

Liz: I am Liz Shroyer. I am the executive director of the US Global Leadership Coalition and I am just delighted to welcome you to our annual conference, our symposium this afternoon and we are in for an extraordinary treat of speakers to learn from, to talk with to discuss some of the most difficult challenges that we face here in Washington and throughout the world. We are excited to kick off with a fabulous program this morning. We are getting word that a lot of our folks from around the country got caught in the storms with airplanes last night and some of the flights were canceled, but I know people are trickling in this morning and we're delighted to see you.

To begin our program, I am delighted to invite up our co-president of the US Global Leadership Coalition, somebody who has been an enormous voice and leader and guiding light for us. Bill Lane who served at Caterpillar [inaudible 00:00:59] 37 years to introduce and give an honor for our very first speaker. Bill, thank you for everything you do and welcome.

Bill: First of all good morning and I have to say I'm really excited about it. I'm Bill Lane. I'm [inaudible 00:01:19] Global Government Affairs director. The job I like best is being the co-president of the US Global Leadership Coalition for a couple reasons. We all get to work together. It's just a terrific organization and I've always found the key to success is to do whatever Liz says. Since I'm not supposed to be freelancing here, it's a great organization is the best investment Caterpillar has ever made in Washington, DC and it really has made a difference. Now I have the honor this morning to kick things off by introducing someone who's really, really important.

He's a senator from Georgia, Johnny Isakson and I have to say that his commitment to this cause has just been overwhelming and it got there in a strange way. Like most people, who like senators, they come to Washington; his main goal was not to go into foreign relations [inaudible 00:02:16]. Even though when you think about the US Senate, the foreign relations committee is what the senator is all about, advise and consent. He became a member of the committee and he's been in the senate since 2004. Prior to that he had three terms in the house of representatives. On the committee, he became a real champion of our cause. He cares deeply about Africa. He chaired the subcommittee and he truly came to the conclusion that the 21st century is going to be the century of Africa. He backed up that commitment with action.

Right now he's the ranking member of the African subcommittee. He also got onto another committee that's sort of important called [Finance 00:02:58] which has all sorts of long term and short term implications. I have to say, this is a true honor. As a Georgia company, Caterpillar is proud to be in the state, but the thing that we're most proud of is that a close relationship with Johnny Isakson and I'd like to welcome him up here [inaudible 00:03:22]. Senator, thank you

very much. Before we get started, we do have an award for him. We were pushing for a lamp or something like that but this is [inaudible 00:03:41]. Even though that the writing is a little bit small, it says in appreciation for your commitment to the International [inaudible 00:03:51]. Senator, thank you very much and welcome. I'm going to put it right here.

Johnny: Bill, thank you very much for your commitment to America and to Smart Power and your commitment to the people of the world. I'm delighted to be here today. I appreciate the nice things that Bill said about me but I'm really a [inaudible 00:04:14] compared to Connie Morella and Howard Berman and Dick Luger who are going to be on the panel to follow after me. I learned most everything I know from them so don't pay a lot of attention to me but listen closely to them when they come up here. I did go on the foreign relations committee eight years ago and met a guy named Dick Luger who was the ranking member at the time.

He asked me to take the Africa subcommittee because nobody else would. I took it mainly because Dick Luger asked me to take it. Once I did take it, I said you probably ought to go to Africa so you can at least figure out what you're talking about when you're talking about issues that affect Africa. I began traveling to Africa eight years ago and have ever since. I just [inaudible 00:04:53] Tanzania, I'm sorry, to South Africa and to Morocco and to Senegal and Somali matter of fact looking at some of the issues that affect the African people and the relationship of the United States of America and Africa. These travels have opened my eyes to realize it's Smart Power and investments by foreign assistance is good for the United States of America and it's good for the future of my children and my grandchildren.

In the years that I've had the chance to travel, I've seen public private partnership with American companies and other countries work. I've seen us bring hope where there was no hope. Education where there was no education and opportunity where there was no opportunity. By way of example, I want to tell you a couple of brief little stories. I went to [Gaza Ria 00:05:35] in Iraq. That's the suburb of Bagdad. Shortly after a major battle, walking with a bullet proof vest on with a United States Army captain making micro loans to Iraqis to reopen their businesses and start again anew. I traveled to Tanzania where Mark Green was the ambassador.

