

U.S. Global Leadership Coalition

**2011 Washington Conference
Investing In The Future:
A Smart Power Approach To Global Leadership**

Impact 2012: Building A Better, Safer World

**Introduction:
John Thomas,
General Manager,
SAIC**

**Speakers:
Tom Daschle,
USGLC Advisory Council**

**Tom Ridge,
Co-Chair,
Impact 2012**

**Norman J. Ornstein
Board Of Directors,
USGLC**

**Liz Schrayner,
Executive Director,
USGLC**

Date: Tuesday, July 12, 2011

MAJOR GENERAL JOHN THOMAS: All right, good morning. Can I ask you please to move to your seats? This has been a pretty good morning. We want to try to keep it on that roll. So if we could move in, that would be great.

Well, good morning. My name is John Thomas, and I'm a retired Army major general and right now a general manager at Science Applications International Corporation. And SAIC is really pleased to be a part of this coalition, proud to be a sponsor of today's event. We think it is a real opportunity for some good discussion and dialogue.

For those of you who may not be aware, SAIC is a Fortune 500 scientific engineering and technology company. We use our deep domain knowledge to solve problems of vital importance to the nation and to the world, especially problems, really, that are in the purview of what we're talking about this morning.

We work in national security, energy and the environment, critical infrastructure and health. And SAIC, like many of the business members of the USGLC, we support the development and diplomacy missions of the U.S. Department of State and the U.S. Agency for International Development. And we understand the importance of the international affairs budget to America's security and to our prosperity.

Whether you live in Des Moines, Iowa, in Manchester, New Hampshire or, you know, even here in Washington, D.C., I think we even know that the 2012 presidential campaign is in full swing. And the question before us today is what and how can the USGLC community do to impact this debate and to educate the candidates and their advisors about America's global leadership? How do we use our voices to ensure that the next president – Democrat or Republican – and the next Congress embrace our call for strong and effective development and diplomacy?

One of the answers lies within USGLC's Impact 2012 presidential initiative, an exciting nationwide effort to unit business, military, faith-based and community leaders in an effort to educate and engage the candidates and their advisors about our agenda. The program this year will build on the successes of the 2007-2008 Impact '08 campaign, while taking into account the new realities of today. Let's begin with a quick look back to July 2007.

(Begin video segment.)

(Music.)

(Applause.)

MADELEINE ALBRIGHT: I'm very proud to co-chair Impact '08 with Secretary Carlucci, and to release today our statement, which is endorsed by such a distinguished bipartisan group of former Cabinet officials, including fellow secretaries of state, defense, Treasury and congressional leaders.

MR. : This is an innovative and nonpartisan effort to urge the 2008 presidential candidates to elevate international development and diplomacy as keys to America's engagement in the world.

MR. : We have brought experts into key primary and caucus states to lead conversations in public forums that have engaged the grass-top leaders in these states. We have tapped into former members of Congress and senators. We have brought former military leaders in.

MR. : What Impact '08 does is – so you have to look at all the tools, and we have to have an honest debate on the role of foreign assistance, on the role of diplomacy, on the role of defense.

MR. : We represent 52 generals and admirals, and we're saying that in order to be effective in this world, we need to integrate all capabilities that represent our national power. So I think this cause is not only good; this is absolutely necessary right now. This is a critical time. This is the time for action.

MR. : Presidential candidates in this campaign have spoken about international issues, development of diplomacy to a much greater degree than in any election we've ever seen before.

SECRETARY ROBERT GATES: We must focus our energies beyond the guns and steel of the military, beyond just our brave soldiers, sailors, Marines and airmen. We must also focus our energies on the other elements of national power that will be so crucial in the years to come.

MR. : That's why we call on candidates to take the message of Impact '08 to heart. How we engage the world in a promising but challenging 21st century should be among the highest priorities set by every candidate in the 2008 presidential campaign.

MS. : Between now and next November, we intend to make some righteous noise so that when the new president steps to the podium for the inaugural address, the only slogan that will come to mind is "Smart power: building a better, safer world."

(End video segment.)

LIZ SCHRAYER: Good morning, everyone – (applause) – and welcome to Impact 2012.

I have to say, as I look around this ballroom, I see a whole bunch of people right here who joined us also on a very hot July day 2007 as we began our journey at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce for what was our first initiative to enter this national debate of presidential politics that, as you say, was called Impact '08.

And much has certainly happened since that day in 2007. I am overwhelmed when I think of both the successes as well as, obviously, the challenges, some of which we will talk about later this afternoon.

But I think what is important about 2012 is that we have the same vision today as we did back then four years ago, which is a vision of how a strange bedfellow coalition, like all of those in the ballroom today, join us together; of how we can contribute to our tagline, “Building a better, safer world.”

And the idea was that we could strategically use our collective voices to meet with and engage with candidates and their advisors about the smart power agenda. We had, as you saw, a prestigious group of endorsers. We had a network that was made up of many people in this room – military leaders, faith-based leaders, business members, non-profits, Democrats, Republicans.

And we traveled. We traveled around the country. I went and met many of you that came in from out of town today in Iowa, in New Hampshire, in South Carolina, in Florida. We went to the states where the presidential candidates were.

