area Council’s expo bid

Around 2010-2011, the Bay Area Council (BAC) of California led a concerted effort to rejoin the BIE. At the 2010 Shanghai Expo, California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger announced California’s intent to bid by saying, “Shanghai has demonstrated that when you host the World Expo, the world comes to you, and I want the world to come to California (“Governor Schwarzenegger, Bay Area Council, Announce Bid for 2020 World Expo,” 2010, para. 2).” The BAC initially attempted to bid for the 2020 Expo, which was awarded to Dubai. They then focused

on coupling a 2025 World Expo bid with a bid for the 2024 Olympics, which the United States Olympic Committee recently awarded to Boston, Massachusetts.

John Grubb, the BAC's Chief Operating Officer described their efforts as first going "front-door" through the State Department, and then working "back-door" through the White House. He expressed disappointment at State's lack of interest in rejoining the BIE, particularly [with] the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, whose "energy and imagination clearly weren't captured by working in expos (J. Grubb, personal communication, April 1, 2015)." Lost institutional knowledge exacerbates these sentiments, with now defunct offices in State and Commerce that used to deal exclusively with expos.

The BAC found support within the Obama Administration, where the matter reached the attention of the Chiefs of Staff for State, Commerce and the National Security Council, as well as President Barack Obama. Under BIE auspices, the BAC prepared a letter, or instrument of accession to the BIE for Secretary of State Hillary Clinton to sign (see Appendix 5). As the BIE's deadline to submit final bids neared, the BAC was told the White House's legal counsel feared that other countries might sue the U.S. in international courts if the U.S. submitted a bid prior to rejoining the organization and paying its annual dues and back dues. The conflict remained unsolved until the deadline. As Grubb said, "That was it for us. That was when we had to tell everyone that it was over (personal communication, April 1, 2015)."

6.5 Circular 175

MN-2023's correspondence with the BIE indicates that the U.S. can rejoin the BIE by submitting a letter from the Secretary of State (Instrument of Accession) that describes its intent to re-accede. The State Department used the Circular 175 procedure to withdraw from the BIE; this procedure entails:

"An action memorandum from a bureau or office in the State Department to a Department official at the Assistant Secretary level or above, requesting authority to negotiate, conclude, amend, extend, or terminate an international agreement... The memorandum should set forth the issue for decision; the principal features of the proposed agreement; any special problems that may be encountered along with any contemplated solutions to those problems; and policy benefits to the United States of the requested action. **It also should address whether there will be congressional consultations** and whether an environmental impact assessment is needed ("Circular 175 Procedure", n.d.)."

State may be able to use the same mechanism to rejoin the BIE that it used to withdraw from the IE in 2001.² According to the State Department's Foreign Affairs Manual, one objective of the Circular 175 procedure is to ensure that, "**timely and appropriate consultation is had with congressional leaders and committees** on treaties and other international agreements (11 FAM 720, 2006, p.1)." If State pursues BIE reentry through the Circular 175 procedure, lining up support from key legislators of the State Department's oversight committees and congressional delegations from Expo

² A legal analysis conducted by Holland and Knight, LLP for the Bay Area Council determined that this is a feasible mechanism for rejoining the BIE (M. Ritchie, personal communication, July 23, 2014).

USA regions would facilitate this process. Appendix 6 reprints the State Department's 2001 memorandum RE: Circular 175.

6.6 Lawmakers' considerations

To date, Representative Tim Walz (D-MN-1), Senators Amy Klobuchar (D-MN) and Al Franken (D-MN) have written letters to Secretary of State John Kerry requesting to rejoin the BIE in support of MN-2023's bid. Letters from Representatives Tom Emmer (R-MN-6) and Erik Paulsen (R-MN-3) are under review (M. Ritchie, personal communication, April 18, 2015). Appendix 7 identifies Minnesota's full congressional delegation. The Senators' letters focused on the soft power benefits of BIE membership. Representative Walz also mentioned soft power benefits, but highlighted the potential benefits for Minnesota and his district, and the support from local community leaders. He described the event not only as an opportunity to "lift Minnesota's advanced leadership in health care and medical technology to a whole new level of global awareness," but also as "crucial for our entire state but especially for my district (M. Ritchie, personal communication, October, 24, 2014)." The State Department responded to Senator Klobuchar with the position explained to MN-2023 in Section 6.3 of this paper (M. Ritchie, personal communication, October 10, 2014). Appendices 8, 9, and 10 reprint the endorsement letters from Senators Franken and Klobuchar, and from Representative Walz.

Membership costs will likely play a minor consideration in the decision to rejoin. Gordon Linden recalls that when New Zealand voted to rejoin the BIE in 2013, "It was one single line item in a meeting. They wanted to promote tourism...[The dues aren't] a big number. So it's a matter of pulling the trigger (G. Linden, personal communication, November 5, 2015)." U.S. annual dues for the BIE would run approximately \$33,000 ("World Expo 2020, Expo Impacts, Silicon Valley, USA", 2011, p. 6). As mentioned earlier, budgetary legislation from 1994 prevents the State Department from expending funds on expo activities, unless expressly appropriated by Congress. MN-2023, and the Expo USA network have offered to pay the back dues accrued by the U.S from 1999, 2000, 2001 and 2002. During this time, annual dues from each year were 25,428.50€ (~\$27,500), or 102,000€ (~\$110,000) total (M. Ritchie, personal communication, December 30, 2014).³ Organizers cite Ted Turner's payment of U.S. back dues to the United Nations as precedent for their offer. Benefits from reduced expo registration fees would accrue more directly to expo organizers, rather than the federal government.

Interview subjects also report that partisan politics may complicate reentry efforts. Even today, conventions pending before the Senate, "that should be non-political, such as the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, have been largely politicized (senior Congressional staff member, personal communication, March 13, 2015)." John Grubb described these pressures when bidding for Expo 2020, "There's so much partisanship built in. It interferes with clear thinking, about doing something right for our country. It should be bipartisan but it's not (personal communication, April 1, 2015)." The recent gridlocks in Congress drove the Bay Area Council's decision to work around Congress by getting White House support. John Grubb describes the difficulty of working across the aisle:

³ Please note that the BIE dues presented in Section 6.6 were calculated using exchange rates from December 2014. The BIE dues reported by the GAO in Section 6.1 did not reference the exchange rate during 1995. Differing exchange rates may account for the discrepancy from the BIE and GAO reports.