Met with the [inaudible 00:05:53] leaders there and saw the miracle of Tanzania taking over more and more of the responsibility of delivering the anti retrovirals to doing the testing and making sure the [inaudible 00:06:03] program worked. Lessening the burden of cost to the United States but empowering the people of Tanzania. I traveled to Ghana with Coca Cola and saw first hand a [inaudible 00:06:12] water plant. For people that had no clean water at all now had a

sustainable way to have clean water for the rest of the lives of themselves and their children. I've traveled all over Africa and seen time and again the investment of American ingenuity, manpower, and intelligence to improving the lives of those people. Let me tell you why it's so important. Our enemies for the 21st century we all know is terrorism. The terrorism and the likes of Al Qaeda and groups like that take advantage of two things; hunger and ignorance and poverty. That's three things. [Inaudible 00:06:42]. I recognized that.

What we're doing with Soft Power is through our foreign assistance, through the NGOs in the United States of America, and through the investment of [inaudible 00:06:54] doing is bringing about less poverty, better educational opportunity so that we don't have those people that become vulnerable to be captured by those that would do ill to us and all the free people of the world. Smart Power is the best power. It precedes the power that you have to use the military when all else fails. We should never let ourselves be an all else fails people.

We ought to make sure we're making investment in the people of the world, making investment in peace, and security, and democracy, and see to it that there is no more hunger, see to it there is more opportunity, see to it there is more clean water and there is basic education for the people of the world. When we do that, people will trade with each other, work with each other, and not kill each other. In the end, that's the most important goal you could ever have as a country and that's one the United States of America should have and I am honored that you took the time to recognize me today.

I wish I could stay and listen to your distinguished panel. [Inaudible 00:07:48] today. Have a great time and I know the theme of this conference is Washington from the inside. When you all figure that out, please let me know because I've been here 15 years and I'm still working on it. God bless all of you and thank you.

Mark: You should never be an all else fails country. I wrote that down. I think that captures a lot of what we're here to talk about today. Good morning everyone. My name is Mark Green. I'm president and CEO for the Initiative for Global Development and a proud member of the board of the US Global Leadership Coalition. This morning I have the honor of introducing three former members of Congress. All of whom will say two leadership roles in advancing the cause of the international affairs budget and all of whom remain active on our great cause even today. First, friend and former colleague, Howard Berman.

Howard Berman represented California in the House of Representatives for 30 years. As chairman and then ranking member on the house foreign affairs committee, Congressman Berman was one of the most influential members of the house and a two champion for foreign assistance. In his final term, he led an effort to draft a long overdue rewrite of a half century old foreign assistance act.

Since retiring, Congress Berman has been advising a wide range of clients on matters of both foreign and domestic policy. We are thrilled to have him as one of the newest members of US GLC advisory council. Senator Richard Lugar. Senator Lugar represented Indiana in the US Senate for 36 years during which time he served as chairman and then ranking member of the senate foreign relations committee. Throughout his career as we all know, Senator Lugar had a role in nearly every foreign policy decision facing this country.

From nonproliferation to food security to the role of the modern US embassy. He currently has the Lugar Center, a nonprofit organization devoted to finding solution to global challenges. We're delighted that Senator Lugar has also now joined US GLT's advisory council. Ambassador Connie Morella, another friend and former colleague. Ambassador Morella represented Maryland's 8th district in the House of Representatives from 1987 to 2003. Throughout her career, including her time as US Ambassador, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, she served as a leader in promoting economic growth in science, technology, and free trade.

Currently Ambassador Morella is president of US Association of Former Members of Congress and is the ambassador and resident of American University School of Public Affairs. There she teaches a course on women, politics, and public policy. Last and certainly not least is the moderator of this morning's discussion, Andrea Koppel. She serves as vice president of Global Engagement and Policy at Mercy Corp where she engages the public on issues that most affect Mercy Corp's program and beneficiary. Andrea is a journalist by trade having worked for CNN for 21 years including as the state department correspondent from 1998 until 2006. Of course she too is a proud member of US Global Leadership Council Board of Directors. Please join me in welcoming our esteemed group of speakers.

Andrea: Good morning everyone. Just so you know, Mercy Corp is an NGO, an international NGO that [inaudible 00:11:59] take their seats that work from over 40 countries around the world. I'm guessing a few of you haven't heard of it before. Just out of curiosity by a show of hands, how many of you in the audience today have done this before? Have lobbied on Capital Hill? Looks like about half of you.

