

U.S. GLOBAL LEADERSHIP COALITION

ANNUAL CONFERENCE 2010: OPENING PLENARY “THE MILITARY VOICE AND NATIONAL SECURITY”

INTRODUCTION/MODERATOR:

**RITU SHARMA,
CO-FOUNDER AND PRESIDENT,
WOMEN THRIVE WORLDWIDE**

SPEAKERS:

ADM. JAMES LOY, USCG (RET.)

**ATTORNEY GENERAL BEAU BIDEN,
STATE OF DELAWARE**

GEN. RICHARD CODY, USA (RET.)

**GEOFF GARIN,
PRESIDENT,
PETER HART RESEARCH**

**BILL MCINTURFF,
CO-FOUNDER AND PARTNER,
PUBLIC OPINION STRATEGIES**

**AMB. MARK GREEN,
MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
U.S. GLOBAL LEADERSHIP COALITION**

GEN. HUGH SHELTON, USA (RET.)

CAPT. JAMES MORIN, USA (RET.)

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 2010

RITU SHARMA: Good morning, Washington. I want to ask you to take your seats, please. We have military leaders with us, so this is going to start on time.

I think that we could all sum up this year's U.S. Global Leadership Coalition Conference in six words: "Clinton, Gates, Geithner, Shah, Johannes, wow." (Applause.)

My name is Ritu Sharma, and I'm the president of Women Thrive Worldwide. But today, I'm here in my capacity as chair of the executive committee of the U.S. Global Leadership Center. And I want to thank you so much for coming to be with us today to begin to see the way forward since the incredible announcements that we had last week from the U.N. General Assembly and the White House.

I want to thank our premier sponsor, L-3 Communications. It's fantastic to have your support. We could not pull this off without you.

And our sponsors Booz Allen Hamilton and Deloitte. Thank you both so much. (Applause.)

So we are coming together at a very important point in history. The global challenges that we are facing are incredibly mind-bogglingly complex and, at the same time, we have opportunities for innovation, for commerce, for human creativity like we've never seen before.

So today, we are here to learn, certainly to network, to debate and then, tomorrow, to go to Capitol Hill to raise our voices to support a smart-power foreign policy.

The president said something very important – many important things – in his speech to the U.N. General Assembly. He asked all of the countries gathered there a question that I want to put to us today as he did to the general assembly last week. He said, "What is the world that awaits us when today's battles are brought to an end?"

What is the world that awaits us? That is the essence of what today's meeting is about. So I invite you to debate that and to think about that deeply. This is, again, a rare moment of opportunity that we have.

I want to introduce now Adm. James Loy, former admiral of the Coast Guard. And as I do that, I have to tell you a story about him. I have two little boys, and the three of us love to go sailing. If you are a sailor, you know that, above God, there is a power that's greater, and that is the U.S. Coast Guard. (Laughter.)

So a few months ago, I had the pleasure of meeting him, and I went home and I told my sons, "I met the Adm. of the Coast Guard." They had eyes like this. Wow. And I was, you know, sort of the coolest mom on the planet for a day.

So I want to invite Adm. Loy to join us now. The military is a very important voice in this coalition. I think it is a voice. It is a constituency where we all can agree, whether we are business, NGO or military, that we want a world that is safer, more peaceful and more

prosperous. On that, we all absolutely agree. And we need all of those tools in our foreign policy to make that happen.

So I'm pleased to turn over the program now to someone who is quite comfortable at the helm of any kind, Adm. James Loy, co-chair of USGLC's National Security Advisory Council. Thank you. (Applause.)

ADM. (RET.) JAMES LOY: Thank you.

Good morning, everybody, and thanks for joining us on what's a very special day for the USGLC as well as for the National Security Advisory Committee. I am proud to co-chair that council that brings the military thoughts and patterns into the debate for the USGLC with Gen. Mike Hagee, past commandant of the Marine Corps. Mike is not able to join us this morning but sends his personal best wishes for the success of our day and for the conference that we'll all be part of for the rest of the day.

A couple of very important new elements to the USGLC's agenda that we're unveiling, if you will, today. You will hear from the pollsters who have just reached out to some 6,000 or more active-duty military folks to get their impressions of what it is that we've been about. We've probably pushed some pointed questions in their directions, but they were able to, by way of the Internet, answer in a fashion that allowed them the comfort and security of telling us like it was.

And the pollsters who were part of that will share those results with you today. And I can hint in advance that we're delighted with the extraordinary support from the rank and file, if you will, that joined those of us who have been part of this campaign effort for the last several years.

The council is now made up of some 75 retired three-and four-star flag and general officers. It was 50 just a year ago. I would like to think there's an end game to that because I don't know how many of them are still alive. But the bottom line is there is an extraordinary amount of recognized support from those of us who have, if you will, been in the trenches and watched either the results of having failed to adequately provide the diplomatic and developmental work up front before a military engagement, it is then part of the scene, or each as part of the scene that the military is being challenged to deal with.

Our country's interests, our country's goals, our country's influence around the world, I believe, invariably, is dramatically better served when all three of those elements are providing the kinds of inputs, whether it's about food-service programs, whether it's about AIDS epidemics in Africa, whether it's about a host of other things that can keep us from ever having to engage the military in places if we've done our homework well up front with our diplomatic and economic development efforts.

And I would offer that the USGLC's fundamental cadre of support is from the private sector. This is about 400, and many more, companies and NGOs and individuals who have signed onto the notion of how important it is to make certain that our impression, our influence, our reputation as a nation around the world is served in all three dimensions of the three Ds, if you will, defense, development and diplomacy.

So I thank all of you for joining us today.

The other challenge that we're going to unveil is, of course, this Veterans for Smart Power effort. And the veterans who have spoken to us, 10,000 or so already, a thousand of whom have put their signatures on a petition that we will walk to Capitol Hill tomorrow, as has already been introduced to you. That notion is to let the Congress know that we were very aware of the 247 of them who signed a petition to – and sent a letter to the president seeking a strong support for the State Department's budget profile and the president's request budget that was brought to Capitol Hill last February – which happened. That \$58 billion request is still on the table. We're watching that very carefully as the days and months go by towards, ultimately, a 2011 budget for all of the appropriations.

But, certainly, we're being very watchful of the one at the State Department.

Having said that, the petition tomorrow will offer that it's not just flag and general officers, not just the CEOs of a couple of companies around the nation but, rather, it's the rank and file of the military that are in support of this same notion. So please take stock of it, Capitol Hill, and do the right thing when the dollars are appropriated for all of the agencies in government this upcoming year.

My personal joy this morning and responsibility is to introduce our first speaker. And many of you have heard the name "Biden" before. This is that other Biden that happens to be the attorney general of the state of Delaware who, in and of his own right, has developed an extraordinary background in his short time in public life, both as a captain in the lawyer end of the Army, both overseas where he just returned from a deployment to Iraq, having been awarded the Bronze Star for his work overseas.

But he is equally proud, as he shared with a couple of us at breakfast this morning, of the time he is spending in the National Guard and in the state of Delaware, which he loves dearly.

He prioritized those things for which he felt a personal commitment and joy. The first thing was being a father, which I identify with, and I think a lot of others in this room would identify with as well. But also, beyond his service to his country and to his state, he honors the time that he has spent in uniform – the uniform of the U.S. Army of the United States of America.