And in those states we hosted surrogate panels, just like the one that will close our conference this afternoon. We met with advisors. We talked to the media. And what we found is an enormous interest by the American public, by people in this room and those that couldn’t come here today, who want to be part of the debate about why it’s important for America to lead in the world and the role that development and diplomacy plays.

At the end of the campaign we were all proud that both national candidates embraced the idea of smart power. But if we end it there, you all know our work would not have been done because the real effort was to go the next step and to translate a lot of campaign promises into real policy impact.

And what we saw is some great successes. Right as the new Congress was coming into town and the new administration was taking over, we released something called “Report on Reports: Putting Smart Power to Work.”

And the idea is that we looked at 20 different analysis reports that were done by Democrats and Republicans about how civilian forces could be used in our national security space, and there was a lot of consensus. And we released that report, saying to the administration, saying to Congress, you don’t have to start anew. Here is a starting point.

I look back on the last few years and I see many great successes: a national security strategy in 2010 that built on the last administration’s to really commit to development and diplomacy. Last year on this stage we hosted the secretary of state, as well as others, as they talked about the new presidential policy directive on global development that said that development must be a core pillar to our foreign policy.

Efforts to modernize our foreign assistance efforts, led by USAID forward, the QDDR process, efforts, though not complete, of bipartisan efforts to rewrite the Foreign Assistance Act

– all an effort to make sure that we have an effective, transparent and accountable international affairs budget. And what I'm pleased about is that there remained a bipartisan support for programs like PEPFAR, MCC, and new initiatives that this administration has led – Feed the Future – critical programs for saving lives and creating opportunities.

So what we saw, as I look back on many of the successes – many that I don't have time to talk about – is an administration that I think boldly embraced the smart power agenda and a Congress – both sides, Democrats, Republicans, House and Senate – that has a range of leaders that have really worked very hard over the years to advance our cause.

But none of us are naïve and all of us know how dramatically the world has changed since four years ago this month. 2011 is not 2007. Impact 2012 cannot be the same as Impact 2008. And if you think about it, just think about – I was thinking about the last six months, seven months, even looking at that, how many different things have happened in terms of our changing world.

What strikes me, though, is this campaign in 2012 will most certainly, as it should, be about our economy, but there will also be a vigorous debate, as there also should, about America's role in the world and America's global leadership that we heard already this morning.

At the end of the day, we still live in a world where infectious diseases to terrorism have no borders. We live in a world where our security and prosperity as Americans is linked with that of the rest of the nations and people of the world. So Impact 2012, one big change is it's not just about the presidential elections anymore. We are going to look to you to also help us on the congressional side as well.

And what we will do with Impact 2012 – and you'll hear about it more in the panel that follows – is to again call on both the presidential candidates, their advisors, and congressional candidates running for federal office, to embrace and strengthen American global leadership with the strategic investment in development and in diplomacy, investments that we all know save lives from people – save lives from preventable diseases, create opportunities especially for those living in poverty throughout the globe, help create markets for American goods and services, keep America safe, and perhaps most importantly, embody the generosity, the values of America as a nation.

But none of this we can do without all of you, and that's where Impact 2012 will really happen. What we need is your voices. We need you to join us in the debate, we need you to join us around the country – events like this but much more importantly events in Iowa, New Hampshire, Florida, Ohio and many, many other states that you all come from.

So I urge you, as our kickoff to Impact 2012, to join us in this conversation, to join us by telling your friends and your neighbors and add your voices to Impact 2012, add your voice to the debate, and add you voice, as we have said over and over again, to building a better, safer world.

Now, the good news is that your voices are already answering the call. And I share with you – (inaudible).

(Begin video segment.)

(Music.)

RUSSEL MEYER: I'm Russell Meyer, the executive director of the Florida Council of Churches.

JENNIFER BRUNNER: I'm Jennifer Brunner, former secretary of state of Ohio.

KRISTIN HEDGER: I'm Kristin Hedger, vice president of Killdeer Mountain Manufacturing in Western North Dakota.

LORALEE CLINTON (sp): I'm Lorelee Clinton from Georgia.

ROGER CRANVILLE: I'm Roger Cranville, president of GlobalPittsburgh.

JOHN "BUDDY" DYER: Hi, I'm Buddy Dyer, mayor of Orlando.

ADAM HANDLER (sp): I'm Adam Handler from Atlanta, Georgia.

MAJOR GENERAL MICHAEL HAUGEN: I'm Major General Mike Haugen, retired, from North Dakota.

CHARLES "BUD" FERILLO: I'm Bud Ferillo, director of the Initiative for South Carolina's Future.

ANNE O'CALLAGHAN: I'm Anne O'Callaghan, executive director of the Welcoming Center for New Pennsylvanians.

COLONEL FRANT TITUS: I'm Frank Titus, colonel in the United States Air Force, retired.

JASON RIVERA: Hi, my name is Jason Rivera, Ohio state director at the League of United Latin American Citizens.

MR. MEYER: I believe in continuing America's tradition of moral leadership through diplomacy and development.

MR. HANDLER: Just 1 percent of our budget goes to funding diplomacy and development. Just 1 percent is a small price to pay to keep America safe and to create jobs here at home.

MS. : American businesses are depending on us to open new markets abroad in order to create jobs here at home.

COL. TITUS: Investing in diplomacy and development increases jobs here in Ohio and contributes to our national security.