How many of you enjoyed the experience by a show of hands? (Laughing) Hopefully tomorrow is going to be a wonderful experience for those of you who have done it before and for those of you who've never done it before and there are no better teachers and advisors than the three panelists seated next to me today. I was adding up collectively the three of these distinguished panelists have over 80 years of legislative wisdom and experience. We are so happy and so honored to have them today. Senator Lugar, I wanted to start with you if I

could. You took office in 1977. Jimmy Carter was president. There were a few things going on in the world back then. We had some good news. We had the Camp David Peace Accord which was [inaudible 00:13:29]. We also had the biggest energy crisis that our nation has faced. We also had a couple years later the start of the Iranian Hostage Crisis.

Back then compared with today, international assistance is a percentage of [inaudible 00:13:49] was more than double, about double what it is today. [Inaudible 00:13:57] because there are a few things happening in the world today. What it is that those conversations when you were inside the Republican Caucus and you were talking to members of your party who didn't see the world the way you do. What were you hearing? What were people saying to you to explain why international assistance should not be as robust as it was back when you first took office?

Richard: I think very frankly within the Republican Caucus, there were those that were deeply involved in foreign affairs [inaudible 00:14:35]. They were listened to and they did not talk about foreign assistance a great deal [inaudible 00:14:45]. Nevertheless, their leadership [inaudible 00:14:52] for example and even people who had fought to be on the foreign relations committee [inaudible 00:15:04] and somebody had some latitude of furthermore, less preoccupation [inaudible 00:15:12] understates it with domestic economic affairs at the time. Essentially the prices now with regard foreign assistance money, it's been through state department money for many, many years as a larger category is that the money has gone primarily to the defense department to the point that former secretary, Bob Gates, really wanted to give some of it back. The Secretary of State [inaudible 00:15:41] handled there. Leaving aside that with our constituents, [inaudible 00:15:50] back home with the preoccupation [inaudible 00:15:52] great recession has been the jobs with the budget, with the deficit of domestic affairs. You can go to sometimes open meetings and people would say it's very nice that you're interested in foreign affairs. We respect that but we don't want to hear about it. Really wanted to talk about the budget.

Andrea: What would you say in response?

Richard: I would say that we still live in a very big world. A dangerous world but one in which the United States' ability to transport troops everywhere in the world and we uniquely are able to do that. We're the only country that has a fleet that is in all of the seas that really keep the foreign trade open for ourselves and for others. This is our livelihood and our future. Reduce that money on the defense department. Reduce all of the above. At the same time, we are not going to be successful just with the ships and with the groups going to places if we have not been thoughtful about the rest of the people in the world. I'm impressed for instance with an article in the Economist for this week, which they point out in

the last 20 years a billion people out of seven billion on this earth have been moved from the poverty or below poverty level, extraordinary movement. We have about a billion to go. It was already decided by Johnny Isakson so carefully and thoughtfully.

As long as there is that number of people out there susceptible to hunger and even starvation on a daily basis, the possibility for terrorism, for all sorts of [inaudible 00:17:35] are always a threat. We really have to be facing constantly with others, the idea of how do we feed the world or how do we continue [inaudible 00:17:47] campaign and so forth. They took the difference in the quality of life and it gives them some chance really of then expressing our thoughts to people who are not with them.

Andrea: Dr. Morella, you just heard Senator Lugar making eloquent case for the mission driven side of the international assistance budget. As the former head of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, I had to look that up because I can never remember what OECD stands for. As the former US ambassador to the OECD, looking at what's going to take place tomorrow, you've got President Obama who's about to head off on his second trip to the African continent but what's different this time than the first time he went is that he's not just bringing his political advisors. He's bringing a delegation of hundreds upon hundreds of American business men and women to go with him because it's not just about aid, it's about trade. How is trade Smart Power for the United States?

Connie: It really is. Thank you, Andrea and first of all I wanted to say I'm Connie Morella and I approve this message (laughing). The message also is that the US Global Leadership Coalition does such a great job and I want to commend all of you for being here and then going to Capitol Hill tomorrow. I want you to know that one of the reasons I wanted to be here is because Senator Lugar and former Congressman, Howard Berman, are here. Although Senator Lugar has given 36 years, Congressman Berman has given 30 years and I've given only 16 in Congress but then four at OECD. OECD came about, Andrea, through the Marshall Plan. It was George Marshall's word for family of nations that brought together right now 34 nations that are the most developed. but they work on best practices to kind of level the playing field, so that businesses in the United States and these other countries will have some of the same rules and regulations and will get the best practices. I think going into Africa is brilliant.