So please let's offer a good USGLC welcome to Attorney General Beau Biden from the state of Delaware. (Applause.)

BEAU BIDEN: Thank you, Admiral, and good morning. It's quite a roster of people you have coming to speak with you today. I'm honored to be in their midst and the people that you mentioned, both of the secretaries and others.

I'm most honored, as I said this morning to a smaller group, I think upstairs – I'm most honored to be with the general and flag officers in this room, most notably, Gen. Shelton, who, for me, as one of many captains in a big Army, you, General, represent, I think, what's the best of the United States military and the U.S. Army. And I'm honored to be sharing a microphone with you today.

As I said to you this morning, I should just sit down and listen to you and not be making this speech.

Ritu, Liz, thank you for what you do. Thank you for inviting me. I know I'm only invited, probably, because Andy Amsler works for you, and he used to work for me. I'm embarrassing one of the staff members here who helped get me elected attorney general, but thank you for having me and thinking of me in being here.

You know, the USGLC, I appreciate all of the rank and file and the staff for having me as well. And I want to, also, before I begin, make a special thanks to the veterans in this room for your willingness to serve, whether you're continuing to serve or have served.

As the admiral mentioned, as an elected official in the state of Delaware, a place I love, as a captain in a big Army in the Delaware Army National Guard, as a father, thank you for what you do, for your willingness to do what you do on behalf of this nation both here on the home front as well as overseas, especially over the last decade as we fight two wars.

As the admiral mentioned, serving with the men and women in the U.S. armed forces, whether they be sailors, soldiers, airmen, Marines, Coast Guardsmen, it's been the greatest honor of my life to wear the uniform of the U.S. Army. I'm honored to be the attorney general, but I'm most honored to be a captain in the Army.

I thought I understood what it meant to wear a uniform, General. I've been wearing it about eight years – seven years before I was deployed. And I thought I knew what it meant. I worked with police officers in our state. I've been in law enforcement in various capacities most of my life. And I thought I understood what it meant to serve.

I didn't until I was deployed and put on my boots every morning and served with the brave women and men that have served under your command and I have served with. I also got a better appreciation and understood something that I really didn't understand. And that is the effect of – that these wars and service has on moms and dads, grandparents, sons and daughters. The average age of our unit was 41 years old. We had grandfathers and grandmothers in our unit.

And it's not without – without the bravery of the moms, dads, grandparents, brothers, sisters, kids home none of this would be possible. So to you veterans in the audience, thank you to you. You all, thank goodness for your country, chose to do what you do. But, really, the people that make that possible are your loved ones. And so a special thanks – I don't go to an audience, General, without thanking the families of those that serve.

As many of you know, serving in the war zone gives you a unique perspective on many things. Here in Washington, there's a lot of talk about smart power, and this is the leading voice in notions of smart power.

I've heard the theoretical debates. I'd like to listen to more of them and what you all have to say. And I've read what many writers have had to say about smart power. Those discussions are key. The discussions that are about to take place today are key.

But it is also important – and I hope maybe this would be part of the reason why I'm here and why you've called on veterans to speak to this – it's important to see those theories tested in action which is why it is so critical that veterans are here making their voices heard on that petition to my left.

Like so many of you, I have seen these ideas put into action in real time. In Iraq or anywhere else, brave women and men are deployed. There's never a question of America's military might. You see it in the MRAPs that we now have overseas, walking to the mess hall with a M-16 strapped around your shoulder or a nine millimeter on your hip. And you see it in what is the best-trained fighting force that this world has ever seen.

But military might – and I think I'm preaching to the choir here when I say this – but military might by itself is not enough. Simply having the best technology and the greatest and best-trained fighting force the world has known is not enough to protect our national security and our values as projected around the world.

America must recognize the substantial and fundamental need to embrace, as the admiral referenced, diplomacy and development and that this is a multi-faceted project.

The folks that I have served with on the ground in Iraq understand this stark reality as I, as one captain, as I said, in a very big Army understand the wisdom of this approach from my experience. When I talk to veterans, this is not a controversial motion, as I mentioned to Liz this morning.

There should be – and I don't believe there is – anything controversial about the very important ideas you're about to discuss today. There's no resistance to the bottom line that using smart power simply works. It buttresses our missions, and it makes America more secure, at least from my perspective and the perspective of those that I have served.

In my experiences, I saw how smart power works mostly with respect to the rule of law. It's only one aspect of smart power, I recognize, and I would submit – and I'm prone to go off my text here – I would submit that rule of law is a component part of each of the three Ds and one that keenly interests me as a JAG as well as an attorney general, and one that I have become familiar with.

In 2001, after the war in Kosovo, I spent several months there as a Department of Justice civilian liaison. I worked with OSCE, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, with lawyers from Germany, Italy, France, from all over Europe. And our charge was, among other things – and I was a small part in this larger project – to set up and help repair and stand up a functioning criminal-justice system in Kosovo.

One of our jobs, working through the OSCE, working through the State Department and then detailed at OSCE, was also to craft a very simple, important thing that has to deal with all the things I think you all talk about. And that is how we train the Kosovar civilian police force.

You had police officers coming from 50-some-odd countries, getting off planes from Bangladesh to Bozeman, Montana, and they didn't have a manual about how they go about doing their business. So as simple a task as that was what I was put to work to on as a Department of Justice employee along with JAGs and military and NGO folks in theater in Kosovo.

In many ways, we were literally restarting the judicial system in a country where the rule of law had been tragically ignored or suppressed by Slobodan Milosevic for basically a decade.

What we did – and, again, I was just a very smaller part of what many people did – and some, probably, in this room – was to really put smart power to work.

I saw it in action when I was in Iraq as well. There, as a JAG officer – JAGs, not I – I was a trial counsel. I was charged with really enforcing the Uniform Code of Military Justice – but JAGs there were there to make sure that the courts – and they are there to this day – to make sure the courts all throughout Iraq are there to do justice, to make sure that the abuse of power is fought at every level.

It's something that we take for granted here, but in the aftermath of Saddam's fall, there are many legitimate questions that can be asked. Could Iraqis overcome their ethnic prejudice? Was it possible for a Sunni judge, for instance, to fairly try a Shia? Could we count on Shia prosecutors to treat a Kurd the same way that they did a Shia?

Simple questions of justice that are basic to our justice system but are somewhat difficult questions presented when I was there and, I think, to this day.

The goal is simple, but it's crucial to any legitimate legal system. We had to make sure that justice was fair for all; that the abuse of power was fought at every level.

As you all well know, we are headed in the right direction – at least I believe we are headed in the right direction in Iraq on these fronts and many others. The Iraqi people, as they say, are standing up as we are standing down.

The American military is ready to make the changes, I believe, to emphasize smart power, and I've seen that up close and personal both in Kosovo, as I said, and Iraq. I might make a note in terms of you can know where I stand as a JAG.