GEN. HAUGEN: I want to make a better, safer world.

MR. : Through investment in our international affairs budget.

MS. O'CALLAGHAN: By deterring security threats, responding to humanitarian crises around the world, and creating new markets and jobs in the United States.

MS. : Just 1 percent of our budget is a small price to pay to keep America safe and create jobs here at home.

MR. : Investing in U.S. global leadership isn't just the right thing to do, it's the smart thing to do.

CARINA BLACK: I'm Carina Black, executive director of the Northern Nevada International Center, and I am Impact 2012.

MS. : I support Impact 2012.

MS. : I am Impact 2012.

MR. : I am Impact 2012.

MR. : I am Impact 2012.

MS. : I am Impact 2012.

MR. : I am Impact 2012.

MR. : I'm ready to go for Impact 2012.

MR. : I am Impact 2012.

(End video segment.)

(Applause.)

GEN. THOMAS: It's now my great pleasure to turn the program over to our Impact 2012 leadership.

First, our moderator for this morning is one of Washington's most astute political observers of Congress and politics – Norm Ornstein, resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute and a member of the board of directors of the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition.

Leading our charge are two extraordinary men who have dedicated their lives to public service and are among the most well-respected foreign policy voices in our country. They are longtime friends, supporters and advisors to USGLC, and we are honored to have them here to help kickoff the Impact 2012 campaign.

Please welcome Senator Tom Daschle, a member of the USGLC advisory council, and Governor Tom Ridge, a member of the advisory council and national co-chairman of Impact 2012 along with Secretary Madeleine Albright, and our moderator, Mr. Norm Ornstein. (Applause.)

TOM DASCHLE: Thank you, John, for that very generous introduction. Let me say how pleased I am to be here along with Tom Ridge and Norm Ornstein as part of the U.S. Leadership Coalition Presidential Initiative 2012.

I was proud to be part of Impact '08, a successful effort to get all major candidates for president from both parties, regardless of policy or ideological differences, to go on record in support of elevating diplomacy and development alongside defense as indispensable elements to a smart power approach to foreign policy.

It actually seems like just yesterday that we were doing Impact '08, and yet here we are again at the beginning of another campaign season. Unfortunately, threats to our security and prosperity remain. They are no less daunting and complicated than they were four years ago. It would be all too easy in today's political climate to walk away from the issue, and that is why I'm committed to be a part of Impact 2012.

American leadership must continue to come to grips with reality and understand that international engagement is not a privilege but a responsibility to our country to keep us safe, secure and prosperous.

So, as we launch this effort today, we are again calling on all of the 2012 presidential candidates, Democratic and Republican, to commit to the strategic use of U.S. leadership. We will call on them to sustain effective support for development and diplomacy alongside defense to ensure a more prosperous and a more secure America.

Then, as now, the U.S. Leadership Coalition represents an unprecedented, diverse network of over 400 businesses, humanitarian, faith-based, community and other organizations, from CARE to Caterpillar, from Boeing to Bread for the World.

We just heard from the secretary of state and from other respected military officials why these investments are vital to our national security. And it's hard to find many issues that can bring together supporters from across the political spectrum, but Tom Ridge and I are proof that the issue is one that unites rather than divides.

One doesn't need to look far to figure out why this issue is so universally supported. Keeping America safe and competitive is a value shared by us all. Investments in development and diplomacy programs provide a necessary dimension to our national security. These are tough economic and fiscal times, and they're placing scrutiny and pressure on all parts of the federal budget today, especially those programs dealing with diplomacy and foreign assistance.

And while these traditionally have been most politically expedient places to look for savings, we know today also how short-sighted. These investments help keep America competitive in the global marketplace, which in turn creates new markets and generates jobs here at home.

American good will and innovation and investment are still needed to address many of the world's most pressing problems. Ten million children die every year of preventable disease before their fifth birthday. Seventy-seven million children around the world are not in school this morning. More than 1 billion are without clean water. And over 2 billion people have no basic sanitation.

For decades, these programs have saved lives; cured disease; promoted political freedom, effective governance; and grown local economies. These efforts have demonstrated the decency and generosity of America to other people and other nations, enhancing our credibility and our influence all around the world.

I've traveled through many of these countries and seen our efforts at work. These programs help in a myriad of ways. Ensuring adequate supplies of food or safe water can reduce the risk of political instability, like the riots in several countries that followed a spike in global food prices just a few years ago.

Fostering conditions that increase economic growth and improve standards of living in developing nations creates new potential customers for American products, and future investors in our country.

And prompt and effective responses to national disasters such as the Southeast Asian tsunami and the Haitian and Japanese earthquakes strengthen existing alliances and build new partnerships and enhance American leadership and influence all around the world as well. This is why I'm part of Impact 2012.

Now I will turn to my friend, Tom Ridge, to discuss why he is a part of this effort too. Thank you.

(Applause.)

TOM RIDGE: Thank you, Tom. Well, thank you, Tom.

First of all, let me publicly acknowledge what a great personal privilege it is for me to be with these two gentlemen on the dais. Norm, as all of you know – at least those of you in the

Washington community – is a great thought leader and a provocateur in the best sense, challenging the political establishment to think boldly and creatively about solving some really big problems. And that’s his reputation. I’m honored to be in his company today as well.