“We come from a very Democratic state, both senators are Democrats and most of the members of our House delegation are Democrats. So we tend to be always colored as Democrats no matter what we say because we’re from here. That may color how people react to whatever we may say. I think you could easily see the Republican argument for doing it, and the Democrat argument. [However,] I just don’t know how it can get bipartisan support. I don’t know (personal communication, April 1, 2015).”

Despite those reservations, the most explicit support for rejoining the BIE comes from conservative public diplomacy literature. A 2011 Republican staff report, written for the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, unequivocally recommended rejoining the BIE. Its author, Paul Foldi recommended that, “Given recent interest by Texas and California in hosting the 2020 Expo, the U.S. should immediately seek to rejoin the [BIE] in order to bid for the 2020 Expo (Foldi, 2011, p. 6).”

Foldi promotes expos as a unique platform for public diplomacy, emphasizing how it impacts our relationship with China. As China continues to censor its media, the U.S. Government must find mediums to communicate with the Chinese public that technology cannot block. “One manner of interaction that cannot be blocked by technology is interaction with American officials, academics, authors and ordinary citizens,” remarked Senator Lugar in the staff report’s introduction (Ibid, p. vi.). Expos facilitate numerous citizen-to-citizen interactions in the planning and execution of the events. Foldi noted that over 7,000,000 Chinese visited the U.S. Pavilion at the 2010 Shanghai Expo, which is an “audience over ten times the size of the number of Chinese who visit the United States in a single year (Ibid, p. 6).”

Foldi’s recommendation that the U.S. participate in expos to conduct public diplomacy with China aligns with the GOP’s platform on U.S.-Chinese relations. The 2012 GOP platform stated that, “The exposure of the Chinese people to our way of life can be the greatest force for change in their country. We should make it easier for the people of China to experience our vibrant democracy and to see for themselves how freedom works (Republican Platform, 2012, p. 49).”

Such messaging may provide a way to appeal to Republican legislators with little or no constituent stake in Minnesota’s expo. In their letters to Secretary Kerry, Democratic Senators Franken and Klobuchar similarly argued for the soft power benefits of world expos in “promoting America’s reputation as a world leader” and “providing a platform for international exchanges of culture and ideas (M. Ritchie, personal communication, April 3, 2014).” The commonalities over soft power benefits of expos are important to note. There are newly empowered Republican majorities in the House and Senate; however urban areas, where expo bids are most likely to originate, identify more strongly with the Democratic Party. The soft power angle could help bridge this dichotomy.

VII. Recommendation

MN-2023 and its partners should mobilize public, private and congressional support to pass a “sense of the Senate” resolution supporting BIE membership. “Sense of” resolutions are non-binding, formal opinions articulated by Congress. MN-2023 should then work with the executive branch to leverage congressional support to encourage the Secretary of State to submit an “Instrument of Accession” to the BIE.

7.1 Criteria

The proposed strategy satisfies the following criteria:

- Builds domestic support for rejoining the BIE with influential stakeholders
- Increases MN-2023’s chances for winning the bid
- Imposes a relatively low resource cost to MN-2023


7.2 Assumptions

1. Membership in the BIE is a necessary precondition for MN-2023 to win its bid, in the event that another member state submits a competing bid to host an expo in 2022 or 2023.
2. The State Department will only recommend rejoining the BIE with support from Congress. Per Section 6.4, the State Department “believes that a decision on membership in the BIE should follow a strong bid...and support from the private sector, [Commerce], and **Congress.**” Furthermore, declining federal support for expo participation began in congressional committees. Based on this evidence and the concurring perspectives of former state department officials, congressional approval is *sin qua non* for BIE reentry.
3. This strategy can be carried out before the State Department transmits MN-2023’s bid to the BIE.

7.3 Political strategy

Figure 1 outlines my proposal for a political strategy that facilitates rejoining the BIE. Phase I mobilizes external and congressional support for the expo bid, culminating in a sense of the Senate resolution advocating for BIE membership. Phase II engages the executive branch to transform congressional support into a statement of federal commitment, whereby the Secretary of State submits an “instrument of accession” to the BIE.

Figure 1. Political Strategy



Phase I: Strong community support is the lynchpin for a successful bid, and a crucial ingredient to attract the support of legislators. Chicago’s bid for the 1992 expo fell apart when it lost the support of its mayor, prompting Washington to withdraw its support of the bid (Shipp, 1985). Many interviewees mentioned the salience of economic impacts and soft power arguments when advocating for world expositions, which can be used when conversing with legislators from both parties. My research also indicates that there is a dearth of awareness of modern expos among the American public.

MN-2023 is actively promoting the event through online and traditional media channels, and by appearing at public events. This report provides useful background information for an opinion editorial (op-ed) that advocates for BIE membership, and that would raise public awareness of the issue. The Milan Expo, which will run for six-months this year beginning in May 2015, provides an excellent backdrop for the op-ed. Publication of the op-ed should be coordinated with the expo’s programming to maximize exposure and interest. Possible days to publish the article include its opening day (May 1, 2015), closing day (October 31, 2015), or Independence Day (July 4, 2015), which will be celebrated by the U.S. Pavilion during the Milan Expo. MN-2023 should continue gathering support from Minnesota’s business and political leaders. To further demonstrate private sector support, MN-2023 should encourage local Chambers of Commerce and MN-2023’s inaugural business partners to write to Minnesota’s Congressmen. Letters of endorsement from Minnesota’s congressional delegates evidence mounting political support. These letters from various stakeholders will be useful when discussing the event with key congressional oversight committees, such as the Senate Committee of Foreign Relations. Appendix 11 identifies legislators who have cosponsored past expo participation bills. These legislators may be more amenable to supporting BIE membership than others.

Phase One culminates in a sense of the Senate resolution advocating for BIE membership. Per the Congressional Research Service (CRS), “one or both houses of Congress may formally express opinions about subjects of current national interest through freestanding simple or concurrent resolutions,” or add these opinions to pending legislation via amendment (Davis, 2013, p. 2).

Resolutions are symbolic, non-binding declarations. Many of the resolutions from the 111th Congress focused on foreign policy matters. Although they have no force in law, CRS notes “foreign governments pay close attention to them as evidence of shifts in U.S. foreign policy priorities (Ibid, p. 3).”