Now, there's been a lot of controversy about taking in a large entourage in terms of the cost, but if you were to weigh the benefits, you would say that the benefits far outweigh whatever the costs may be for security, et cetera. I think bringing the business community says something about what the benefits can be. When you can assist countries in terms of education, in terms of the best

business practices, in terms of health, you have stability, and when you have stability, then companies are willing to go there.

Trade is a very key element, and I hope that when you go to Capitol Hill that you do talk about the benefits of trade as foreign assistance, as a package that you are concerned about. We can come up with a scale and we can show all of the benefits of this particular trip, in terms of the [inaudible 00:21:21] of smart power, but bringing the business people, this is a newer dimension which is so critically important, and it's clear that the Chinese have been doing it for years.

Andrea: Congressman Berman, before you retired from Congress, you worked tirelessly to reform the Foreign Affairs Act of ... wait for it ... 1961. Just to put that in context, *Breakfast at Tiffany's* was the hot movie in the box office that day. You also had the U.S. breaking relations with Cuba, you had the start of the civil rights movement, so that just gives you a sense of how long ago, and unfortunately you weren't able to push it over the goal line. What do you think it's going to take to make that happen, and do you think it's even possible that it'll happen during the second Obama administration?

Howard: *Breakfast at Tiffany's*. That was the last good movie, right? The issue of foreign assistance or foreign issues was born at the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition, when Liz Schroyer and George Ingram grabbed me about a minute after I became chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee and said, "What are we going to do about this law, with its thousands of earmarks, its reference to institutions and entities that don't exist anymore, its lack of focus and direction for a foreign assistance program?" They made a case which I may have worked tirelessly at, but I certainly did not work successfully at, which was to essentially try to rewrite our whole foreign assistance law.

The key issue here is to make it ... this is such a different time. We just heard, from your questions and what Dick and Connie have said, that foreign assistance isn't just about trying to do good or help people who need help. It is so integrated into a globalized economy, or it needs to be so integrated into a globalized economy, where it helps to create the institution that allows for the trade and the investment.

The story of Africa, for some people, it's a very depressing story. It's about Sudan and what's going on in the Congo and the horrors, but if you look closer, you're starting to see leaders in Africa and the people of Africa deeply committed to improving their own lives, willing to take on responsibilities for sensible policies, and we have to have a foreign assistance program that incentivizes that, that has country ownership, that separates the goal of foreign assistance from a particular bilateral U.S.-country relationship.

For years we gave billions of dollars to the government of Egypt as part of a post-bilateral relationship, and have no basis for thinking that that assistance made a substantial difference either for the Egyptian people or in the capacity of the Egyptian people in the future, to get the benefits of better infrastructure. The purpose here is essentially to make it a program that lays the foundation for the trade and the investment and the growing prosperity which is in every American's interest.

When we go to our constituents to talk about foreign aid, first of all, they ... as everybody here has heard from the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition ... they think it's ten times larger than it really is, and secondly think it's totally unrelated to their own lives, when in fact we can see the benefits all over our country of trade and stability around the world where we have it and how that helps make a more prosperous America, so it's a self-interest issue.

Now, your fundamental question is how we can win reality. We need a few people, deeply committed, and a Congress that's willing to sort of bring back the process of legislating, rather than sort of dealing with the crisis of the moment in an extraordinary way. Senator Lugar, when we got into it, he was the greatest supporter of these efforts as the ranking Member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and I guess there is people like Bob Corker and Johnny Isakson and others. There are some people who would see the wisdom of trying to take on this program, and it involves constantly pushing.

Part of what I hope when you go guys go tomorrow is, in addition to the very specific things you're going to be lobbying on behalf of, which are very important, also some attention to the largest question of creating country ownership, of reorganizing our own agencies to make the aid more effective, to restore the capacity of USAID, to monitor and evaluate our foreign assistance programs, not so much about how much dollars we spend but how effectively we spend them.