And my friend Senator Daschle – obviously a fabulous record of public service. We were talking briefly beforehand, and the work he’s now doing with the Bipartisan Coalition, dealing with questions of budget deficit and energy, so it’s no surprise that he’s here in support of smart power in 2012 and this initiative. So it’s a great pleasure with both of these gentlemen.

I also want to thank each and every one of you. To a certain extent, I was thinking as I sat there, I’m probably preaching to the choir. So instead of a collection, I guess we’re just going to ask you to get your megaphones out, and when you have an opportunity to influence the political process along the way, your voices need to be heard.

It’s not just the presidential candidates that need to hear your voices, but frankly there’s some folks in the House and the Senate dealing with issues – budget and next year’s budget – we probably need to hear your voices as well. So, I thank you for taking the time and leaving whatever you do on a day-to-day basis to join us this morning.

I think Tom said it best. Unity around this issue is critically important. And this is a town where there seems to be, every single day, a greater and greater partisan divide. And, look, the whole democratic process is built on the notion that people can express ideas to hopefully build a successful coalition and come up with the right answer and get the requisite support.

So unity doesn’t necessarily mean unanimity. We can have differences of opinion, but at the end of the day we need to come together for a common good. And I can’t think of a more important initiative than the one we’re talking about today as America begins to take on the challenges of the interdependent and interconnected world in the 21st century.

What I think is important, that all of us Republicans and Democrats and independents share the conviction that despite the economic challenges facing our country today, America’s leadership and engagement abroad is necessary for us to be secure and prosperous and free here at home. We know that in conflict zones, long after the soldiers are gone, our diplomats and development professionals will have to sustain some very hard-fought gains, but they can’t do it without proper resources.

So we have to make strategic investments in our future because our military is but one option available to influence geopolitical events and to bring about a better, safer world. It’s an important option but we cannot rely on it exclusively. And, frankly, we’ve got ways to support and, frankly, build on the success of our military in different parts of the world.

And sometimes, as we all know, those of us who are privileged to be associated with U.S. Global Leadership, sometimes development and diplomacy at the front end might avoid the conflict and the need for the military down the road. It’s no less – it is no less true than it was four years ago that the global threats we face require an approach to national security that uses all the tools of America’s national power: defense, diplomacy and development.

And while debate continues over the proper military strategy and troop levels in Afghanistan, I think there's a little disagreement on one point: Our success in that country will depend ultimately on the ability of the Afghans to govern and provide for themselves, and only a fraction of the cost of large-scale military deployments, I think we need to consider those as critical investments in our national security as well.

Some of you probably remember "Charlie Wilson's War." I think Tom and I served with Charlie Wilson way back when. There is a poignancy in that movie – and I'm not talking about the bathtub. (Laughter.) It's at the end – it's at the end – remember this? I think it's the most important and powerful scene in the entire movie.

At the end he's before the intelligence community. And, you know, there's that scene where the Russian tanks are rolling out of the bridge and they're leaving Afghanistan, and he's sitting before the Intelligence Committee and they've committed hundreds of millions – billions of dollars to the mujahedeen to get rid of the Russians.

And he says, all right, now the next phase is we need some money to build schools and roads, et cetera. And I think the script, the line is, who do you think you are, the congressman from Kabul? Interesting thought.

You don't know what might have happened if, after the extraordinary use of America's economic wealth, our ability to fund the opposition, fund the mujahedeen, what happens if we go in and fill the social void, the civil void, to start building the roads, building the schools, micro enterprises? What happens then? Maybe the Taliban overwhelms even our best efforts. But I guess we'll never know because we didn't try. And at the end of the day, shame on us for not trying.

Now, we all know – we all know, and particularly in this political climate, that there is a view that when you talk about development assistance and foreign aid – I mean, I heard it when I served in Congress 20, 30 years ago: Well, we have so many problems here at home; how can we spend hundreds of millions of dollars over there when we have so many problems here at home?

Well, if you want a safer, secure world, a more prosperous world, you're going to spend those dollars because it's in America's best interest to do so. And the dollar amount pales in comparison to what we have expended when we've failed to recognize the opportunity to effect social and civic change and ended up, unfortunately, from time to time, sending our military to deal with deteriorating conditions that led to conflict.

I mean, when you think about it, next to executive compensation in the public domain these days, foreign aid probably comes in a close second as to being anathema to the political figures, and yet it is a strategic and necessary investment. It's far less expensive than sending our greatest treasure, and that's the men and women of our military.

I often think back – and some of you heard me say this before but please indulge me. I spent some time in another part of the world in the '60s in Vietnam as an infantry soldier, and I remember from time to time just kind of moving around out in the middle of nowhere and watching these people trying to eke out an existence at the same time we were trying to fight a war around them.

But the bottom line is, is that – you know, I've often wondered if simultaneously while we were there we also didn't start trying to build up their infrastructure. There are people eking out an existence – eking out an existence day to day, dealing with the necessary – finding food, health care.

What happens, perhaps not in that venue but elsewhere, if we'd make those investments – investments in our future and theirs? Today those memories make me look back and think of America's leadership and our engagement with the rest of the world in the 21st century. It's far more important than ever before.