I'm assigned to a signal brigade that I served with over in Iraq – the JAG school headquartered in Charlottesville, Virginia, and much around here in this city, is placing much, much more emphasis on ideas of the rule of law and have been for a while and have entire sections – and brigade headquarters is dedicated to rule of law where they work every day, not just with Afghans and Iraqis, but also NGOs and judges and diplomats on how we stand up a functioning and credible civil-justice and criminal-justice system in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I have to give credit where credit is due. All the way up the chain from, most importantly, I think, Gen. Petraeus, his JAGs who he relies heavily on and our leaders have recognized the need for what I believe is this broader strategy focusing on not just defense but diplomacy and development.

The troops should also be given credit serving in Iraq from the youngest E-2 to the most senior E-9 to colonels and lieutenants in Afghanistan and Iraq and other places overseas. They have seen the ideas that you have been the leading advocate for put into effect and then not just effective in the projection of U.S. force around for our national security interests but, as I made the point today earlier to Liz and to Gen. Shelton – which is a point he knows all too well – it has a very practical, practical reality. And that is it's not only important for projections of our force around the world, but it's important to keep their soldiers alive day to day in Afghanistan and Iraq and around this world.

We ask so much of our soldiers, but we also ask them to be diplomats. They're our warrior diplomats. They should have more diplomats to work with them at their side. And that's part of what you are about and why I'm so honored to be here.

Our soldiers saw smart power in action. They saw the need for the training of non-military tools, the need for additional diplomats in developmental projects. And their leaders, I think, are listening, at least from my perspective in the U.S. Army.

People like you, those who stand up and say there's more to America's foreign policy than awesome power, we'll always have and are making an incredible, incredible difference in the day-to-day lives of our soldiers but also, I think, in the long-term interests of our foreign policy as we move forward.

I would submit to you – and it's easy for a 41-year-old guy from Delaware to say this – but I think you're having an incredible impact on the future of how we conduct our foreign policy and project our force around the world.

So I'm here not just to thank you but to tell you from someone who has seen it up close and personal, as many of you have, it works. It works. So keep up the work, and I look forward to joining you some other day if you'll ever have me back. (Laughter.)

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

GEN. (RET.) DICK CODY: Thank you very much, Attorney General Biden, or, Capt. Biden, as you like to be called. It's an honor to have you here with us today in support for your Veterans for Smart Power, but more important, we'd like to all thank you for your service and that of your family.

Good morning. I'm Gen. Dick Cody, vice president of Washington Operations at L-3 Communications. L-3 is proud to be a premier sponsor this year of USGLC's Washington Conference, and I'm pleased to be here as a member of the GLC National Security Advisory Council.

In my former life as vice chief of the Army and now as being part of L-3 in its developmental company, International Resources Group, it has reinforced to me the need for smart power – for a smart-power national security policy, not just hard power and not just soft power but the alignment of and the symmetry of development, diplomacy, alongside defense. That is smart power, and that's will keep America safe and secure.

As a member of the National Security Advisory Council, many of us were interested in understanding what our colleagues, particularly those who have recently been on the frontlines, think about the smart-power agenda. The USGLC commissioned a public-opinion poll earlier this month to explore military attitudes towards the use of non-military tools of global engagement. So today, we're going to release the results of that.

To tell us about this poll and the results, I'm pleased to introduce two of our country's leading opinion researchers, Geoff Garin, a Democrat pollster and president of Peter Hart Research, and Bill McInturff, a Republican pollster and a partner and co-founder of Public Opinion Strategies.

Ladies and gentlemen, please join me in welcoming Geoff and Bill. (Applause.)

GEOFF GARIN: Good morning, everybody. I'm delighted to be here with you today.

This poll that we're about to present was conducted jointly by Bill and myself. We each do a lot of work outside of partisan politics, but when we are involved in partisan politics, Bill works on the Republican side, I work on the Democratic side.

We wanted – Liz wanted to make sure that this poll was done on a completely bipartisan basis and, indeed, as you will soon see, the findings we're about to report to you really cut across party lines. This is not a matter of partisanship or politics for officers but really about doing what works in the interests of our national security.

To understand what it is that military officers believe about these topics, we conducted an online survey with a total of 606 current and retired commissioned officers. By and large, these are people who are still on active duty, 84 percent of them. To the extent we included retired, they're all recently retired; people who left the service in 2002 or more recently than that – two-thirds of them within the past four years.

This is really hot off the press. The interviews were conducted in mid-September. We cut across the services, across the ranks in the officer corps. And so this is a broad representative cross-section of our line military leadership.

Let me just go through four key findings, and then I'll do a little bit of a deeper dive.

First, Secretary Gates and others have been talking for a while now about the reality that a strong military alone is not enough to protect America's national security. And what we can report to you is that that observation is firmly held now by the vast majority of America's military officers.

Fully 89 percent agree that a strong military alone is not enough to protect America in today's world and that the tools of diplomacy and development are essential for our national security.

So the observations you will hear from the military leaders here today are very much reflective of what our military officers throughout the service are understanding and believing about the value of smart power.

As you heard from Attorney General Biden, to have been there is to be a believer in smart power. The vast majority of officers we interviewed who have served overseas report to us that they have witnessed firsthand the benefits and the values of diplomacy and development of these non-military tools in accomplishing their own goals in their work – their military work.

Among the people in our sample who served in Iraq or Afghanistan, which is 56 percent of all the officers we interviewed, fully three-quarters of them say that they have witnessed firsthand the benefits and the values of these kinds of investments.

Given that, it is not surprising that officers in our sample see a direct line between the funding of these smart-power tools and America's national security so that they report in very large numbers their belief that, if Congress increased funding for non-military tools for

development and diplomacy, that would be an investment that would help our national security and, conversely, that if Congress, for some reason, decided to decrease funding for those tools, it would be a setback to our national security.

And as you'll see – we'll go through this – people in the military not just understand the importance of it but have a clear division of labor in terms of the ways that smart power complements and supports military power given the challenges that our military faces in the world today.

In terms of the broader context, our military officers believe that this is still a period where we face very significant threats to our national security. Only 17 percent say this is a good period with few significant threats compared to 47 percent who say this is a relatively dangerous period for America. Thirty-six percent say we're somewhere in between those two places.

You can see that older officers, by age, are a little bit more likely to see this as a dangerous period. But on this question and most other questions, there's very little variance by which service the officer is in.

Given that view of the world, it is not surprising that our military officers believe it is crucial to strengthen our military capacities. Forty-four percent describe that as essential. Forty percent say it's very important.

So there is nothing about what we are presenting that is to suggest that smart power is in lieu of traditional military power, but it is very clear, however, that in this world that we live in and the way – because of the challenges that – the changing military challenges, that non-military tools of diplomacy and development also are important.

Eighty-three percent describe them as being very or fairly important. Only 17 percent say they are just somewhat important or not important at all. And officers were quite articulate that this is an open-ended question on the right-hand side of the slide about why these tools are important and how it helps in meeting the military mission in terms of building good will that there are some things that development and diplomacy tools can accomplish more effectively than through traditional military sport that building good will among the local populations and so forth.

And while you saw earlier that officers believe it is crucial to increase our military strength, what is really important and, at some level, counterintuitive is that they put the development of these smart-power tools on an equal footing with the military tools.

So when we asked what should the emphasis be on strengthening and improving our military efforts, strengthening and improving our use of non-military tools, or that both need to be treated equally, 51 percent say these really are equal; they go hand in hand and both need to be attended to. And military officers do not see this as a zero-sum game.

