

U.S. Global Leadership Coalition

**Welcome Breakfast and
Breaking Through on Capitol Hill: Insiders' Perspectives**

Welcome:

**Liz Schroyer,
Executive Director, U.S. Global Leadership Coalition**

Featured Speaker:

**Rye Barcott,
Former Captain, U.S. Marine Corps;
Co-Founder, Carolina for Kibera;
Author of "It Happened on the Way to War"**

Presiding:

**Nancy Ziuzin Schlegel,
Treasurer, U.S. Global Leadership Coalition;
Director, Global Security Policy, Lockheed Martin Corporation**

Panelists:

**Former House Representative Mark Green (R-WI);
Former Senator Mel Martinez (R-FL);
Former Senator Gordon Smith (R-OR)**

Moderator:

**Dan Glickman,
Chair, U.S. Global Leadership Coalition;
Senior Fellow, Bipartisan Policy Center**

Location:

**Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center,
Washington, D.C.**

Time: 9:00 a.m. EDT

Date: Tuesday, July 17, 2012

LIZ SCHRAYER: Good morning, everyone.

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (Inaudible.)

MS. SCHRAYER: All right, that was way too quiet for a Washington office – audience. Good morning.

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Good morning.

MS. SCHRAYER: There we go. I'm Liz Schrayer, and I think I've gotten a chance to meet a lot of you but not everybody. I'm the executive director of the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition. And it is just a delight to welcome you here this morning. We have a very exciting day. You have come to Washington at a very unique time. And I just wanted to add a few thoughts and put today's meeting and tomorrow's day on Capitol Hill in perspective.

I want to acknowledge – I think most of you have met, but our phenomenal field team that – I'm not sure they're in this room, but if they are – I see Brendan (sp); there he is. Are – is the rest of the field team – they're probably outside. There's Megan (sp). But they're – the field team – the reason I want to acknowledge is because this morning was really created for our activists, our leaders, our supporters from around the country. And as the day goes on, you will see the Washington, D.C., crowd join us throughout the meetings.

When I say that you've joined us at a unique time, it's not surprising to any of you that the challenges here in Washington are quite extraordinary. I've been in Washington for over 30 years, and I have to say that in all of that time, I have found this one of the more difficult times to try to work and get compromises and bring people together in a common vision. And what strikes me at a time when there's such partisanship, there's such extreme interest in being on the opposite side of someone else, we come together around an issue that actually has strong bipartisan support. And I think you'll hear that reiterated throughout the course of the next two days.

I think there's two reasons for that. There's probably others, but two in particular. One is because I, like all of you, believe passionately in the policy and what we are trying to achieve. But frankly a lot of it has to do with you. For those of you who have come from Tennessee and New Hampshire and Pennsylvania and North Dakota and many, many other states, I cannot tell you how many times I've gone to Capitol Hill without constituents and with constituents, and the difference at that second meeting when you come.

I do a lot of training for people who come to Washington and go on Capitol Hill. And I still remember, early on in my career there was a young woman who came to a conference who drove from the Midwest. She was quite pregnant and wasn't allowed to get on the plane, but she was committed to going to Washington to speak to her members of Congress. And in the morning she was so nervous because she had never done this before. And when we met at lunch, I asked her how it went. And she said, I was so nervous, but as soon as I said I was a constituent, the whole meeting changed. And everybody sat up, and they started to listen in a different way. And you all know that as well as I do.

So we are coming here at a – at a time, as I said, where the atmosphere – and you'll hear it from our speakers today – is very, very difficult. But what I will tell you is that they will be

interested in what you have to say; that you have taken time out of your life, your business, your family to come and talk about the importance of the international affairs budget.

We recognize the very, very difficult economic times – times that we are in. And one of our biggest messages – and we'll talk about it before we go to Capitol Hill tomorrow, but – is that our concern is the disproportionate cuts that have been proposed around the issues of development and diplomacy. About a year and a half ago, proposals began to form on Capitol Hill that were calling for almost a 30 percent cut in these programs – quite drastic compared to other issues. And because of all of you, we've really changed that tide to help people understand the importance of it.