Andrea: Speaking of spending those dollars effective, during your time in Congress, Senator Lugar, you were a leader on trying to end global hunger. The Obama administration just tried and failed to reform U.S. food aid, much as you had President Bush attempt the same thing a few years back. What do you think it's going to take to reform food aid, and frankly, do you think that U.S. international food aid assistance needs reforming in the first place?

Richard: I believe it needs reform. I strongly supported Rod Shalk [phonetic 00:28:11] and USAID's new idea that much more of the food would be purchased on site, where the famines were occurring or at least close to that point.

Andrea: Could you explain it to the audience?

Richard: Essentially the idea for now is that we have a food assistance program. When a famine occurs, farmers in America, food suppliers, are summoned and food is bought from them. It's put on American ships ... and that's a very important part of the thing legislatively ... and conveyed out to the field and distributed there. The thought was that we in fact could buy the food in country, thus encouraging farmers at the local level. It would be present six or seven months before it would be present under the current system, while people are starving in the meanwhile, and we would not have the shipping costs.

I've run flat into, of course, the group that would say, "Well, we supported all this to begin with because we're buying from American farmers, and secondly, you were paying the freight for American shippers, and that's our interest in the thing. Incidentally, there's some food at the end of the sale for the people." I would just say simply it's a good idea. It will have to continue to be pressed with Rod Caruso [phonetic 00:29:40].

While I'm speaking of him, I'm impressed with the fact, as you are, that over the course of just the last few years, about 700 people have been trained in USAID to be much more effective in the distribution of foreign aid programs, and that's come despite budget cuts and all sorts of difficulties. In other words, the expertise involved has been proven very substantial. I think perhaps in this current atmosphere, in the program that's been mentioned, the savings were a difficulty.

Even then, I advise each of you as you head to the Hill, there are still bills to come, places where amendments might be placed. This is not going to happen in the old-fashioned way, by sort of the regular order right now. In the case of a bill, everybody knows the whole process is much more likely to occur on bills that are so-called essential, and it's still a good idea.

Andrea: While you all think of your questions, and you may have questions right now, I'm just going to put one more question to our panelists, and then there'll be microphones that are here in the room. If you just raise your hand, they will bring you a microphone. We've got about 16 minutes left, time for a few questions from the audience.

I'd like to start with you, Ambassador Morella. What advice do you have for these men and women in the audience today to be most effective in the way that they engage with either their Member or a member of their senior staff? What works with you? Obviously having somebody from your district makes a big difference, but is there anything in the way ... do we need to get right to the point right off the top? Is an example helpful? What would help persuade you? What was most effective?

Connie: Well, I think the people who are here are committed, so therefore they're pretty diplomatic when we're talking about smart power. I would say to know what your agenda is. You can't focus on everything throughout the world, but decide what it is that you think is most important, to be pretty concise about it, to listen to what the staff person sees too. I always just say, "My rod and my staff, they comfort me. They prepare the papers for me in the presence of my constituents," but don't underestimate staff, please, because they will have the ear of the Member, and so I think to respect their time too.

I think the point that you should keep in mind is that I represented a very [inaudible 00:32:29] district in Montgomery County, Maryland, and yet I can remember in town meetings talking about, even then, reducing the budget deficit, and somebody would say during the meeting, "Let's reduce the foreign assistance budget." I'd say, "Well, tell me, sir, what do you think we spend on foreign assistance?" "Twenty-five percent." Then someone else would say, "Oh, no, no, that's too high. It's more like 15 percent," but I'd say to you it's more like 1 percent, and sometimes the Members don't even realize that when they're thinking about the various [inaudible 00:33:04].

I would say all of those things, priorities, conciseness, respect for staff and Members, and remember that you're talking about a very small part of the budget that gives a lot of benefit.

Andrea: Congressman Berman, what advice do you have?

Howard: In addition to everything that Connie has said, with a focus on the conciseness and why it is in our country's interest and their constituents' interest to do this. Leave some sense that people from their district who care about this issue will be watching what they do. We want more accountability and monitoring of foreign aid programs. We also want it in our representatives, and the notion ... this isn't a pro forma business. This started with a conversation [inaudible 00:34:03] paying close attention [inaudible 00:34:09]. They're representing someone more than yourself, but a significant voice in their district I think is a useful part of the message, quite impactful.

Andrea: Senator Lugar, a number of those in the audience will be meeting with members of your party, some of whom are not in favor of international assistance. With that hat on, what advice do you have for them when they speak to people like Rand Paul, who absolutely, categorically think this is a terrible idea?