Attorney General Biden reported to you his own experiences in Iraq and in witnessing the benefits of these smart-power tools. When we asked officers about their own experiences, whether they have personally seen the value of non-military tools in making their own work

more effective, 71 percent report that they have. So this is a common experience now among people – officers who have served overseas.

As I had mentioned earlier, among the officers who have served in Iraq or Afghanistan, 75 percent say that they have personally witnessed the benefits and value of these kinds of tools in making their own work more effective.

So the opinions and perspectives they are reporting here are not abstract. They are really based on experience and firsthand experience that is very reflective of the kinds of things that General Biden described to you.

In terms of looking forward, nearly half say that these non-military tools will play and should play a larger role in terms of meeting our national security challenges. Only 22 percent say that they ought to play a smaller role. And, indeed, there is no substantial audience for cutting back in this direction that our national security policy has taken. In fact, you can see here close to 4 in 10 have a critique that we are doing too little in terms of our investments in these regards.

You can also see the important differences here that, among higher-ranking officers, they are more likely to want these non-military tools to play a larger role. And those who served in Iraq and Afghanistan are more avidly supportive of these tools than those who have not.

Obviously, a lot of this will come down to money as you make your trek to Capitol Hill with regard to appropriations. And on that score, there's a clear message from the officers we interviewed. What they are saying quite clearly is if Congress increases funding for these non-military tools, it's not just an investment in these tools themselves but in America's national security.

Fifty-nine percent of all officers feel that way. And conversely, even at a moment of considerable budget restraint, when Secretary Gates has indicated his interest in reducing the overall defense budget, on this question of decreasing funding for the non-military tools, officers are crystal clear as well that that would be a blow to our national security and would have a harmful effect.

Finally, part of the reason why support for these non-military tools is as strong as it is among the officer corps is that there is a clear sense that there are some things that will occur more effectively and more successfully if civilian agencies are involved in if the burden is not placed entirely on the military. So you can see that there are some topics on the bottom of the chart where there's a view that the military ought to be taking the lead in terms of training police and national forces or providing security for local populations. But even on those, a large number of officers see a key role for civilian agencies.

But on other topics – working with local leaders on education, health care and economic development and providing infrastructure needs or providing assistance to strengthen the rule of law – as Attorney General Biden had been doing in Iraq – people say that the civilian agencies have a very important role to play. And the more that they are playing that role, the more they are freeing the military, both supporting the military mission and freeing the military to focus on the things that they can do best and most effectively.

And I just want to end with this quick slide. We asked people about – officers about their reaction to a number of statements. The one, I think – all of these are important, but I do want to draw your attention to the second one here, which is that it is now, I think, really a well-established observation among the officer corps that, in today's world, a strong military alone is not enough to protect America and that we need to use the tools of diplomacy and development. It's essentially the statement that is in the petition that you see over there, and that petition is not just reflective of the views of the people who have signed it but of our officer corps generally.

So with that, let me ask Bill to add his observations on what we found.

BILL MCINTURFF: Thank you. Hi, Bill McInturff with the Republican National Committee. That was my old job 20 years ago. And when I was there, we were given this charge, and they asked us to say how do you teach strategy. How would you teach strategy in a campaign environment?

And so we said, well, who does. And we went to business colleges, but we went to the war colleges. And I was so struck – and I have such an enduring lesson from that experience meeting with the officers of the war colleges about how do you teach strategy.

And one thing they said to us was a key element is shared doctrine. In other words, have you taught strategy in a way that everybody would know what to do and they would do the same thing? And he said, what we do is we have units that get lost. They're behind enemy lines. They're out of contact. They have to know what everybody else is doing. We have to know what they're likely to do because we have a shared doctrine.

And so when you talk about the powerful things in this survey – we did 600 people – and, normally what Geoff and I do for a living is we come and report how Republicans think, how Democrats think, how men think, how women think, and we divide and kind of divide America into a micro-nation.

This shared doctrine is what's powerful about this data because there is very minimal difference in America's officer corps. Whether you're a man or woman, Republican, independent or Democrat, the kind of things that divide most Americans, they have come to a shared consensus around these issues.

And the shared consensus is this works, it's critical, and it's something we should be stressing.

Now, in this data, believe me, they tell us military power is still the number-one goal and they want American military to be funded and they want us to – they want the primary mission of the military to be – to not be these soft areas. But they certainly see the primacy.

The second thing that struck me is how much, again, as a personal who gets to peek into your world, more than half of these officers have already served in Iraq and Afghanistan during these long campaigns. And this experience is clearly, as it did with the attorney general, shaping their views.

And so when you look at the data, what's really powerful is what do people in Iraq and Afghanistan that have served there – what do they believe compared to people who have served

elsewhere in the world, compared to the very small number of officers we interviewed – less than 15, 16 percent – who have not served outside of the United States?

And what you come away with is – and this is why the attorney general was such a good introductory speaker – is his observations are writ large in this data, which is if you served in Iraq and Afghanistan, as has a majority of our officer corps we interviewed, they come back and report that these are really, really important parts of what has to be done as part of our mission.

And so when we asked them whether these non-military areas should be a bigger role, a smaller role or should be the same as it is now, it's the people with that firsthand experience who say that this needs to be a bigger role.

The third thing is language matters. When we asked people a series of phrases: How would you describe this kind of process and what do we do? We tested economic development, foreign assistance. Foreign assistance with a 51 favorable, 20 unfavorable. We had a lot of people to say neutral.

But the phrase “smart power,” which is development and diplomacy in conjunction with military strength, had a 72 favorable, nine unfavorable.

There is a big difference communicating with people with a 72 favorable and a 51 favorable. And it tells you kind of the language structure of what's important here.

And then the last thing I want to just emphasize when we talk about kind of shared doctrine and this common belief is, as Geoff said, we asked people who are competing for resources in a very difficult time, do you think these non-military spending by Congress should be increased, decreased, but we also said, kept the same. We didn't ask – they didn't have to say they thought spending should be increased in this area.

And the fact that 59 percent say this has got to be an area of increase I found to be very, very powerful. And so it is those kind of elements – the fact that this data is flat across our – flat, meaning not very different among our officer corps; that it's become a part of our shared doctrine around the military.

Number two, the way that we are being reshaped by attitudes by the Iraq and Afghanistan war because they're very different and certainly very different than the people who have retired during this era and, third, that the language matters. That smart power and the focus that you are putting on that is the right emphasis and, four, as Geoff said, that there's a message from this survey for our officer corps to Congress, and that is that spending in these areas should be increased.

So that's our overview. There's a lot of very compelling and interesting data. We appreciate having a chance to work on the study, and we look forward to talking more about it and what we've learned.

Thank you. (Applause.)

GEN. CODY: Well, thank you, Geoff and Bill, for your enlightening presentation. It's good to see that you can actually take data together and agree on something.

It's now my honor to introduce our distinguished panelists for the first plenary session. You've already met Adm. Jim Loy earlier. He is one of the most respected security strategists in our country. His distinguished career has included serving as the commandant of the United States Coast Guard and as our first deputy secretary of the Department of Homeland Security.