No matter what your view of our recent wars, after so much American blood and treasure has been expended, after so much loss and heartbreak, we certainly have to know by now, and we have to get it by now, that it would be a travesty to shortchange that work by not investing in the political and economic development required to help these countries develop a stable future. In many parts of the world it is a necessary add on. In other parts of the world it ought to be the initial investment that we make.

And perhaps we don't need the military add on after that. As Tom pointed out, we have to understand if you bring clean water, sanitation systems, vaccinations, schools and technology – if you reach out to address human needs, you will certainly, in parts of the world, make the ideology of extremism far less attractive to those bent on the subversion and perversion of lands and people because what happens after the war is just as, if not more, important than what happens during it.

But this isn't just a matter of national security. It's also in our economic interest to do so, and that's all right to make investments in our interest as well. A solid strategy of U.S. global engagement spurs economic growth, it expands markets and creates American jobs. It's easy to say we have our own problems, but now more than ever our security and prosperity is tied to the security and prosperity of the rest of the world.

You know, from time to time during the course of the political debate, I hear some folks say, well, we've got to be protectionists. We just don't want to engage the rest of the world economically. We have to have it made in America.

And I say to the economic protectionists, wake up, 21st century. If you really believe that, then I think you ought to – I think you ought to divest yourself of everything that's been made elsewhere. And I've concluded you probably will be homeless, you'll probably be without a car, and god only knows what you'll be wearing. (Laughter.)

The fact of the matter is, we are interconnected, interdependent. The economy is global and it is in our interest to be engaged that way. And I also say to the political isolationists, either America leaves or it doesn't. From my point of view, America must maintain its leadership position, and those who would draw inward are asking us to take a very perilous path to become a second-rate country, to minimizing our interest on geopolitical events.

So, either way, whether you're a political isolationist or a protectionist, in the 21st century you've failed to recognize that our security and prosperity today, now and forever will be tied to our connectivity with the rest of the world and the security and prosperity of the rest of the world.

The more we are engaged with other countries, the better our economic conditions can be here at home. That's why I join with Senator Daschle and Secretary Albright and U.S. Global Leadership Coalition and its partners in urging robust and sustainable support for the full range of diplomatic and developmental programs in the international affairs budget. It's not a big number but it makes a big, big difference.

And I know you were probably convinced of this mindset and had this mindset before you came in, but let me give you one more idea that maybe we pass it on to our legislators and those who disagree with this approach.

If we want America to maintain its ability to lead in the broader global community, to influence events in a way that's in our self-interest but also in the interests of the rest of the world, we have to understand that America has a brand. If America is a product, our value system is our brand.

And part of that value system is the world understands, I think almost implicitly, the natural humanitarian and compassionate impulse and empathy that America normally has for people with problems around the world. Whether it's a tsunami, an earthquake; whenever natural disaster strikes, we're there. People understand that.

Oh, the benefits are intangible but I think they're very, very important. So the other, I think, justification for making sure that we continue to support, at a very robust level – as I said, it's a small number but a big difference – is where we are to promote our – it's our brand. It's our nature.

To a certain extent it's our mission and our duty, but it's also in our best interest to promote that value system that says that we care, that a rising tide lifts all boats, and if we can help you eradicate disease, improve your health care, better your schools, it's not only good for you, your region, but it's better for the broader global community. And if we want to lead around the world, that's the position we have to take.

So I'm very proud to be part of this leadership coalition, and thank you for leaving whatever you do today to come in. I'm going to encourage you to get the megaphone, the microphone, the pen out, the letters, the phone calls. You've got a lot of work to do up on the Hill. So your job is to go to work.

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

NORMAN ORNSTEIN: Thank you both. It's really my honor to be on the stage with two people who have been models of public service and problem solving for the country for a long time. And you both made the case that America's leadership in the world is neither partisan nor ideological, and it's in our national interest.

Let me start by reflecting a little bit on the past and talking about today. I've been reading a lot about 1946 and 1948. The famous 80th Congress was Truman's landmark campaign against the "Do Nothing Congress." Part of the irony here is it was actually quite a productive Congress when it comes to the issues we're talking about.

That was the Congress that gave us the Marshall Plan. It was the Congress that gave us the Department of Defense that brought the military services together and reformed it, and the National Security Council. So, back then at least, in an atmosphere of contention and partisanship, politics did stop at the water's edge, a quite remarkable set of decisions. I think Senator Clinton talked today about the Marshall Plan.

Today seems to be different. We're seeing these partisan divisions bleed over into America's involvement in the world and foreign policy itself. Talk a bit about why it's so important to move beyond that and ways in which we can use Impact 2012 to try and create the sense again that it's in America's national interest to find a common set of values here.

MR. DASCHLE: Norm, I thought Tom said it so well, that this is really in our national interest from a security point of view in a profound way. Not only do we have the examples of Iraq and Afghanistan to point to as examples of what happens when diplomacy and development really fail, I think we can go even beyond that to the realization, as he so eloquently noted, of the not only interdependence but the integration of our world community today.

We are far more integrated as a result of telecommunication and the result of modern change. That interdependence is now a very relevant part of our lives. His question about what would we wear, in what kind of a home would we live and what kind of a car would we drive if we were not so interdependent or if we had to give up what interdependence means to us today is a very relevant question. So we are all very tangibly and palpably affected by this interdependence.