In regards to resource cost and feasibility, proposing and passing a resolution is less labor intensive for Senators than passing formal legislation, or passing a treaty vote. CRS finds that sense of Senate resolutions are easier to pursue than sense of House resolutions, which is the basis for pursuing this process through the Senate rather than the House. Sense of the Senate resolutions have passed with as few as four cosponsors. More than 2,100 sense of the Senate resolutions have been introduced since 1981; only six of these resolutions have failed with majority votes of ‘Nay’. Of the failed resolutions, three proposed changes to Senate procedures, one called for an increase \$1 billion in federal education funding, one related to the Chemical Weapons Convention, and one proposed a feasibility study to increase oversight of the Federal Reserve and its interest rates.⁴ These issues are more contentious than the issue of rejoining the BIE. Therefore one would not expect such spirited opposition. The resolution would be more likely to get stuck in committee than fail outright.

As Minnesota’s Senior Senator, Amy Klobuchar would be the ideal Senator to approach for sponsoring the resolution. Senator Klobuchar has a record of cosponsoring bipartisan legislation with Republican Senators on a wide range of issues; some of which include health care, international trade, and human trafficking. In the 114th Congress, she has sponsored fifteen bills and resolutions; nine of which have at least one Republican cosponsor (“Sen. Amy Klobuchar,” 2015). Nineteen Republican Senators have cosponsored bills that she introduced during this Congress. This record demonstrates Senator Klobuchar’s ability to work across the aisle, an ability that will be crucial to overcoming the politicization over international conventions.

MN-2023 should leverage the network of expo organizers represented by Expo USA, and encourage them to lobby their states’ senators to cosponsor the bill. The Expo USA network includes states from the West Coast, the Midwest, the Southwest, and the Northeast. Senators who represent states in this network come from both sides of the aisle; they include Al Franken (D-MN), John Cornyn (R-TX), Ted Cruz (R-TX), Dianne Feinstein (D-CA), Barbara Boxer (D-CA), Bob Casey Jr. (D-PA) and Pat Toomey (R-PA). Senator Cornyn has cosponsored multiple bills with Senator Klobuchar over the years, and his seniority in the Republican Party would make him an important ally. He should be pursued as the lead cosponsor of the bill. Demonstrating bipartisan support from senators – who each have constituents that are organizing expo bids – would hedge against other legislators politicizing the issue for their own gains.

Providing input on this resolution also allows MN-2023 the opportunity to frame the issue for Congress. If the resolution passes, it can build momentum for support of MN-2023’s bid within the BIE general assembly and encourage participation by foreign governments. Positive attention from foreign governments and/or the BIE can be leveraged to continue discussions within the executive branch to sign the instrument of accession. If passed, the resolution can also encourage further private sector funding for the event.

⁴ These results are based on my informal survey of sense of the Senate resolutions using the search features on congress.gov, on April 3, 2015.

However, there are risks to this strategy. It draws attention to what is otherwise an under-the-radar issue, risking additional scrutiny from detractors. As mentioned earlier, the issue may be negatively politicized. If the resolution is followed internationally, a non-vote may disappoint BIE member states. Framing the legislation in broad, positive terms, and assembling a bipartisan and geographically diverse group of cosponsors for the resolution are the strongest ways to deter these negative effects.

Phase II: The sense of the Senate resolution provides MN-2023 with an on-the-record vote of support that they can use to further discussions with the executive branch. In particular, MN-2023 should focus on working with the Departments of State and Commerce, and the White House. The Secretary of State must transmit the instrument of accession, but will only do so with supporting input from Commerce and approval from the White House.

James Ogul and John Grubb both described internal opposition to rejoining the BIE in the State Department. If Congress supports rejoining the BIE, then MN-2023 can begin working with the State Department's Bureau of Legislative Affairs (H), which, "facilitates effective communication between State Department officials and the members of Commerce and their staffs ("Bureau of Legislative Affairs," n.d.)." H can serve as a facilitator to navigate conflicts over the Department's resource constraints, and to help overcome expo apathy within bureaus (e.g. the Bureau of Education and Cultural Affairs).

Relationships with the Department of Commerce's Office of Legislative & Intergovernmental Affairs (OLIA) can be leveraged in the same manner as H in the State Department. Additionally, hosting international expos increases tourism in host cities (Wilson and Huntoon, 2001; Sun and Ye, 2010), which directly supports the Office of Travel and Tourism Industries' (OTTI) goal of "increasing American jobs by attracting and welcoming 100 million international visitors, who we estimate will spend \$250 billion annually by the end of 2021 ("National Travel and Tourism Strategy," 2012). A federal task force on travel and competitiveness found that the global travel market has become increasingly competitive as countries aggressively compete for market share (Ibid). Mega events like world expos and the Olympics help host cities stand out in this competitive environment. MN-2023 should promote their event to OTTI, to the Travel and Tourism Advisory Board, and to the Tourism Policy Council; and show them how hosting a world expo aligns with their goals.

Finally, the White House is an invaluable ally, as demonstrated by the Bay Area Council's experience. The current administration is already familiar with the issue. By judging from the BAC's accounts, they also appear to be supportive of rejoining the BIE. The BAC is currently leading an effort to have California business leaders and early supporters of President Obama write letters to the White House endorsing expositions. MN-2023 and other Expo USA organizers should follow suit.

State Department literature and interviews with their former officials referenced Congressional support as a necessary precursor to rejoining the BIE. Securing that support builds public momentum for the cause, and opens new channels within the executive branch to facilitate negotiations. These channels will help pave the path for the Secretary of State to sign an instrument of accession to the BIE.

VIII. Conclusion

John Grubb described the U.S.'s relationship with the BIE as a “sad history (personal communication, April 1, 2015).” A few outspoken Democrat and Republican lawmakers drove the decade-long decline in U.S. world’s fair participation throughout the 1990s. However, public and congressional apathy towards world’s fairs allowed the U.S. to renege on its obligations to the BIE before fully withdrawing from the organization. World expos’ declining popularity in the U.S. coincided with the rise of the Internet, leading many to wonder if expos were still relevant in today’s interconnected, global society (Wilson and Huntoon, 2001).

But as evidenced by attendance in recent world expos and the diversity of host cities, world expos remain popular internationally. Since 2000, twenty-one cities from around the world have bid to host BIE-sanctioned expos. This number does not include bids that were planned, but not presented to the BIE. U.S. cities such as San Francisco, Las Vegas, and Houston have all recently prepared expo bids, but they have either delayed or cancelled their bids until the U.S. rejoins the BIE.