We started as a coalition in the mid-'90s, at a time, if you think back on your – I know a few of you are studying political science and your history – post-Cold War and pre-9/11. And it was a time in this country that Americans weren't sure what our role was in the world. And it was a time where members of Congress literally went to the House floor and bragged that they didn't own a passport, as if that was a badge of honor to go back to your constituents. And we formed together because many of us believed that morally, as a country, we needed to be engaged in the world and help those – especially those suffering from extreme poverty.

Over the years we learned that it wasn't just the right thing to do, but engaging in the world and America's leadership is also the smart thing to do. I remember the days, as all of you do, in the post-9/11 era, where we all wondered and questioned how we engage in a new version, a new framework of national security. And throughout that, one of the things that the 9/11 commission said is it said that we need a range of tools to be engaged and to be safe. And much of those tools are the ones that we're advocating today, the development and diplomacy that goes along with our defense programs.

In the last year and a half, two years, as the economic framework in this country has become so concerning to us all, we recognized, as many of you – and the business leaders in particular – that when 95 percent of Americans' consumers live outside of the U.S., it's more important than ever that America engages, and again, that we engage in a way that helps American business, keeps us safe, keeps us secure. So I think the message is very, very powerful. And you as the messengers will be even more so.

Our state activists that most – many of you I've met around the country have really been an important voice for us. And so what we try to do with this conference – a few of you were here last year. How many of you came last year to our conference? So if you remember, when we started, we started with Secretary Hillary Clinton with about 800 people. She was – rescheduled her own time; she had to go to Betty Ford's funeral. And yet she did not cancel from us; she wanted to be there. And she actually launched her initiative on economic statecraft. And we're going to hear about that from Deputy Secretary Tom Nides today. But it was a much larger program throughout the full day.

And one of the things that we talked about when we got back to the staff afterwards is that we really didn't all get a chance to engage with our state activists. So this morning and through lunch is really devoted to you: to learn from you, to learn with you. You're going to

hear from some incredible speakers. We're going to go visit over to the State Department so you can see one of the many agencies that we advocate for. And when you come back, you're going to have an opportunity to have smaller lunch meetings with heads of the key agencies that are part of the international affairs budget. These are very dear friends of the USGLC who will share and want to hear and listen about how we can engage with you. So it's a unique opportunity to get literally eight different agency heads or deputies to join us today.

This afternoon about 2:00, we're going to move over to the amphitheater just a little bit around the corner; we'll direct you. And you're going to notice that all of a sudden the crowd got quite a bit larger. We have about 700 people coming for what we call our Impact 2012 symposium. And as many of you know, we have focused extensively on the election coming up. We're not taking a position of whether it should be a Democrat, a Republican or independent. What we care about is that they embrace the smart power foreign policy.

And so what we're going to work with you and ask you – and some of you have already done this – is that when you get back home, the most powerful thing we can do together if you take – you prioritize; you're all very, very busy. And if I were to ask one thing, it was to help – it would be to help meet with those individuals that are running for the House and the Senate – and if you can get to President Obama or Governor Romney, to do that as well – and to make sure they know, as veterans, as business leaders, as community leaders, that you care about the smart-power tools of global engagement.

The Impact 2012 symposium will have some fabulous speakers, some of whom you see on TV quite often. And we're going to close it out with addresses from Senator Kerry, representing the Democratic side and obviously a close adviser to President Obama, and Senator Norm Coleman, who serves on our advisory council and has absolutely been a fabulous friend of ours, who's working closely with Governor Romney. Some of you will join us tonight, I hope, where we'll be right across the hall but with about 900 guests for our annual tribute dinner. And I know the South Carolina and the Vermont delegations are particularly excited as we honor both of their senators.