Tom Friedman once wrote a line that I've never forgotten. You probably remember it as well. "If you don't visit a bad neighborhood, a bad neighborhood will visit you." And those bad neighborhoods have a tendency to take American lives in a very profound way, as we've seen with all the way from 9/11 to a lot of the other conflicts we face.

So I think that's the real message here, is that in profound ways we are all very, very directly affected by this and we've got to – I think we've got to show more leadership in making that connection a more palpable and real part to the American voter and the American family.

MR. ORNSTEIN: Governor Ridge, let me ask you more specifically – if we can go back to the 2010 campaign, it was striking how even – well, in most campaigns there isn't much focus on foreign policy. It was virtually absent except for a little China bashing here and there.

You now have this tea party movement coming forward that includes a lot of members of Congress who have never thought about America's role in the world, who are now so intensely focused on cutting back on the role of government. How do you reach this group of people and get this message across that their concerns are not going to be fully met unless we address America's global engagement?

Next question. (Laughter.)

MR. RIDGE: It's a very – I was just thinking I'd like to tell John Boehner before I told you. It would help him out a lot.

You know, at some point in time – look, they brought a set of beliefs about American exceptionalism – I mean, they believe strongly in America. They believe we're unique. They believe we've got to get our budget under control.

Let's set aside for a moment maybe some of the shrillness of the rhetoric, but I think they really believe in America's – in its future. They haven't quite connected – and it's people – it's organizations like this and people like me and other people just to remind them that it didn't happen by accident.

America has not ascended – even in the bipolar world when we were facing off with the Soviet Union – had never ascended to the position of influence without us reaching out – not only sending troops to faraway places of World War I and II and the first Gulf War and Vietnam, but also following on, or even beforehand, taking part of our treasure, part of our wealth, and distributing it and making investments in the lives of, you know, families in countries in faraway places.

And I just often wonder, that sense of history that I think should be profoundly embedded in that notion of American exceptionalism, they must – they haven't read a couple of chapters. And those chapters, if they looked at them closely, they would have to conclude that the reason we are here, the reason we're able to influence events, the reason we're able, at least until recently, to lead rather than be led, is because we did project ourselves not just with the military but with diplomacy and with developmental assistance.

I know this is not, again, right on point, but I've often wondered, Norm, right after our government and our diplomatic corps managed to get the Syrians out of Southern Lebanon, and that whole situation was percolated, right, and we had a democratically elected government. It's a fragile democracy. We've got the exodus of the foreign troops. And now we have an opportunity to help build a stable government.

I think we may have sent to that country 40 (million dollars) or \$50 million over a period of a couple years. Who filled the vacuum, particularly in Southern Lebanon? Iran. And how

did they fill the vacuum and create a problem not only for us but with our ally Israel, is they built roads and schools, nurtured micro enterprises.

And so, I guess we've just got to try to convince these folks who believe as strongly as they do in America's unique role in the world it didn't happen by accident, not just because we're America's but we do things differently than everybody else.

And we might remind them of what China is doing these days. We're not talking about – we know it's a different kind of government but they're making major investments all around the world. And at the end of the day, why do they do it? It inures to their benefit.

There's nothing wrong for sovereigns to act in what's their benefit, but it's certainly in our long-term benefit to remind these folks, both sides of the aisle, the reason we're unique – read those two chapters, those chapters of history, to explain why we've achieved this level of recognition and respect around the world.

MR. ORNSTEIN: Senator Daschle, let me turn to the Democratic Party a little bit. Both parties, we know, now have some significant divisions over – you know, I'll use the catchphrase “isolationism” or “internationalism.” We now have the additional overlay of this excruciatingly difficult budget environment where every area of spending is going to be under intense pressure, but the discretionary budget especially.

And we're into what will be a vicious zero-sum game. One of the chilling moments for me came a few weeks ago when a, well, now former Democratic congressman who left for reasons I can't exactly remember, Anthony Weiner – (laughter) – joined with Republican colleague Jason Chaffetz to try to not just defund the U.S. Institute for Peace but take away its charter.

How serious do you see it as a problem having Democrats whose priorities may vaguely include funding foreign aid or making sure America is involved in the world, but when push comes to shove, are going to throw that over the side for other priorities, and what do we do about it?

MR. DASCHLE: I think foreign aid and development assistance will remain an easy political target, and especially so when the economy is as soft and as fragile as this one is. It's easy – we can all get people to their feet by talking about the need to spend in the Midwest and not in the Middle East, and do all the kinds of political rhetorical tricks we've got to gin up an audience. And it's great politics but it's terrible governance.

And I think the other part, I think, of the story that is becoming clearer is that because of this interdependence, it's no longer an easy thing for us to talk about economic growth in the context of our own domestic economy. If we're going to grow our economy we've got to look at where the markets are, and 95 percent of the export market is found today in the developing countries – 95 percent. One out of every seven jobs in America is produced as a result of an export.

So, if we're really serious about finding ways to build this economy, to grow jobs, to find ways to address the malaise we've got economically today, I can't think of a better way to do that than to build those markets all over the world in Africa and South Asia and the BRIC nations and trading with them.