Rejoining the BIE will require activating “latent excitement,” as John Grubb has said, from the public and from government officials. Americans who remember attending past U.S. expos describe them fondly, and they recall how the events generated wonder and excitement in their lives. Despite the low costs of BIE membership, bureaucratic inertia, lack of public awareness and congressional apathy are preventing them from occurring here again. With Expo 2015 occurring this summer in Milan, and with the open bidding season for MN-2023, 2015 is the perfect year for Minnesota to promote U.S. membership in the BIE.

We all have a stake in this endeavor, which is why I argue that Minnesota must convince a broad range of stakeholders, most notably Congress and offices in the executive branch, that BIE membership is a worthwhile investment. The economic benefits of the proposed expo will accrue mostly in Minnesota; but this expo, along with future expos hosted in the U.S., will represent our nation. It will represent our ideals, our values, and what we hope to pass on to our children. Furthermore, it provides a platform to work with the international community on solutions to pressing global problems.

Perhaps, and most importantly, world expos allow us to place our individual and collective existence in the broader context of time, and empower us to use our ingenuity and imagination to see the world under a new light:

“We went to the New York World's Fair, saw what the past had been like, according to the Ford Motor Car Company and Walt Disney, saw what the future would be like, according to General Motors. And I asked myself about the present: how wide it was, how deep it was, how much was mine to keep.”

- Kurt Vonnegut, *Slaughterhouse-Five*, p. 23.

IX. Bibliography

- 11 FAM 720, Negotiation and Conclusion. (2006). In *U.S. Department of State Foreign Affairs Manual Volume 11 - Political Affairs* (pp. 1 – 18). Retrieved from <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/88317.pdf>
- 2012 Republican Platform. (2012). Republican National Convention. Retrieved March 6, 2015, from <https://cdn.gop.com/docs/2012GOPPlatform.pdf>
- Aberbach, J.D., and Rockman, B.A. (2002). “Conducting and Coding Elite Interviews.” *Political Science and Politics*. 35(4): 673-676.
- Andersson, T. D., Armbrrecht, J., & Lundberg, E. (2008). Impact of Mega-Events on the Economy. *Asian Business & Management*, 7(2), 163–179.
- Baade, R. A., & Matheson, V. A. (2002). Bidding for the Olympics: Fool’s Gold? In M. Ibrahim & S. Szymanski (Eds.), *Transatlantic Sport: The Comparative Economics of North American and European Sports* (pp. 127–151). Northampton: Edward Elgar.
- Bart on the Road. (2015). *Wikipedia*. Retrieved March 6, 2015, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bart_on_the_Road
- BIE. (n.d.). Who We Are. Retrieved from <http://www.bie-paris.org/site/en/home/who-we-are>
- BIE Convention. (1972). Retrieved April 23, 2015 from http://www.bie-paris.org/site/images/stories/files/BIE_Convention_eng.pdf
- Blocked Funds Put U.S. Role In Seville World Fair in Doubt. (1990, April 17). *The New York Times*. Madrid, Spain.
- Bureau of Legislative Affairs. (n.d.). *U.S. Department of State*. Retrieved April 17, 2015, from <http://www.state.gov/s/h/>
- Camp, B. (2012). How I Came to Love the Shanghai Expo. W. Kiehl (Ed.), *The Last Three Feet: Case Studies in Public Diplomacy* (pp. 9 – 18). Washington D.C.: Public Diplomacy Council.
- Circular 175 Procedure. (n.d.). Retrieved April 27, 2015, from <http://www.state.gov/s/1/treaty/c175/>
- China puts Milan Expo ticket sales on track. (2015). *USA News*. Retrieved March 6, 2015, from <http://usa.news.net/article/2772358/china-puts-milan-world-expo-ticket-sales-on-track>
- Congress. (1970). An Act To provide for Federal Government recognition of and participation in inter- national expositions proposed to be held in the United States, and for other purposes., (1), 271–272.

- Congress. An Act To provide for the participation of the United States in the International Exposition on the Environment to be held in Spokane, "Washington, in 1974, and for other purposes. (1972).
- Congress, U. S. Official U.S. Government Recognition of and Participation in International Expositions Held in the United States (1981). Retrieved from <http://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/15/310.1>
- Creswell. John W., *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed-Methods Approaches*. (4th ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- De Giuli, M. (2015, March 4). Feature: Expo Milano 2015 to involve entire city for the first time in world expositions' history. *Xinhua News Agency*. Milan, Italy. Retrieved from http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2015-03/05/c_134038341.htm
- Egerstrom, L. (2013). Imagine a Minnesota World's Fair. *MN 2020*. Retrieved November 03, 2014, from <http://www.mn2020.org/issues-that-matter/economic-development/imagine-a-minnesota-worlds-fair>
- MN-2023. (2014). Donors | MN-2023 | Minnesota's World Fair. Retrieved November 05, 2014, from <http://expo2023.info/participate/donors/>
- Fatiguso, R. (2015). Expo Milano 2015 chief aiming for 1.5 mn visitors from China. *Il Sole 24 Ore Digital Edition*. Retrieved March 6, 2015, from <http://www.italy24.ilsole24ore.com/art/business-and-economy/2014-10-23/intervista-sala-expo-165326.php?uuid=ABrPt75B>
- Findling, J., & Pelle, K. (Eds.). (2008). *Encyclopedia of World's Fairs and Expositions* (2nd ed.). McFarland & Company, Inc.
- Foldi, P. (2011). *Another U.S. Deficit – China and America – Public Diplomacy in the Age of the Internet*. Washington, D.C. Retrieved from <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/175159.pdf>
- Freed, D. (2011, May 8). Good times for San Antonio's River Walk. *The Los Angeles Times*. San Antonio. Retrieved from <http://www.latimes.com/travel/la-tr-sanantonio-20110508-story.html>
- GAO. (1997). State Department: U.S. Participation in Special-Purpose International Organizations. Washington, D.C. Retrieved from <http://www.gao.gov/products/NSIAD-97-35>
- Goldstein, K. (2002). "Getting in the Door: Sampling and Completing Elite Interviews." *PS: Political Science and Politics*. 35(4): 669-672.
- Gotham, K. F. (2010). Resisting Urban Spectacle: The 1984 Louisiana World Exposition and the Contradictions of Mega Events. *Urban Studies*, 48(1), 197–214.