Tomorrow is lobby day. We're going to talk more about that as we go along. But I hope you have picked up your packages on Hill visits, because as I said, that is really one of the most important things we do here in Washington, which is to meet with your senators and congressmen. And then back home we want to work with you with the candidates running for office.

So I am just giving an early welcome. I want to visit with you and hear from you and learn from you what's going on in your states. I can tell you over and over again, as sincerely as I can communicate, how critical it is that you are here and part of this conversation. You will literally see a change – and I mentioned to some of the veterans I met with last evening is I do remember last year going to meet with a senator who had – as a House member had been very difficult and actually had called for amendments to cut the foreign assistance account. And as the business leaders and I talked – very eloquent – we all gave our talking points – kind of listened.

But when the veteran talked, and then – and the business leader from back home, as opposed to Washington, talked – his whole focus of the meeting changed. And he changed in terms of his interest and excitement about this issue and wanting to understand the connection back home to his state.

So with that as a backdrop and a welcome, I am delighted to introduce one of our veterans for smart power, a member of our Virginia advisory council, who will introduce this morning's keynote speaker. So welcome, and thank you, and please welcome Rear Admiral Larry Baucom. Thank you. (Applause.)

REAR ADMIRAL LARRY C. BAUCOM (RETIRED): Thank you.

Well, thank you, Liz. It – I'm certainly excited and proud to be here representing Virginia as this retired sailor from Virginia Beach is here today. And I also very much look forward to visiting with my Virginia delegation on the Hill tomorrow. It's a very important mission that we have, and the advocacy of smart power has never been more important in our country as it is now.

And our speaker this morning really embodies the vision that Liz just laid out for us. And he's one of those unique individuals in this country that's really making a difference. Rye Barcott co-founded the nongovernmental organization Carolina for Kibera to prevent violence and empower youth through participatory development in the Kibera slum in Nairobi, Kenya. And he did that while he was an undergraduate at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. What started as a small interethnic soccer program and medical clinic run out of a 10-by-10-foot shack today has over 5,000 youth participating in its holistic youth programs, and the clinic treats more than 40,000 patients a year in collaboration with the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Rye's fundamental premise is that the poor themselves have the solutions to the problems they face. After graduation with highest honors at UNC in peace, war and defense and international studies, he served in the U.S. Marine Corps for five years in Iraq, Bosnia and the Horn of Africa. He then earned master's degrees in business and public administration from Harvard University, where he was a Reynolds Social Entrepreneurship Fellow. He has also been named as the Economic Forum Youth (sic; Young) Global Leader in 2011.

Rye Barcott was appointed to the Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board by the president in March of this year. He's a special adviser to the chairman and CEO of Duke Energy and has written the critically acclaimed "It Happened on the Way to War" book that was published by Bloomsbury. And I have it on order; I have not quite read it yet, but I'm looking forward to it.

Please join me in welcoming Mr. Rye Barcott. (Applause.)

CAPTAIN RYE BARCOTT (RETIRED): Thank you, sir. Appreciate it. (Off mic) – sir.

Good morning. How's everybody doing? I – (chuckles) – was reflecting with my wife last night. And I said, you know, honey, can you imagine – did you ever imagine in your wildest

dreams that I'd be able to do the opening breakfast at the U.S. Global Leadership Council (sic; Coalition)? And she looked at me, and she said, babe, frankly, you've never been in my wildest dreams. (Laughter.) So she's not here with us this morning.

But what I thought I'd do is just tell a little smart power story. And really what I'd – what I'd like to do is talk about two parallel experiences that happened simultaneously, one in the Marines and then one through an NGO and humanitarian work. And I have a – I have a topic, a common topic that I'll come back to as I weave this narrative together. And that is what I think the most effective rule of aid can be is to connect talent with opportunity. Simple idea: connect talent with opportunity. So I'll come back to that.