I mean, that to me is the solution in part – there's no silver bullet, but I think it's even more so now than ever before, and that realization – if you really want to grow the economy you've got to have an export component to do that – has to be part of the message.

MR. ORNSTEIN: Now let's talk a little bit about some of the Republican presidential candidates and the dynamic, Governor Ridge.

We know that we've got a lot of different viewpoints out there. Some heartening things from our perspective: We've had people like Tim Pawlenty speak out about needing a forceful American role in the world. We've had similar comments from Governor Romney. Ambassador Huntsman certainly has a sophisticated understanding of the world.

But you've also got libertarians like Ron Paul, who basically want to pull out of virtually everything in every place. And you've got other candidates who Senator McCain said he was worried about in terms of the strong strain of isolationism.

How can Impact 2012 reach these candidates and get this message across, including that very important message that Tom Daschle talked about, about what this means for jobs at home?

MR. RIDGE: You know, it's interesting; the three individuals that you mentioned on our side of the aisle all spent some time as governor. And I think, referring back to my experience as governor, you know by virtue of experience how much opportunity and wealth and how many jobs are created in your own individual states.

I daresay I bet all three of them led trade missions overseas. I bet all of them, when push to shove, will have the statistics at their disposal to tell you how important it was to tie their companies, small, medium and large, to that broader global market.

And as Tom pointed out, the emerging markets are great opportunities for us to build some economic success, but also these are the ones that could – whose – our relationship would be substantially enhanced if we were also helping them with vaccinations and sanitary systems and water quality, water treatment centers and the like. So they go really hand in hand.

So I think at the end of the day, and you said it in your opening remarks, not only did – I mean, people didn't pay too much about it in 2010. People certainly aren't paying too much about it in 2012. And we'll get – I mean, this part of this effort – we will get to these candidates. We'll sit down with our staff like we did before.

They'll understand our position. And I think there's a degree of sophistication with these men and women, most of them, to accept the – and to acknowledge the importance of diplomacy

and developmental assistance. It's whether or not they elevate it during the course of the campaign as something they run on. I doubt if we're going to see that.

I think we would feel – we'll do everything we can to try to get them to talk about that, but at the end of the day, folks, there aren't enough people in America – 300 million strong – who understand and appreciate that our president has the potential and this country has the potential and has the need and the responsibility, and I would say the obligation, to reach out and to engage the rest of the world.

But we don't elect – unfortunately we don't elect too many people of that mindset, that role. You're the leader of the free world but you also can influence the non-free world. But I do think it's not coincidence that the three names you mentioned happen to be governors who probably led great missions and appreciate very much the economic impact of this kind of developmental assistance long term.

MR. ORNSTEIN: Both of you are veterans of the campaign world, and one of the challenges we face is the media climate in a presidential campaign focuses first on the horserace and second on conflicts. How do we get past the campaign noise to try and make it clear that this is a vital interest, not just in terms of what the candidates say but to voters out there that – and it's not just the economy in the narrowest sense that matters but in this broader global sense, cutting through the noise.

MR. RIDGE: Well, I think there's – I mean, I'll be happy to take a shot at that first. I'm not being facetious when I say to this audience, you've got some work. I mean, you've got the Leadership Coalition and we're going to do our work. You've been kind of deputized. Organizations to which you belong, senators and congressmen that represent you, but I also think there's a role to be had by the broader business community, whose future depends on growing markets overseas.

I think there's a role to play for religious organizations because many of them have vested their own resources in troubled and challenging places around the world. So I think those of us who feel very strongly about the need for America to sustain its position of leadership and outreach and support have to assist the Leadership Coalition in adding you voices to ours.

MR. DASCHLE: Well, I think the American voter has sort of split personality. He likes – he or she likes competition but they also like to be inspired.

I think back in the 20th century – I guess all of us have talked a little bit about the history of our country and why it's unique in so many ways, but when we weighed in with World War I, we won. We had to weigh in in a very collective way to get through the Great Depression and we won that. We ended up winning World War II after an incredibly titanic fight. We won the Cold War.

We won a lot in the 20th century, and I think Americans look back with great pride. Why did we win? We won in part because of American resiliency. We won in part because of American innovation. But we also won because of American leadership.

At those occasions when things were at their worst, we rose to the occasion and showed the kind of leadership throughout all of those periods that made the difference. But we have a tectonic shift going on right now in the 21st century and you can't apply, necessarily, the lessons as we learned them in the 20th and just say they fit exactly as we go forward.

But those same qualities still apply. We've got to show resiliency. We've got to show innovation. And we probably need leadership as much now as we've ever needed it in all of American history. And I think the American people want to be inspired by leadership when they see it, and they also are inspired by the competition once again.

But the competition is no longer necessarily a war. I think the competition is China and all the other major new players out there who would love nothing more than to take international leadership away from the United States.

So we've got a competitive and a leadership motivation here that I think is every bit as big and bold as it's ever been in all of our history.

MR. RIDGE: I'd like to add just quickly to what Tom said. That's a beautiful – that's actually a beautiful summation of what we're all about today.

If nothing else, if we can get presidential candidates, even during the course of the primaries – well, you're not going to have one but we will – but in the general campaign, to your point, it is executive leadership, not necessarily talking about smart power per se, but just reminding America that our future prosperity and our future security, and interdependent, interconnected, and, as you pointed out, integrated world, depends on being more connected in more ways than not.