- Governor Schwarzenegger, Bay Area Council, Announce Bid for 2020 World Expo - Bay Area Council. (n.d.). Retrieved April 28, 2015, from <http://www.bayareacouncil.org/news/governor-schwarzenegger-bay-area-council-announce-bid-for-2020-world-expo-2/>
- Henn, S. (2014). What Would A World's Fair Look Like Today? | Planet Money | NPR. *All Things Considered*. Retrieved November 14, 2014, from <http://www.npr.org/blogs/money/2014/08/22/342246102/what-would-a-worlds-fair-look-like-today>
- Kasimati, E. (2003). Economic aspects and the Summer Olympics: a review of related research. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 5(6), 433–444.
- Kennedy, S. (1999, May 9). Commercial Property; In New Orleans, Developers Rush to Add Hotels. *The New York Times*. New Orleans, LA.
- Kerry, J. (2014). Remarks at a Reception to Celebrate the Groundbreaking for the USA Pavilion at the Milan Expo 2015. Retrieved November 05, 2014, from <http://www.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2014/07/229329.htm>
- Kramer, C. E. (2008). Knoxville 1982. In *Encyclopedia of World's Fairs and Expositions*. McFarland & Company, Inc.
- Lorek, L. A., & Robbins, E. (2006). San antonio: A city in search of itself. *Planning*, 72(2), 8-15. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/206705923?accountid=10598>
- Michaels, D. (2009). Fans Want to Organize New World's Fair Expo in U.S. - WSJ. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB123499805562316993>
- National Travel and Tourism Strategy. (2012). Retrieved April 28, 2015, from <http://travel.trade.gov/pdf/national-travel-and-tourism-strategy.pdf>
- New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade. *International treaty examination of the Protocol to Amend the Convention signed at Paris on the 22nd of November 1928 Relating to International Exhibitions: Report of the Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Committee*. (2013).
- Ogul, J. (2014a). How the US participated at the Taejon 93 and Lisbon 98 world expos – and didn't at Hanover 2000. *InPark Magazine*. Retrieved November 05, 2014, from <http://www.inparkmagazine.com/how-the-us-participated-at-the-taejon-93-and-lisbon-98-world-expos-and-didnt-at-hanover-2000/>
- Ogul, J. (2014b). Tales from the Expo: Comparing US pavilion plans for Milan 2015 with Genoa '92. *In Park Magazine*. Retrieved November 03, 2014, from <http://www.inparkmagazine.com/tales-from-the-expo-comparing-us-pavilion-plans-for-milan-2015-with-genoa-92/>

- Ogul, J. (2014c). Tales from the Expo: Revisiting the US Pavilions at Knoxville '82 & New Orleans '84. *InPark Magazine*. Retrieved September 29, 2014, from <http://www.inparkmagazine.com/tales-from-the-expo-revisiting-the-us-pavilions-at-knoxville-82-new-orleans-84/>
- Ogul, J. (2014d). The Franklin Spirit: US participation in Aichi Expo 2005. *In Park Magazine*. Retrieved November 05, 2014, from <http://www.inparkmagazine.com/the-franklin-spirit-us-participation-in-aichi-expo-2005/>
- Ogul, J. (2014e). US Pavilions at world expos: Tsukuba '85, Vancouver '86 and Brisbane '88. *InPark Magazine*. Retrieved September 29, 2014, from <http://www.inparkmagazine.com/us-pavilions-at-world-expos-tsukuba-85-vancouver-86-and-brisbane-88/>
- Owen, J. (2005). Estimating the cost and benefit of hosting Olympic Games: What can Beijing expect from its 2008 Games? *The Industrial Geographer*, 3(1), 1–18. Retrieved from <http://igeographer.lib.indstate.edu/v31.pdf#page=4>
- Petrequin, S. (2014). France still considering Paris bid for 2024 Games. *Associated Press*. Retrieved October 19, 2014, from <http://wintergames.ap.org/article/france-still-considering-paris-bid-2024-games>
- Pfeffer, M. (2008). New Orleans 1984. In *Encyclopedia of World's Fairs and Expositions*. McFarland & Company, Inc.
- Plafker, T. (2010). Shanghai Puts on a Green Face. *The New York Times*. Beijing.
- Reagan, R. (1982). Memorandum on the Chicago World 's Fair 1992. Retrieved April 23, 2015 <http://www.reagan.utexas.edu/archives/speeches/1982/111182f.htm>
- Roche, M. (1994). Mega-events and Urban Policy. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(1), 1–19.
- Roche, M. (2003). Mega-events, Time and Modernity: On Time Structures in Global Society. *Time & Society*, 12(1), 99–126.
- Rubin, J. (2013). World's fair consultant James Ogul talks about Milan 2015, and the history of US expo participation. *In Park Magazine*. Retrieved March 6, 2015, from <http://www.inparkmagazine.com/worlds-fair-consultant-james-ogul-talks-about-milan-2015-and-the-history-of-us-expo-participation/>
- Sen. Amy Klobuchar. (2015). Retrieved April 17, 2015, from https://www.govtrack.us/congress/members/amy_klobuchar/412242
- Shipp, E. R. (1985). Plans Falter for A World's Fair in Chicago in 1992. *The New York Times*. Retrieved April 16, 2015, from <http://www.nytimes.com/1985/06/25/us/plans-falter-for-a-world-s-fair-in-chicago-in-1992.html>

- Sieff, M. (n.d.). EXPO 2017 Kazakhstan, Astana 2017 Expo, World Expo | Edge : Kazakhstan. Retrieved April 8, 2015, from <http://www.edgekz.com/expo-2017-world-comes-kazakhstan/>
- Sun, J., & Ye, L. (2010). Mega-events, Local Economies, and Global Status: What Happened before the 2008 Olympics in Beijing and the 2010 World Expo in Shanghai.
- Swayze, N. (1975). The London-made '51 Colt Navy with a Comparison to Its Hartford-made Counterpart. *The American Society of Arms Collectors: Bulletin 31*, 24 – 40. Retrieved from http://americansocietyofarmscollectors.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/B031_Swayze.pdf
- The Pavilion of China at Expo Milan 2015. (2014). *Bureau International des Expositions*. Retrieved March 6, 2015, from <http://www.bie-paris.org/site/en/news/102-newsannouncements/expo-milan-2015/898-china-pavilion-expo-2015-expo-milan-bie-world-expo-italy-cooperation-food-agriculture-hunger-expo-milan-2015>
- Voge, A. (2014). Where to put the World's Fair? *Finance & Commerce*. Retrieved November 03, 2014, from <http://finance-commerce.com/2014/10/where-to-put-the-worlds-fair/>
- Vonnegut, K. (2009). *Slaughterhouse-five, or, The children's crusade: A duty-dance with death*. New York: Dial Press.
- Wagner, L. (1964). Impact of the Seattle World's Fair on Retail Sales and Services in the State of Washington. *University of Washington Business Review*, 23, 5–15.
- Webster, R. (2005, April). 1984 World's Fair sparked surge in New Orleans conventions, tourism. *New Orleans CityBusiness*, 1.
- Wilson, M., & Huntoon, L. (2001). World's Fairs and Urban Development: Lisbon and EXPO98. *International Urban Planning Settings: Lessons of Success*, 12, 373–394.
- World Expo 2020, Expo Impacts, Silicon Valley, USA. (2011). San Jose, CA. Retrieved April 8, 2015, from http://www.bayareaconomy.org/media/files/pdf/Expo_Report_sml.pdf