Today, he serves as a senior counselor at the Cohen Group and, with Gen. Mike Hagee, he co-chairs the USGLC's National Security Advisory Council.

Joining him today will be one of my favorite soldiers, Gen. Hugh Shelton, highly decorated career in the Army where you served two tours in Vietnam. He's held numerous impressive positions including commander-in-chief of the United States Special Operations Command, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Gen. Shelton now serves as the director of the Gen. H. Hugh Shelton Leadership Program at North Carolina State University. The USGLC is also proud to have him as a member of our National Security Advisory Council.

Joining these two flag officers is a captain. After graduating from West Point, Capt. James Morin served in the United States Army from 2001 to 2007 in the 82nd Airborne Division, including combat tours as an infantry platoon leader in Afghanistan and Iraq.

He graduated magna cum laude from Georgetown University Law Center – usual for an infantryman – (laughter) – and is currently practicing law at Hogan Lovells. He is a security fellow at the Truman National Security Project, and he continues to be a member of the Virginia National Guard. Capt. Morin is a member of the Veterans for Smart Power.

And our moderator today is also a distinguished citizen, Ambassador Mark Green. Ambassador Green brings with him a rich background, dedication and understanding of the issues before us today. He has served as a member of the House International Relations Committee representing the great state of Wisconsin from 1999 to 2007 and contributed to the landmark global health legislation during those years.

In 2007, President Bush nominated him to serve as ambassador to Tanzania. And today, he serves as the managing director of the Malaria No More Center. Ambassador Green is a member of the USGLC board of directors.

Please join me in welcoming Ambassador Green and our distinguished panelists.
(Applause.)

MARK GREEN: Well, good morning, everyone. We've just heard powerful personal testimony about the importance of smart power, and we've also heard clear evidence that support for smart power exists all across the military.

Now, the idea that development and diplomacy are linking to national security is not a new one. Our 2006 national security strategy provided as follows: Development reinforces diplomacy and defense, reducing long-term threats to our national security by helping to build stable, prosperous and peaceful societies.

Our current national strategy puts it this way: Through an aggressive and affirmative development agenda and commensurate resources, we can strengthen the regional partners we need to help us stop conflict and counter global criminal networks.

I think we have an agreement. But what is new this morning as we gather, I think, is our sense of urgency. In his letter to Congress regarding proposed cuts to the international affairs budget, Joint Chiefs Chairman, Adm. Mullen, wrote: The more significant the cuts, the longer military operations will take and the more and more lives are at risk.

This morning's panel understands that sense of urgency. It has members from the National Security Advisory Council of USGLC, and as you've just heard, Veterans for Smart Power. And they're here to discuss why, not despite their military experience but because of their military experience, they're such strong supporters of these civilian-led and civilian-funded tools of development and diplomacy.

I'd like to begin, Adm. Loy, if I can with you. Earlier this year, more than 50 retired officers – flag officers and general officers – you among them, of course – signed onto a letter to Congress supporting robust funding for these civilian tools. Can you tell us why and why do you think there's such strong support for this across the military?

ADM. LOY: Well, I guess in some ways, there's this sense that, gee, don't we all understand this. You know, isn't this a motherhood kind of thing and we all should just jump on the band wagon? But I really do believe the devil's in the details, as is always the case.

And so you have to get into the notion that talk is cheap and behavior is real. And at the other end of the day, to whatever degree we are offering notions in such documents as the national security strategy, what happens when the resources are or are not there to back up the intended litany of rhetoric that is forthcoming from these kind of documents.

And I think those of us who have been now involved for a couple of years in the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition just has recognized collectively and individually that we have to stand up and be counted when it's an important issue that's on the table. So sign what needs signed. Get the intentions and the commitment of, in our case, a group of retired senior players who have been in these trenches, you know, whether it's as a young person like Gen. Shelton and I in Vietnam, or whether it's in a later stage.

But whatever you find as your experience base, share that and make it quite clear such that the right behavior, including resource dedication, can follow the rhetoric that's often on the table.

MR. GREEN: Well, let's hope we get the right behavior. That's what brings us all here.

Gen. Shelton, if I can turn to you. You were chairman of the Joint Chiefs on 9/11, and I'm sure that affected your outlook in a lot of different ways and shaped your experience.

But based upon what you saw and what we all saw and dealt with in those days, those challenging days, how do you think – or maybe I should say – what do you think are the tools that America needs right now to really deal with these changing and evolving threats?

GEN. (RET.) HUGH SHELTON: Well, thanks, Mark. And, first of all, let me thank Attorney General Biden for his very kind words up here earlier today. Thank you.

You know, what I saw was not necessarily on 9/11 but it was on 9/12. And it took place in a National Security Council meeting, our first one after 9/11. And the director of the CIA and the FBI had both just finished briefing – George Tenet and Bob Mueller – and they had talked about the threat – or the event being caused by al-Qaida.

And as was typical in a meeting like that, as soon as we finished determining who had done the deed, all eyes in the room turned over to the secretary of Defense and myself – Rumsfeld and Shelton – as if to say, now, what are we going to do about this?

But before we could say a word, the president himself interrupted, and he said, wait a minute, we'll get to the military tool shortly, but first let's talk about what we can do diplomatically, economically, informationally (sic), et cetera.

And he went around the room, and he had the secretary of the Treasury, he had the secretary of state, et cetera. And so for the first time, we saw that maybe we can do this with all the tools in our kitbag. And that was a refreshing – very refreshing to me as a chairman because, as you know, when you fight the type of battles that we fight today, the types of wars that we're involved in in Afghanistan and Iraq, as I had been involved in when we planned Haiti, you need all those tools, not just the military.

Now, America's men and women in uniform, our soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines, Coast Guard, even the merchant mariners – very good at what they do. They can fight and win the wars. But the truth is, is that it takes more than that in the type of environment that we find ourselves today.

If you go all the way back to the Berlin Wall – in 1989, the wall came down. Most of us in this room thought peace was going to break out everywhere. But instead, what we saw without the two big superpowers to hold everyone in check, we saw the ethnic, religious and tribal warfares breaking out around the globe, which led to a 300 percent increase in the use of our armed forces but without a corresponding focus, if you will, on all the things it takes to really reestablish a nation once the Army, Air Force, Marines, whoever goes in and wins.

When we planned the operation for Haiti in a room just like this right here in Washington, D.C., every agency of government was represented and a lot of the non-governmental organizations as well. And when the day was over, we captured 51 key elements that would have to be done outside of the military just kicking the FOD (ph) out and killing or capturing them.

But these were things that would have to restore the power to the cities, restore the government, get the justice system working again, get the jails opened up, et cetera.

But when we got on the ground down there, the only people that really were there with us, to a large degree, were the nongovernmental organizations and the FBI and the attorney general support for the operation. In fact, Commissioner Ray Kelly from New York was the one that led that – that reestablished the police force, if you will.

But other than that, we found the military trying to do it ourselves. As I said, we can fight and win, but when it comes to getting that government back functioning, to getting the elements of the society functioning again, the military needs a lot of help. And if you don't, it prolongs the use of the military involvement, if you will.

And as we talked about earlier this morning at breakfast, you may have even, by using the developmental and diplomatic tools have precluded the conflict to start with if you're using it in a preventive manner.