If we would accept that as a premise for both domestic and foreign policy, it would be a lot easier for us to find the political support and the will to generate the modest resources to continue the effort to build these relationships.

MR. ORNSTEIN: I have a couple more questions that we can do before we wrap. One is – and I'm going to pull a couple of things together – a part of global leadership and engagement is dealing with global health. And we've had global health crises and we've seen impressive bipartisan support through the Bush administration and forward in dealing with AIDS and dealing with some of these problems of global health.

Another, in which Dan Glickman has been particularly eloquent, and you too, Tom Daschle, is on food security and global hunger. At a moment when America is becoming more introspective, and especially if we find a debt crisis that sends us into even more of a tailspin, how can we make the case that it is in our interest in every sense to combat some of the global health crises and make sure that we deal with hunger not just at home but abroad?

MR. DASCHLE: Well, first of all, I would echo what you just said about Dan Glickman. No one has been more forthright and shown more leadership in the area, and I salute him and thank him for all that he's done.

I guess it goes back to some of the things, Norm, we've been talking about this morning already, that it's so much in our interest – you know, we're going to have 9 billion people in the world by 2050 – 9 billion. And whether or not we can feed them, whether or not all the stability or instability that comes from that realization can be – can be confronted is really up to us.

We've got a little lead time, but when you think about the fact that today 30 percent of all of the food produced in developing countries rots in the field simply because it can't get to the marketplace ought to tell us something about the infrastructure required.

So you want to produce American jobs? Let's have them produce American infrastructure in those countries, just as China is doing all over Africa today. If you want to really help in the most compassionate yet economically sound way to assist in development of these countries, let's develop food programs with a greater emphasis on education, and make sure that drought-resistant crops are more nutritious, and nutritious crops are more drought-resistant.

We've got to do both, but we can do that, we have the capacity, if we commit the kind of leadership required. You know, even if we doubled what we do today, we'd be going from 1 to 2 percent of the whole budget. We can afford this. We've got to do it. It's in our future as much if not more than it is in theirs.

MR. ORNSTEIN: Just the last question that I'll direct to you, Tom Ridge. You mentioned Lebanon and Syria, and of course Syria has been very much in the news in the last couple of days with the attack on our embassy, and Senator Clinton speaking out forthrightly about that. The "Arab spring" is an area that is forcing us, in some ways, to pay attention to that critical part of the region. Many important things happening.

How do we make the case now that we need to play a role there, not only to enable freedom to move forward but basically to make sure that we have both economic development and democracy emerging in the right way in the region?

MR. RIDGE: Norm, whether we're looking at North Africa, the Middle East or these emerging countries, I kind of go back to, obviously, an experience I had, profoundly impacting my view of what the world needs to do. At that time I was a soldier.

But we have a tendency in this country – and I'm going to use the word "preach" about democracy. And we've embraced it. We're still not perfect but it seems to work, in spite of all its imperfections (sic), for us, and we'd like to see the rest of the world embrace this form of self-government. And we must be that beacon. We must be the shining light on the hill. That is who we are as America.

But the one thing we need to understand, if you're struggling to put food on the table and if your belly is empty, and if your children are afflicted with childhood diseases, and your water is unsafe to drink, and there's no opportunity for education and advancement, the notion of building a stable civil society where somewhere down the road that stability forms itself into self-government is absolutely lost because, frankly, when you're struggling to survive and for existence, those are dreams that you'll never realize if you don't live a full and complete life.

So, I think that the challenge – again, in North Africa, along the way there's going to be difficult policy decisions that the president and Secretary Clinton are going to have to make, obviously with one exception: We haven't had any military involvement, but clearly down the road there may be some opportunities for us to influence events, and that's where this whole notion of development assistance comes in.

You know, you take a look at those countries and some of them have just abject poverty and they're still – the human condition itself has not been advanced among the body politic even though the leaders have lived pretty good lives over the years.

But it's not just North Africa and that region. It's the rest of the world. An empty stomach, a sick child, just horrible living conditions; if we help address those, then that whole notion of talking about America and self-government, and the value system that I talked about and Senator Daschle talked about, then it begins to make sense.

But you've got to help people survive some very difficult and challenging circumstances, and that's where it's in our long-term best interest to help them not only survive but to flourish. Then our appeal to them, I think, has more attraction.

MR. ORNSTEIN: Well, we know that Governor Perry is considering entering the race. It's clearly not too late for other governors to consider it as well. (Laughter.)

But thank you both for your leadership. And I think Impact 2012 has some challenges ahead, but with the two of you involved, we're in much better shape. And thank you both.

MR. RIDGE: Thanks, Norm. (Applause.)

GEN. THOMAS: And I'd like to add all of our thanks, Mr. Secretary, Senator Daschle, Norm Ornstein, for a great time, some really good comments, I think some really kind of useful pieces of information that we can all use to support this effort. Very well done. Thank you. Thank you very much.

I'd ask all the participants to remain in here. We're now going to get to hear what the media thinks about this. Maybe we can ask some of the questions to the media, why they don't get down to issue number three.

And Chuck Todd will be us shortly and lunch will be served shortly, so please stay in your seats. And thank you, gentlemen. (Applause.)

(END)