X. Appendices

Appendix 1. Inaugural partners of the Minnesota World's Fair Bid Committee

Inaugural Partners of the Minnesota World's Fair Bid Committee (in alphabetical order)	
1. Blue Cross Blue Shield	8. International Union of Painters and Allied Trades, Council 82
2. Carlson Family Foundation	9. Mall of America
3. Ecolab	10. Medtronic
4. Faribault Woolen Mills	11. Minnesota Building and Construction Trade Council
5. Health Partners	12. North American High Speed Rail Group
6. HGA Architects and Engineers	13. Tunheim
7. Hubbard Broadcasting	

Appendix 2. Interview request letter



Box 90239 Duke University
Durham, North Carolina 27708-0239
T 919-613-7401 F 919-681-8288

December 14, 2014

Dear Mr. Foldi,

My name is Toumil Samonte. I am a second-year Master of Public Policy Candidate at Duke University. My master's thesis will examine the United States Government's relationship with the Bureau of International des Expositions (BIE). I am conducting this research on behalf of [Expo 2023](#), a Minnesota-based group that is preparing a bid to host a World Expo. To fulfill my graduation requirements, I will submit a final report of my findings to Duke and to Expo 2023.

I would greatly appreciate an opportunity to interview you about your 2011 report to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations regarding public diplomacy with China, specifically about your recommendation for the U.S. to rejoin the BIE. I'm especially interested in understanding the arguments for and against engaging with the BIE, and how the decision to withdraw from the BIE developed. The interview would last no more than 30 minutes, or what your schedule permits. Your input would be invaluable for my research.

Please know that I am very appreciative of this opportunity to speak with you, and will take great care to protect the integrity of our conversation. With your permission, I would like to record our call so that I may remember the information accurately. The transcript and the recording will be safely hosted on Duke's secured server. I do plan to share relevant details of our conversation with my client and my advisor. However, I will first contact you for permission before including any information or quotes from our conversation in my report.

If you are open to being interviewed for this project, please e-mail me your availability at tvsv7@duke.edu. My advisor, Dr. Bruce Jentleson may also be reached at bwj7@duke.edu if you have any questions about this program. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Toumil Samonte
RPCV Moldova, '08-'10
Master of Public Policy, Class of 2015
Sanford School of Public Policy
Duke University

Appendix 3. Timeline of declining U.S. involvement in world's fairs

- **1989:** Congress, led by Neal Smith (D-IA), reduces \$15 million appropriation for U.S. pavilion at the Seville Expo to \$2.9 million (“Debate Flares on US Role at a World’s Fair,” 1990)
- **1992:** To finance the U.S. pavilion for the 1992 Seville Expo, the government moved to a “50/50” funding model, whereby USIA reprogrammed \$15 million of its agency’s budget and raised \$15 million in private sector donations (J. Ogul, cited in Rubin, 2013)
- **1993:** The private sector fully funds the U.S. Pavilion at the 1993 Taejon Expo (Ibid.)
- **1994:** Congress prohibits USIA from obligating its budget to fund pavilions and other exhibits at world’s fairs, “in excess of amounts expressly authorized and appropriated for such purpose (Ibid., para. 4)”
- **1997:** A GAO Report profiles U.S. membership in the BIE (GAO, 1997)
- **1998:** Congress stops appropriating funds for U.S. dues to the BIE (State Department Memorandum, 2001)
- **1999:** USIA is absorbed into the State Department
- **2000:** House and Senate reports urge withdrawal from BIE in State Department FY2001 Appropriations (State Department Memorandum, 2001)
- **2000:** U.S. declines to participate in Hannover Expo due to inability to raise private funding
- **2001:** Secretary of State Colin Powell transmits letter of withdrawal to the BIE and the French Government
- **2002:** U.S. membership in the BIE ends.

Appendix 4. State Department position on rejoining the BIE

The United States withdrew from the BIE in 2001 after Congress did not appropriate funds for U.S. annual assessments to the BIE over several years beginning in the late 1990s. At the time, the prospect of the United States undertaking a world's fair was remote. The U.S. experience with hosting expos in the 1980s was not positive, with one expo (New Orleans in 1984) ending in bankruptcy.

Membership in BIE is not a prerequisite to U.S. participation in a world expo held in another country. The funding and management of a domestic exposition requires a collaborative effort, led by the host city, involving multiple U.S. federal, state, and local government agencies, and funding from the host city and the private sector. In the United States, hosting a world's fair is a private venture. In accordance with statutes governing U.S. recognition and participation in international expositions (22 U.S.C. § 2801 et seq.), the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. § 2451 et seq.), and Executive Order 11034, the Department of Commerce would bear primary responsibility for the coordination and oversight of any domestic world's fair.

The viability of any U.S. bid to host a world's fair depends more on the commitment of significant financial resources and expertise than it does on membership in the BIE, which is not an absolute prerequisite for a successful bid. The United States was not a member of the BIE at the time of the Seattle World's Fair, which was sanctioned by the BIE. Therefore, the State Department believes that a decision on membership in the BIE should follow a strong bid that reflects substantial commitments of resources from the private sector and support from the Department of Commerce, as well as from Congress.

Appendix 5. Instrument for accession

The Bay Area Council drafted this document with input from the BIE, for former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton during the Bay Area Council's bid to host Expo 2025.