And so I think we're in a real new era. It's one that started some time back but certainly was highlighted by the activity on 9/11.

MR. GREEN: I'm glad we're recording this session. I think that's pretty powerful testimony for what we're here to talk about.

Former Capt. Morin, you have been a platoon leader in both Afghanistan and in Iraq. Based on your experience, what do you think the potential is and what do you think the challenges are for civilian-led efforts to work side by side with military efforts in trying to stabilize societies and build peace?

CAPT. (RET.) JAMES MORIN: Well, first off, I'd like to say I'm glad my mother is here today so least one person in the audience thinks I'm qualified to be up here with – (laughter.)

But with that said, and following pretty tough speakers, you know, whenever I think about that question, I think back to my first patrol in Afghanistan as a young – I think I had just pinned on first lieutenant and I had a rifle platoon of about 50 soldiers.

And we knew that we were in Khost, which is kind of, just, almost into Pakistan. And from there, we drove about 40 miles – actually, I guess it was about 10 miles. It felt more like 40 miles on Afghan roads – to this small village that was right along the border, and we knew the Taliban was operating in that village. And we knew that we needed to kind of establish relationships with that village to identify where the Taliban were, what they were doing, how we could defeat them militarily.

So we had, you know, two or three truckloads of humanitarian daily rations, kind of MREs for normal people, probably 10 (thousand dollars), \$20,000 worth of food, school supplies, a whole slew of things. We drove in there, sat down, as you often do for tea with the village elders and you just start this dialogue from which you hope to kind of coax information from them as well as build rapport.

And we asked them what we could do for them and what they really needed. And this old man with this long, white beard, he strokes it for a few minutes and he says, you know, we could use a mating pair of American goats. And we all kind of look at each other – (laughter) – like I don't have that. (Laughter.)

But, you know, later on, reflecting on it, we all kind of agreed, you know, hey, there are people out there who have been doing this for years. This is their profession. This is what they

went to school for. We've been taught how to fight wars, how to call in artillery when you need it, how to call in air power when you need it.

There is this whole set of assets out there that the U.S. government has experts in, that our NGO community has experts in, and we need to start bringing them in so that we can, you know, build some synergy across not only our government but our whole society to really meet our nation's objectives.

We have been taught how to fight wars, how to call in artillery when you need it, call in airpower when you need it. There is this whole set of assets out there that the U.S. government has experts in, that our NGO community has experts in. And we need to start bringing them in so that we can, you know, build some synergy across – not only our government – but our whole society to really meet our nation's objectives.

MR. GREEN: I was just saying Gen. Shelton didn't realize that he was supposed to have goats in what he supplied to his – (laughter) – men in uniform.

GEN. SHELTON: I've got to respond to that part, just only by saying that our first request, even before we got forces on the ground in Afghanistan came back from the Special Forces captain that was out with the Northern Alliance in Afghanistan. He said I've got everything we need.

I've got my laser designators. I can call in the smart-bombs. All of our U.S. forces are well-equipped but I've got a real problem. The Northern Alliance doesn't have corn to feed the mules. I need help. It's a different war and we have to think that way.

MR. GREEN: Geoff and Bill, if I can turn to you. As you know, tomorrow is the day on the Hill. And so a lot of the folks who are here right now listening to us are going to go up to Capitol Hill. And they're going to talk to their members of Congress in coming weeks. During an interesting election season, they're going to talk to candidates. What do you think the best message is that they can carry to these candidates and elected officials in talking about smart power?

MR. GARIN: Well, let me talk about both messenger and message because I think the military voice here is extraordinarily powerful. And we are at a moment of maximum – hopefully it's maximum – cynicism in America. But the institutions of the U.S. military are still extraordinarily respected.

And that voice – an apolitical voice talking about the military value of these investments I think is quite powerful. And, frankly, it really is all about national security and about making investments that support the extraordinary demands that are being placed on our military today. And it is a logic that is hard to refuse.

MR. MCINTURFF: Well, of course, Geoff and I have a similar point. I do work for the NBC Wall Street Journal Poll with Geoff's partner. And we check every year what institutions are held in esteem or who have dropped in esteem. And it is a very grim view about American attitudes because everything is falling off the table.

And there are two institutions only that have increased in this esteem and the first is the American military. And that goes up almost year by year as they perform this long and these difficult missions. And number two is small business. But as we look at the military, when you talk about messenger, look, our country is – as I'm sure the military is – we are fatigued after nine years of this kind of engagement.

And there is this very powerful, underlying differences about what do we do next? But there is always support for the men and women who are serving abroad. And I think that, what I would be asking, what is the message? It would be that – it would be we've interviewed, we've talked to hundreds and hundreds of people who have been and had this experience.

And they're telling us that what we need to be successful is we need more help in these soft-power, smart-power areas. And that if you, as a member of Congress or out talking to your town-hall meetings, you should be talking about what you've heard from the military folks and what you've heard that they need. And as part of your support for our troops, their mission, and to head home and to come home safely we've got to do more of this.

And I think that's how I would boil it down. And, Mark, my apologies, I had to – something camp (ph) and I had to leave a little early. No disrespect – as you said, this very prestigious panel – and to this audience. But Geoff and I are seamless – (laughter) – and I know he will speak for me and I appreciate – (inaudible).

MR. GARIN: We share a brain, which is very scary. (Laughter.) Hardly enough for one.

MR. GREEN: Well, let me continue on with the discussion of the politics because we're in election season. And we're also in a time of fiscal challenge because I think, as members of this group go up to the Hill, you're likely to get the response, well, we agree with you, but there's not a lot of money.

Adm. Loy, if I can turn to you. How would you respond to that? When someone – a policymaker says to you, look, I'm sorry, these are tough times and we don't have a lot of money – what do you say?

ADM. LOY: Well, I think we all live in, sort of, a force field. And our country lives in a force field, as well. Some of those are external forces; some of those are internal forces. And it's a balancing act that's constantly about the business of how you're going to cope with those things.

So we have a secretary of defense who has initiated the notion of \$100 billion worth of efficiencies that can be extracted in one way or another from the Defense Department. That's a noble – an absolutely noble effort. I mean, as the commandant of the Coast Guard, you know, when my budget was where it was, I was thinking of just being at the table for the crumbs that would fall off the defense table – (laughter) – and be able to fund my organization for the next year.

But the reality is, to the degree that ambitious effort is undertaken, we should not simplify the notion that says, okay, if we can save X-number of billion dollars out of the Defense Department, we ought to shuffle it on over to the State Department – if that's the reality.

What we should do is take stock of that National Security Strategy that you just cited, the many strategy elements that are forthcoming as a result of that and in a balanced fashion consider and then allow resources to follow the rhetoric that's associated with the elements of that strategy.

And if that means increasing – as the president has requested – the State Department's budget to \$58 billion this year – that's the president's request that went to the Hill in February. We're watching very carefully the marking process between authorizers and appropriators at the other end of the day to see where we end up with that.

And if that is a – if the challenge there is to recognize that over the course of a decade, we've grown from X to a \$58-billion request – take into account, you know, inflation and all the things that have to be taken into account. But in a balanced fashion, put a number that is resources on the rhetoric that's associated with a U.S. national security goal set around the world.