Richard: Well, I would say you have to be very original, but I think the fact is that Rand Paul is only one of several members of our party now who are really opposed to foreign assistance, and it comes down to the fact that they feel that talking about foreign assistance is a trivial pursuit as opposed to getting on to the discussion of the debt ceiling and the very large changes [inaudible 00:35:26].

Even though we're now, in the Congress, taking a look at immigration and gun control and the farm bill and so forth, they have been saying, "Let's get on with the major bills, but nobody seems to talk about the salvation of the country as we see it, and that cannot occur with trillions of dollars in debt, trillion or hundreds of billions of continued deficits." In other words, it's a preoccupation with that immediate situation.

Granted that that's not what you may have come to talk about, but the point, I think, is that we're talking today about foreign assistance as something that does assist us in more than [inaudible 00:36:13] in the dangerous world in which we live, and the building up of constituencies abroad that can be very, very helpful. Smart power, as opposed to sending troops in every direction very frequently and with loss of life and so forth. This is all a benefit. Rand Paul and others will understand that.

I don't want to characterize all of them in one category, but they've read, at least, the polls that indicate that the American public does not want to be involved right now anymore in Afghanistan. A large majority do not want to be involved in any way in Syria. They do not really want to be involved in anything that may have troops and may have loss of life. What we're suggesting is that, in the absence of that, in addition to intelligence services and drone strikes and so forth, which are certainly a lot more economical than sending troops, the most humane and satisfying overall way would be to talk about food and to talk about opening up trade through, for instance, the African Opportunity Act.

In fact this was a great idea, for textiles to come from Africa to the United States. Often blocked by interests here, but that's the sort of thing that empowers people there to make money within the [inaudible 00:37:40] business. We want to talk about trade. We want to talk about how you get American business into countries, and we've got American students abroad and foreign students here. With telecommunications, smart power comes through the media everywhere, so people have some glimpse of our way of life. These are things that you might talk about.

Andrea: That's wonderful. What would you like to ask our panel? This gentleman right there in the middle of the room. If you could tell us your name and where you're from, please. Thank you. Try turning on the switch. Is there a switch there on the top? There it is. I think it may be on now. No? Okay, why don't you just try speaking loudly?

Speaker: My name is Danny Lit. I'm with the Institute for Defense & Businesses in Chapel Hill, North Carolina. It's a professional education institute. But I'm also a retired Foreign Service officer, and that's where I would like to direct my question to the panelists. Programs on trade and aid are important, and also our ability to carry out, implement and execute those through our institutions. So what would you

advise us as we go out and discuss on the Hill, both the programs and support for the institutions and human resources? ...In terms of blending our conversation, are we going to more receptive on the programs than on hiring more experts in our Foreign Service, USAID and Department of Commerce? Or can we go equally on both of those tracks?

Berman: I'm a big believer in maintaining and strengthening the capacity of our folks in Washington, and even more importantly in our missions in-country to know what is happening with our aid, to help shape what programs are given priority in a particular country in terms of the needs of the people of that country through the participation of the people in that country in helping to shape those programs. To me I think it's a big mistake to dump huge more money into a process without the capacity to help shape, monitor, and evaluate the effectiveness of those programs.

Morella: Oversight, transparency are critically important to your constituencies than to the members of Congress, and this comes from the foreign service personnel. I have great regard for them, because I represented a lot of them in Montgomery County, Maryland, and surveying at OACD, those who were posted to that mission were just some of the most committed, hard-working people that I have ever met.

But I think when you're talking to the members of Congress, you want to talk about the benefits to their constituency in terms of health. What we can do for stability. The benefits in terms of jobs. We talk about jobs and unemployment. What foreign aid does to create jobs through trade. So I'm thinking of also coming up with tangible benefits that the members can see to assist their country and their constituency.

Koppel: Senator Lugar.

Lugar: This is a more broad and comprehensive thought, but during my travels in Asia in the last few months, I've been struck first of all by the impression, the so-called pivot, the strategy that is sending our fleet out around the South China Sea and elsewhere has made our participation in the ASEAN group and at APEC specifically what I mean here is that the countries involved - Japan, the Philippines, South Korea, Thailand, Indonesia - are all countries I visit. The leadership is impressed with the fact that we care, and therefore they're paying much more attention to our business needs, quite apart from our political needs. The amount of American investment is increasing, the prosperity of those countries has taken a turn for the better. Granted that Japan has its own problems with QE2 and those difficulties.