INSTRUMENT FOR ACCESSION

The Government of the United States of America declares to re-accede to the Convention relating to International Exhibitions signed at Paris on November 22, 1928, modified by the Protocol of November 16, 1966, November 30, 1972 and amended on June 24, 1982 and May 31, 1988, in conformity with Article 3 of the Protocol and agrees to fulfil all obligations deriving from the Convention and the Protocol.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I sign the present instrument

Hillary Rodham Clinton
Secretary of State, United States of America

Appendix 6. State Department Memorandum RE: Circular 175

Apr-06-01 03:19pm From-L/MSG CNTR

2026471097

T-866 P.02/05 F-384



United States Department of State

Washington, D.C. 20520

www.state.gov

4/9/01 - sent via email to:

MUNA

LIT

M. Deputies

by fax to LPO

UNCLASSIFIED

TO: The Secretary

FROM: IO - David Welch

SUBJECT: Circular 175: Request for Authority to Withdraw from the International Bureau of Expositions (BIE)

Issue for Decision:

- Whether to withdraw from the BIE.

The BIE is a small organization that brings standards and order to the hosting of World's Fairs. Congress has not appropriated funds for U.S. dues since 1998, and we have lost our vote (current arrears, \$78,000). In the FY 2001 State Department appropriation, both the House and Senate reports urged withdrawal. Withdrawal requires formal "denunciation" of the BIE treaty by written notification to the Government of France.

ECA manages U.S. participation in World's Fairs held abroad; Commerce coordinates U.S. bids to host. Congress provides no money for participation and has enacted legislation encouraging private sponsorship. This has not worked; the United States withdrew from Hannover 2000 one month before its opening due to lack of private funding. Japan and France are planning Fairs by 2005; Mexico, China, Korea and Argentina are bidding for 2010.

Commerce and R consider World's Fairs ineffective in promoting business or the national interest. However, should the U.S. wish to participate in future fairs, withdrawal would not preclude it. As a non-member, the U.S. would pay higher fees for participation and would have no voice in scheduling future fairs or selecting private exhibitors wishing to represent the U.S. Also, a U.S. city would be less likely to be selected as a host.

UNCLASSIFIED

(Appendix 6: Page 1 of 4)

UNCLASSIFIED

- 2 -

Staffs of relevant House and Senate committees expressed no objection when informed of a possible U.S. withdrawal.

Recommendation

That you sign the attached letter of withdrawal.
(R and Commerce concur.)

Approve _____ Disapprove _____

Attachments:

- Tab 1 - Proposed letter of withdrawal.
- Tab 2 - Convention Concerning International Expositions.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

- 3 -

Drafted:IO/T:REWanner x72560 3/23/01
Doc. Z/RXW/BIECirc175

Cleared: ECA:HFinn ok
 ECA/PE:SWunder ok
 EB/PD/E:Wwanlund ok
 L:JThessin ok
 L/PD:JCaldwell ok
 L/UNA:HSchildge ok
 L/T:KGhaffarkan/RDalton ok
 EAP/J:RHotz ok
 EUR/WE:CDavis ok
 P:RMeyer ok
 R:BCarlson ok
 H:CCullum ok
DoC/TD/TICommerce:LHarbaugh ok
DoC/DAS/TD/TT:HMarano ok
 IO/T:LLambert ok
 IO/S:DWynes ok
 S/S-CR:BHambrick ok
 IO:EMSouthwick draft

UNCLASSIFIED

Dear Mr. Minister:

I refer to the Convention Concerning International Expositions done at Paris November 22, 1928, as amended and supplemented by the Protocols of May 10, 1948, November 16, 1966, and November 30, 1972, for which the Government of the French Republic is the Depositary.

This letter constitutes notification by the Government of the United States of America of its denunciation of the Convention as amended and supplemented, effective one year after the date of receipt of this notification pursuant to Article 37 of the Convention.

Sincerely,

Colin L. Powell

His Excellency
Hubert Vedrine,
Minister of Foreign Affairs
of the French Republic,
Paris.

Appendix 7. Minnesota's Congressional delegates

Senators	Representatives
Al Franken (D)	Tim Waltz (D-MN-1)
Amy Klobuchar (D)	John Kline (R-MN-2)
	Erik Paulsen (R-MN-3)
	Betty McCollum (D-MN-4)
	Keith Ellison (D-MN-5)
	Tom Emmer* (R-MN-6)
	Collin Peterson (D-MN-7)
	Rick Nolan (D-MN-8)

* Newly elected

Appendix 8. Senator Al Franken's letter of endorsement

AL FRANKEN
MINNESOTA

SUITE
SH-309
202-224-5641

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-2309

December 22, 2014

The Honorable John Kerry
Secretary
U.S. Department of State
2201 C Street NW
Washington, DC 20520

Dear Secretary Kerry,

I write today to urge you to consider taking steps to reactivate the United States' participation and membership in the Bureau of International Expositions (BIE). Being a full member of the BIE would give cities in the United States a greater opportunity to bid on and host a world's fair.

The BIE serves to promote and support high-quality international expos, in which countries, businesses, civic organizations, and individuals come together to educate and promote innovation. When the United States was a BIE member, we were a leader in this endeavor—hosting five international expositions. Reentering the organization would help foster community between nations and promote America's reputation as a world leader.

I encourage you to strongly consider this issue and thank you for your work supporting America's leadership in international organizations. If you have any questions, please contact Charles Sutton on my staff at 612-221-1016 or charles_sutton@franken.senate.gov.

Sincerely,



Al Franken
United States Senator

WWW.FRANKEN.SENATE.GOV

Appendix 9. Senator Klobuchar's letter of endorsement

AMY KLOBUCHAR
MINNESOTA

COMMITTEES:
AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION,
AND FORESTRY
COMMERCE, SCIENCE,
AND TRANSPORTATION
JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE
JUDICIARY
RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

United States Senate
WASHINGTON, DC 20510

September 18, 2014

The Honorable John Kerry
Secretary
U.S. Department of State
2201 C Street NW
Washington, DC 20520

Dear Secretary Kerry:


I write to request that you consider taking steps to rejoin and activate the United States' membership in the Bureau of International Expositions (BIE).

World Expos provide benefits and opportunities for both the host country and the participants. They provide a platform for the international exchange of cultures and ideas. As you stated earlier this year, "From the very first World's Fair that opened its doors in 1851, more than 60 World's Fairs and Expos have taken place around the world... And you can trace the history of many of the devices and technologies that we use every single day right back to these particular expositions."

Currently Italy is busy preparing to host the 2015 World Expo in Milan. The United States is sending a pavilion that highlights the theme of "American Food 2.0" which will showcase American expertise in global food security, in agriculture, and in cuisine. Reactivating the United States' membership in the BIE would be a positive and impactful step toward increased participation in future World Expos.