And where the total comes from in these very difficult economic times – one hopes that in the balancing process, some of the impact of what Secretary Gates is doing there – and you can bet to the degree he's successful there – the boys and girls in OMB will watch that very carefully and we will be looking for the same kind of efficiencies elsewhere in government, as well.

But the American people deserve to recognize that, that kind of positive initiative is happening. And as I say, they'll only believe it once they see the actual appropriations bills come out of the Congress at the other end of the day.

MR. GREEN: Gen. Shelton, anything you would add to that?

GEN. SHELTON: Well, I think Jim summed it up very nicely. I guess, I would just add to that, that I believe that you have to ask yourself how much is enough? I mean, how long do you want to stay in a country that we deploy to? Because it's going to take us an inordinate, longer period of time if you go in without the proper tools when you get there to reach that exit strategy.

And I define exit strategy before you go. But it includes all the elements of our power, not just the military. And each of our agencies here in town or our departments need to have the resources available to them so that it can be a coordinated effort.

If you give them the resources, you've got a right to demand that they perform. If you haven't resourced them for it, then things will like it – it is today. And so you go to each department. You make them lay out for you – and this is to Congress – make them lay out for

you what they feel they need to have in order to properly participate in an operation like Afghanistan or Iraq.

And that you fund them to that level and then you hold them accountable. And so when you have the ambassador in that country and the military commander working as a team deciding what needs to be done, then you have the right to say, everybody ought to be doing that. I know Ambassador Bill Swing was very, very concerned and disappointed in Haiti when I was there because he had the military and those men and women in uniform were doing a tremendous job.

But he didn't have those other elements I just talked about, those other 51 pieces that were coming in and really putting the country back together so we would have a very – a relatively fast exit in the military and leave a country that was stable.

ADM. LOY: If I could, Mark, I would just add one other thought. The other thing is to note the successes that have been achieved when, in fact, this balanced approach is actually taken. There are just some extraordinary evidences of sustained U.S. reputational investment around the world that people will turn to as demonstrations of if you do it right, you get it, so to speak. And your reputation as we would have ourselves be seen around the world is enhanced in the doing of that.

Just one little example: I'm of the mind, or I'm told, and I have no reason to challenge the statistic, that when USAID micro-financing investments in small businesses around the world are looked at four-to-five years later, there's an 88-percent success rate that they are now thriving contributors to the local economies associated with that investment.

That's a pretty astonishing – I – you never see that on the front page and the challenge is to be able to cite and hold accountable, as Gen. Shelton just mentioned, hold accountable not only the U.S. military for what elements of this overall game plan they're responsible for, but all these others as well.

He cited 51 – that's quite jumble to hold together, but there certainly are a half-a-dozen or so that you can see direct accountability attended to the resources provided, and if success rates like 88 percent are not achieved, then those kinds of things ought to be challenged through the course of the next year.

But we have evidence of wonderful numbers. For example, out of the AIDS program in Africa that President Bush initiated and President Obama continues; these are nonpartisan efforts where good is being done and reflected as U.S. investments in good things around the world. To the degree we don't see the Somalias and the Yemens of the world become the Afghanistans and Iraqs of the world. Those are extraordinarily good investments that we will have made up front.

MR. GREEN: Captain Morin.

CAPT. MORIN: And I think a lot of things that resonates in answering that question amongst the junior officers is that they understand just how cost-effective development aid can

be. I mean, \$10,000 to build a bridge in a village does so much more for your mission than maybe a \$5-million cruise missile launch would.

And just as an example, one of the great things I got to do in my legal practice recently is I have a pro-bono client called Bonyam Media who, through a DIA subcontract from USAID, teaches entrepreneurship through reality TV shows in Afghanistan and now elsewhere in the world.

You know, and that's something the Taliban cannot offer people. It cannot offer the opportunity to unleash entrepreneurship and that's something that military people understand. Petraeus has said, money can be one of our best weapon systems and that's something I think that this community really can help make the case to the American people.

ADM. LOY: And I'd offer one other thing, Mark, if I may, and that is, we have talked about military, State Department, NGOs, USAID, but let's recognize the validity of the U.S. businessperson around the world as well. We're not only delighted with the sponsorship of those folks who would offer us a chance to tell this story this morning.

I just led, or co-led, a delegation of about 20 U.S. companies and their representatives over to India for a week. Extraordinary opportunities there, and this is in fact, like it or not, part of that force field, a global marketplace that we live in these days.

And to the degree we can be making investments business-to-business as well as business-to-government and develop the public-private partnership kind of sense around the world that allows U.S. business, as well as the U.S. government, to be a highly recognized and reputed package of influence, then the U.S. invariably ends up higher on the scale of positive reputation than otherwise it would be.

MR. GREEN: We have time for a question or two from the audience. We have microphones at least right here and over – the gentleman standing –

MR. : And over here as well.

MR. GREEN: – and up on right-hand side. Any questions?

MR. GARIN: Mark, while people are making their way to the microphone, I just want to – on that very last slide that I didn't go through, there was a point about the observation of military officers recognizing that in a lot of respects, we are ceding our leadership role to China in many of these areas, and they also talked about this as – these are important investments to at least provide balance to what – the very aggressive efforts China is making in this regard, and that applies to the economic imperative as well.

MR. GREEN: Absolutely.

MR. GARIN: This is a moment when Americans really do not want to cede our leadership to China around the world.

MR. GREEN: Anybody have a question?

Q: Hi, yes, my name is Eric (sp), I'm from New Jersey. I actually was interested more in learning more about how the military works with civilians and how they could work with NGOs and businesses to work after humanitarian crises, in particular. If you could kind of explain how the military works with those groups, I'd be interested to hear more.

MR. GREEN: Who would like to you – you want to take a shot at all?

GEN. SHELTON: Well, I can tell you, for example, if you take a local disaster here in the United States – or you want to go overseas, which is it?

Q: Either would be good, actually, I'd like to hear both, if that's possible.

GEN. SHELTON: Okay, well for example, I led a taskforce that went into Miami right after Hurricane Andrew, when the place was really devastated down at the airbase. We went right into the local government there, in this case with the mayor of the city, and we set up a taskforce in one of the few buildings that was still inhabitable.

And we started working out of that, working together, deciding who needed to do what, each one of the organizations telling us what their capabilities were, first of all, and then the mayor and myself, militarily, outlining what we felt like were the key things that had to be accomplished to restore law and order, if you will, right there within the area, and then start getting the people out of the houses and resupply, et cetera, et cetera.

But it's as a team, and the same thing was true in Haiti. In our Command Operations Center in Haiti, all the NGOs had a desk. They were all brought into the fold, if you will, we found out what their needs were, we told them what they – how they could assist us, and did it as a team. No different than how we work it militarily, we just started including them as a part of the taskforce.

ADM. LOY: I would offer that post-Katrina, we have learned a lot. We were embarrassed, as a nation, I think at the federal level, the state level, the local level, and in the aftermath of Katrina, I can tell you, there has been an awful lot of very good work. First of all, there were extraordinarily comprehensive lessons learned, reviews taken by the Congress, by elements in the executive branch, by the White House, certainly by the folks in Louisiana and elsewhere.