I would just say I was impressed, for instance in the Philippines, our Clark Air Force Base, which closed down awhile back. Now there's quite a display of businesses outside there in the woods, before you get to the cemetery. Possibility of opening this up again in some various ways.

And it's true that in Indonesia the whole discovery of what a great country this country is, and how much we can mean to them, and their feeling of neglect before being rather profound, to the extent that any of you have knowledge of business situations in these countries, quite apart from the history of these countries, I would express this to members of Congress. They will find this educational, because the fact is that the Indonesian ambassador from our country told me only two members of the Senate had visited Indonesia in the last year. This, despite the fact that our diplomats through ASEAN and others are much more concentrated on this, and we really all need to be, as a whole government.

Koppel: Wonderful. In the back of the room? Yes, your name please?

Kali: Good morning. My name is Fahrman Kali, I am a principal and founder of the International Foundation for Justice. I'm an Iranian American citizen, and the very purpose of me physically here is colliding of two worlds - the American dream and oppressive measures of Iranian regime. I wanted to bring your focus on the question of Iran. I just got a Twitter statement from Senator Kirk that he would not allow Iran to continue with this rope-a-dope strategy in where the world power, the world community down.

I have a lot of questions. Hopefully during this course of next two days I will ask that, but I wanted you to bring a little more focus on how we can consolidate America's founding vision of supporting democratic movements around the world, and thus making the world safer.

Koppel: There is a good portion of international assistance that goes towards governance and democracy building, and whether it's the International Republican Institute, the Democratic Institute. Senator Lugar, do you want to respond?

Lugar: Specifically on Iran, this is a critical question in terms of American security, but likewise the future of Iran. Let me just make a few points. First of all, in the previous election in Iran, the State Department did begin to unleash the idea of smart power through iPhones and all sort of communication devices. The young people in Iran caught a hold of that. We've got pictures of what was going on in Iran literally coming back from these phones and so forth.

Koppel: This is during the Green Revolution.

Lugar: Yeah. And so we began to find a constituency there of people who really would like to know more about the United States, and we'd like to know more about them. We would like to have more of a sharing. Ultimately this is going to be very important, although maybe not in the next two weeks or so. I would just say that this probably led to a different kind of election this time around, in which there was large participation, great skepticism as to whether Khamenei pays any attention to whoever was elected, but at the same time some possibilities here that are important.

I think we do need to take a look once again at the possibility for communication of our ideas, and that it makes a difference ultimately in all of this. Beyond that, in this country we need to be having a proper debate, regular order. Let's say all sorts of rumors about how far the nuclear program can go, the enrichment, before it's intolerable, before somebody needs to strike and take it out, and so forth. We're talking about war, we're talking about a very large war, not something that is ended in a few days and so forth.

We better talk about this in the right way, as a country, whether we wanted to declare war or not. If we do, we ought to have the proper hearings and debates and authority in the Congress on this situation, as opposed to hints here or there that the leadership might do this or that. The same time we're all taking polls saying we want to be out of every place, our leadership may be talking about how we're going into some place, because it's intolerable to have nuclear weapons there, and it may very well be.

But this debate hasn't occurred in this country, and it needs to, and the Iranian people need to know we're having the debate. We need to be able to communicate, particularly with the young people there, who have a stake in the fact that their economy is declining, the sanctions are having an impact. If they are more comprehensive, they will have even more of an impact, and these are some random thoughts about the Iranian picture.

Koppel: Wonderful. Either one of you?

Berman: We have different objectives with our Iran policy. The nuclear ... Iran's nuclear weapons program, I think, is justifiably a very high concern for the American government and for the international community, because the implications of Iran having a nuclear weapon, there are many of them. By the way, I don't think ... I think them using it always has to be considered. That isn't the first reason of concern, it's how it alters the balance of power in that part of the world, the death of the non-proliferation regime, the inevitability that a number of other countries in the region then will seek to get nuclear weapons. So it's a high priority.

We also have other priorities with Iran. Their support for international terrorism, and what the questioner raised, which is the nature of authoritarian rule, the suppression of the people and their rights. Senator Lugar is right, we have started in some smart ways, even notwithstanding all the different sanctions and all of that, to try and help enable the Iranian people to be able to get information and give reporting of what is happening inside Iran.