I urge you to consider this request and thank you for your commitment to America's participation on these important global platforms.

Sincerely,



Amy Klobuchar
United States Senator

Appendix 10. Representative Tim Walz's letter of endorsement

October 22, 2014

The Honorable John Kerry
Secretary
U.S. Department of State
2201 C Street, NW
Washington, DC 20520

Dear Secretary Kerry,

Thank you for your leadership in addressing the many challenges facing America around the world. In southern Minnesota, we are especially grateful for your continued emphasis on economic diplomacy initiatives that can help local regions grow jobs and expand business opportunities.

I write to bring to your attention one specific action you could take that would greatly assist Minnesotans and your economic promotion efforts aimed at expanding trade, tourism and foreign direct investment.

Minnesota is planning to make a serious bid to host the 2023 World's Fair and we need your help. Our bid will focus on the theme of "Health and Wellness" with an emphasis on the global leadership of institutions like the Mayo Clinic, Medtronic, United Health Group and the University of Minnesota. Our honorary co-chairs, former Vice-President Walter Mondale and former Governor Arne Carlson, have been instrumental in bringing a wide spectrum of Minnesota's most internationally minded leaders into this effort including key political and business leaders from both parties such as House Majority Leader Paul Thissen, former Senator Rudy Boschwitz, Marilyn Carlson-Nelson, Stanley Hubbard and Minnesota Chamber of Commerce President Bill Blazer.

Our state is investing \$585 million into Rochester, Minnesota – which is based in my district – through a public-private partnership to create high paying jobs over the next 20 years as part of the Destination Medical Center (DMC) project. Expo 2023 would be an important collaborating component with these efforts.

I believe Minnesota will have a good chance of successfully winning the support of other nations for our offer to host the 2023 Expo, but we know that our bid would be greatly enhanced if the United States would re-engage with the Bureau of International Expositions (BIE). If we were to resume our status as a dues-paying member, it would create a level-playing field for Minnesota's bid. Dues-paying members also enjoy significant discounts that could significantly lower our costs as well as reduce expenses for the organizers of our US pavilion being built in Milan for Expo 2015.

I am aware that other cities and regions in the US, including Houston and San Francisco, have joined with our organizing committee in Minnesota to create a national association called EXPO USA. This organization is dedicated to providing the financial support needed to cover any costs associated with re-engaging with the BIE, including the annual dues. A letter highlighting this commitment was sent to Ambassador Thorne via State Department senior staff Beatrice Camp.

Hosting the 2023 World's Fair is a very important building block for our economic future in Minnesota. By bringing 10 million or more visitors to Minnesota to explore a "world of wellness; healthy people, healthy planet," it will lift Minnesota's advanced leadership in health care and medical technology to a whole new level of global awareness.

This is crucial for our entire state but especially for my district. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,



Tim Walz
MEMBER OF CONGRESS

TJW:jsp

Appendix 11. Congressional actions in support of expo participation

Bill (Year)	Sponsor	Co-Sponsor(s)	Subject
H.Res.509	Alcee Lamar Hastings (D-FL)	Mike Honda (D - CA) Madeleine Bordallo (D - GU) Alan Grayson (D - FL) Betty McCollum (D - MN)	Shanghai 2010 Expo Participation
H.Res.509	John Kerry (D-MA)	Dianne Feinstein (D - CA) Mark Udall (D - CO)	Shanghai 2010 Expo Participation
S. Con.Res. 47 (1997)	Richard Lugar (R-IN)	Jay Rockefeller (D-WV)	Hannover 2000 Expo Participation
H.Con.Res.139 (1997)	Douglas Kent Bereuter (R - NE)	Lee Herbert Hamilton (D - IN) Michael Garver Oxley (R - OH) Owen Bradford Pickett (D - VA) Richard Andrew Gephardt (D - MO) Ira William (Bill) McCollum Jr. (R - FL)	Hannover 2000 Expo Participation
S.Con.Res.22 (1995)	Claiborne Pell (D-RI)	N/A	Lisbon 1998 Expo Participation
H.Con.Res.91 (1995)	Richard Pombo (D-CA)	Patrick Joseph Kennedy (D - RI) Fortney Hillman (Pete) Stark Jr. (D - CA) Barney Frank (D - MA) Neil Abercrombie (D - HI) Brian P. Bilbray (R - CA) Martin Thomas Meehan (D - MA) John F. (Jack) Reed (D - RI) John Joseph Moakley (D - MA) Robert Guy Torricelli (D - NJ) Robert Menendez (D - NJ) Frank Pallone Jr. (D - NJ) Richard Zimmer (R - NJ) William J. Martini (R - NJ) Joseph Patrick Kennedy II (D - MA)	Lisbon 1998 Expo Participation
H.R.6409 (1982)	Corinne C. (Lindy) Boggs (D-LA)	Bob Livingston (R-LA) John B. Breaux, John (D-LA) Gillis W. Long (D-LA) W. Henson Moore (R-LA) Thomas J. (Jerry) Huckaby (D-LA) W. J. (Billy) Tauzin (D-LA) Buddy Roemer (D-LA)	Louisiana Expo 1984 Participation
S.2701 (1979)	Russell B. Long (D-LA)	J. Bennett Johnston (D-LA)	Louisiana 1984 Expo Participation
H.R. 5079 (1979)	John J. Duncan (R-TN)	N/A	Knoxville 1982 Expo Participation
S.1012 (1979)	Howard H. Baker, Jr. (R-TN)	Jim Sasser (D-TN)	Knoxville 1982 Expo Participation

Bold type indicates that this Congressperson currently serves in the 114th Congress

Sources: Proquest Congressional Publications, Congress.gov, Govtrack.us

Appendix 12. State Department Clearance for Publication



United States Department of State

Washington, D.C. 20520

APR 28 2015

Case No. MANU-2015-07300

Dear Ms. Allen:

We have completed our review of your piece entitled, "Opening the X-Files: A Case for Rejoining the Bureau International des Expositions (BIE)" and have no objection to its release in full.

In addition, the Department requests that you include the following disclaimer:

"The opinions and characterizations in this piece are those of the author, and do not necessarily represent official positions of the United States Government."

Should you have questions, please contact our program analyst Alden Fahy at (202) 261-8431.

Sincerely,


John Hackett
Director, Acting
Office of Information Programs and Services