So today, when the National Response Framework which is in place and the National Incident Management System which is in place – as I'm sure Hugh (sp) will verify for – with me, the middle of the crisis is not when you exchange business cards and hope everything goes okay.

Rather, wherever you have designed those activities in advance, actually trained and exercised as might be necessary for, for example, a Category 4 storm hitting the Gulf Coast, all

of those activities, if primed in advance, including the reach to the private sector as necessary to offer opportunities for input, you will, in fact, do a dramatically better job than if you wait for the storm to hit and then show up that day and, as I say, begin the process of exchanging business cards. That's not the time to do that.

Today's military elements have on the shelf already clearly identified responsibilities that they very well might be asked to contribute to both domestic and overseas crises, and those are – there's nobody that plans better than the Department of Defense in the United States of America.

They, when challenged to do so, will do that better than anybody else in the world, and in this instance, as you're asking, whether it's a domestic earthquake in California, floods in the Red River, another hurricane, whatever, we now have primed and ready to go – thankfully, this hurricane season was a mild one, like, almost nonexistent, we hope that's always the case – but it's not a matter of if, it's always a matter of when.

And when the next big one hits, hopefully, those lessons bitterly learned in Katrina – and on 9/11, as a matter of fact – will have been translated into trained exercises, capability ready to put into practice when the nation needs it to be done.

MR. GREEN: I think we have time for one more question. Please.

Q: Thank you. Good morning. My name is Susana Florian with Parsons. First, thank you so very much for the uplifting and meaningful conversation here. My question has to do with, I would like to fully understand – one source of funding the two Ds is, perhaps, reducing the first – the big D. But how would the funding be administered – who, what agency, what part of the government – in order to make sure that this is working seamlessly? Is it clear, what I'm trying to ask?

ADM. LOY: I think it is. I'll take a crack, and the general can probably help us as well. But I think if it's an over there, if it is a Haiti, if it is an Afghanistan, if it is an Iraq, if it is an other than a domestic incident that's involved, I have always had enormous faith in the embassy and the ambassador as the centerpiece of what needs to be dealt with.

Now, that's now when you're talking about a military invasion, of course, but in the course of such things as – Hugh and I were both involved in Haiti a couple of times, I think, along the way, and my most poignant experience was when the junta was being displaced by Mr. Aristide.

That whole episode offered a chance to watch Ambassador Bill Swing just do an incredibly good job of being the owner, if you will, of the issue, and to play the multiple players – he was like the carpenter with a full tool kit, you know.

So he used a hammer when he needed, he used a screwdriver when he needed, et cetera, et cetera. And the array of players that were around that particular episode offered Ambassador

Swing a chance to lead the way and to utilize that variety of tools in his toolkit appropriately to the challenges that were, day by day, brought to the table.

MR. GREEN: General?

GEN. SHELTON: And being right there with Bill Swing, I will tell you that the only thing he lacked was, in this case, which I asked the president personally for on two occasions was directive authority over the – to make people do what they were supposed to do rather than having to plead with them and you know, accept excuses as to why it had not been done.

The only organization in this town that I know of that can carry out what I think your question is, which is the ability to make each agency of this government support the plan that the ambassador and the military commander have in place is found in the National Security Council and in the national security team.

That's the level at which you can direct people. I mean you've got – you're dealing with secretaries from, whether it's the attorney general or secretary of defense, secretary of state, whatever.

So the budget – they had budgets and they would have to justify additional funds or whatever, but the pulling it all together, monitoring whether or not people are actually doing their job, the only place in town right now that can do that is the National Security Council. And the by the way, that's what a four-star was told early on and we still have the same mission today. So we've got a – we've got a ways to go.

ADM. LOY: I would offer one other thought and that is, in this post-9/11 security environment, the competencies and skills of leaders placed in those positions maybe have adjusted a bit from the days of the good, old Cold War. I mean, who would have thought we'd be pining for the good, old days of the Cold War? (Laughter.)

But at the other end of that, to recognize that collaborative – the skills of being a good collaborator. I used to kid Secretary Ridge at DHS when the president was pinning the rose on him, for example, to be the person responsible to the president for protecting the critical infrastructure of the United States of America.

Now, just think about that for a second. Eighty-five percent of it is owned by the private sector, not by anybody in government and he was supposed to be the guy that could look all his Cabinet-level colleagues in the eye and pull together – as Gen. Shelton was just mentioning – their willing contribution to whatever the challenge was in protecting some element of critical infrastructure.

So I used to accuse him of being more the secretary of collaboration than the secretary of homeland security. But the reality is the same. The kind of skill sets of today about being very good at risk management, risk assessment and risk management, being a very good collaborator, those are the kinds of skill sets that our leaders today have to be – have to bring to the table to

allow Gen. Shelton's notion of singularity of purpose and directional accomplishment to get it – and then be held accountable – be held accountable for what it is you're responsible for.

CAPT. MORIN: The way I used to explain it to my soldiers is using the football analogy. And you watch football and you see a team with just an amazingly strong defense. You know, they stay in the game pretty well until the fourth quarter and at that point, the defense gets worn down.

You have to have the ability to do the forward pass and a good running game in order to complete the set. And so in some ways, it's just a false choice between a smaller big D and other – do other Ds. They all need to be able to play together.

MR. GREEN: Well, I want to thank everyone up here for participating for your service today as well as your service over the years. You know, as was mentioned in the introduction, I'm not only a former ambassador, but I'm also a former member of Congress and a conservative.

And during these fiscally challenging times, people sometimes ask me how it is that I can be such a strong supporter of a robust international affairs budget and a robust foreign assistance budget. Seems to me it's real simple – it's the right thing to do. I think generosity to those in need in far off lands is part of the American character, certainly part of the American history. But it's also, as we've heard over and over again up here, the smart thing to do.

I think it was summed up pretty well by something that the Smart Power Commission from CSIS said just a few years ago. They said today's central question is not simply whether we are capturing or killing more terrorists than are being recruited and trained, but whether we are providing more opportunities than our enemies can destroy and whether we are addressing more grievances than they can record.

That, after all, is the way that we prevent having to send men like these into action in far places of the world. Thanks, everyone. (Applause.)

MS. SHARMA: Thank you so much. In closing, I just want to try to sum up, particularly from the NGO-development perspective, what we've heard this morning, I mean, how extraordinary it is what we've heard this morning. And in essence, I think every military leader that we've heard from, from Gen. Shelton, all through the ranks, is that if all we have in our toolbox is a gigantic hammer, it's not only cumbersome to work with, it's a very heavy lift.

And we need strong civilian capacity, a strong civilian development agency, a robust diplomacy infrastructure. And I really appreciate the words of Gen. Shelton. What you said was so powerful, that the military is built to fight and win wars and our military does that extraordinarily well.

But our development professionals are taught to build people and build nations and do that extraordinarily well. And our diplomats are taught to build peace. And it really is those

three together that are the key. So I want to thank you so much for bringing your military voices to our table to speak on behalf of development and for a better, safer world. Thank you.

I want to invite everybody to take a 10-minute break. We will be back at 11:10 for the session on the links between development and our economy. So please join us after the break. Thanks so much. (Applause.)

(END)