It's very complicated. I think this administration is actually handling it sort of right. We are using different tools in our authority to build an international coalition, not an America go-it-alone program, but international coalition to apply pressure on the regime with the hopes of reaching a diplomatic resolution, which can give confidence that Iran's nuclear weapons program has ended.

That's the strategy. Part of that involves the implication that this is serious enough that all options remain on the table, including a military option, and the question is whether the strategy can be successful. I don't think any of us know for sure. There were interesting signs in this last election that the candidate ... the irony is in Iran, we are so estranged from the government of Iran, and have been now since the revolution there, and what polling is available shows that in that part of the world, there are no people that are more pro-Western and pro-American than the Iranian people. It makes one think that there's an inverse relationship between how close we are to a government, and how much the people of the country like us.

You touch on a very important issue. How in the end one part of our foreign policy goals are to promote what we consider to be universal values regarding the right of people to choose their own form of governance, and some basic fundamental human rights that no government should be able to stifle. We always have to remember that how you successfully pursue that is very much a subject of debate now as we watch what's going on in the different springtimes that are occurring around the world, so to speak.

Koppel: I know that our conversation has been very very heavy thus far. In our remaining couple of minutes here I've been asked to have a little lighter end to our panel. If you'll humor me, I've been asked to do a very very short Actor's Studio, and I'm going to ask if you've ever seen this program on PBS, and I love it. At a certain point during the interview, they are asked just to give a one-word answer. So I'm just going to ask you a couple of questions, just to show another side of our distinguished panel.

Beginning with you, Ambassador Morella, favorite movie? Recent movie.

Morella: Okay. I think it was 42. That was the Robinson story, which is really great.

Koppel: Okay. Congressman Berman?

Berman: Anything done by Quentin Tarantino. The vulgar violence really ...

Koppel: Senator Lugar.

Lugar: There was a movie about Iran, and I can't remember the name of it now. The Academy Award winner ...

Koppel: Argo.

Lugar: Argo.

Koppel: Oh, yeah, that was a terrific movie. Favorite book, Ambassador Morella?

Morella: Right now I'm finishing up Olympia Snowe's book On Common Ground, because it's what we've lived through from her perspective.

Koppel: Congressman Berman, what are you reading now?

Berman: I'm trying to choose between Ken Pollack's new book ...

Koppel: That's my husband. It's coming out in September on Iran.

Berman: ... and Texas Hold 'Em for Dummies.

Koppel: Senator Lugar?

Lugar: I've been reading David Hamburg's new book Let Peace Have A Chance, and a wonderful new biography of C.S. Lewis.

Koppel: And final question. Favorite swear word.

Morella: That would be under my breath, so I wouldn't dare use it here.

Koppel: What letter does it begin with?

Morella: What incrimination that is.

Berman: Do you think you have Rahm Emmanuel on the panel?

Morella: Exactly, exactly. I defer to the gentlemen.

Lugar: Too heavy

Morella: Too heavy.

Koppel: Congressman Berman?

Berman: Yes?

Koppel: Listen, I want to thank all three of you for a fascinating discussion, for taking the time to come here today, and I as a board member of USGLC, want to offer my sincere thanks to each and every one of you for taking time out of your lives to come to DC and lobby on behalf of this incredibly important issue. Thank you so much.

Morella: And good luck.

Koppel: Thank you, Senator.

Green: Thanks again to Andrea and our panelists for this morning's presentation. I hope you found it as interesting as I did. There's an old adage that there's no such thing as a free lunch. Well, there's no free breakfast either. We are now beginning to move forward and mobilize for the very important work that we have ahead of us.

We're going to be breaking into smaller groups right now for a series of leadership development workshops. USGLC staff is positioned at the ballroom doors to direct participants to these sessions, which will begin promptly at 9:15, so just in a few minutes. I hope all of you will proceed directly to your next session so they can get started on time.

Following these leadership sessions, everyone will be heading to the US Institute of Peace, so make sure you take all of your belongings with you as you leave the ballroom. Thank you for being here this morning, thank you for what you're doing for this great cause. We have a lot of work ahead of us, but as you can tell from the fine leaders you heard from this morning, certainly we're on the right side and there's a lot that's taking place. It's very very positive. Thanks again everyone and have a great day.