But let me start off by just talking a little bit – and I know we have a lot of veterans in the room – by just talking a little bit about the calling I felt to go into the military. It was really pretty simple. I was – I was most attracted by the advertisements. The Marine Corps has good advertisements. Now, this one actually is pretty old-school, but this was the one that really got me when I was 13 years old. Do we have any Marines in the room? Hoo-rah. Sergeant Talliano, minor celebrity in the Marine Corps – I waited in line for him for two hours to sign this poster in Camp Lejeune. And he signed it. And I took it, and I stuck it up on my wall. My wife used to call that my wall of man. That wall now no longer exists. These are some of the compromises of marriage. (Chuckles.)

But that photograph – that photograph might not speak to some folks, especially the folks that don't have a military background. But when we're at – when I'm at colleges and nonprofits, the top line I think actually resonates across the board, right, because the larger – the larger point is what in life worth anything is easy? So I was attracted to the advertisements. I was attracted to the larger idea that they had behind them – some of the larger ideas that they had behind them. And my father had served. He hadn't served as a career, but he was a Vietnam vet. He had volunteered for the Vietnam War. And many of my earliest mentors were his closest friends.

But what I didn't realize when I was 13 years old was that my dad was deeply conflicted about that experience, because as much value and meaning that it brought to his life – and it did; in some ways it's the most significant thing, in his mind, that he's done – it also wounded him in severe ways. And it was also a war that he felt was wrong and fought for the wrong reasons. But he served, and he did it. But I didn't – and I didn't realize any of that conflict that was happening in his own mind. But he was deeply ambivalent about my decision as a young guy to go into the Marines.

And in order to do that, I applied for an ROTC scholarship, got fortunate, went to UNC-Chapel Hill. I remember looking at the admissions booklet – I had a couple admissions booklets stacked up against each other. I pulled up UNC's, and it had one just amazing statistic, you know, that – one of those statistics that are so elegant in its simplicity that it distills to an essence. Does anybody know what that might be?

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (Off mic.)

CAPT. BARCOTT: (Chuckles.) Basketball's a good one, but the Marine got it – 65 percent female. Good odds. So I said, thank you; I'll take that ROTC scholarship. And in return I of course owed four years on active service and four years in the Reserves. Chased the dream, got to UNC. And this was before September 11th, so I assumed that the types of missions that I would face would be of a peacekeeping type of nature. And knowing that I was going into the military, I wanted to be best prepared for those types of missions.

Now, my mom's an anthropologist. She actually gave me the middle name Mead, after the famous anthropologist Margaret Mead. And so I started taking a few anthropology classes. And I met a mentor of mine, young anthropologist. She was a graduate student at the time. And she confronted me one day in a powerful way, because she came – and I was asking her some questions after class.

And she said – (inaudible) – listen, stop. You know, you – I'm glad you're reading these books. You got to read these books; they're important. That's part of the reason why you're here. But there is only so much that you're going to really learn from books. And so if you want to – if you want to better understand why strife happens in the world, you got to actually go to a place and immerse yourself into a community and understand it. And in order to do that, you should do that in an authentic way. If you're going to go someplace overseas, you should try and – try and learn a little bit of the local language beforehand.

Now, this anthropologist had a particular tie to Kenya. And UNC had a Swahili program. So I took Swahili, and I kind of followed her direction, and I wound up in Kibera. This is a view of the outskirts of Kibera. How many of y'all have heard of Kibera before? More than most audiences, about 10 percent maybe. Kibera's located on the outskirts of Nairobi. And it has a history of ethnic strife.

It's a slum community – I use the word slum because the residents themselves refer to the community as a slum. But you also see the – a more technical term in some of the literature you may come across, and that is an informal settlement. And an informal settlement actually has a precise definition. It means principally two things. One, the structures are not permanent, they're semi-permanent. Most are made out of mud and corrugated iron. And secondly, there's an absence of land tenure rights. And when you look into that second factor in particular and you look into why a lot of the strife happens in some of these communities, they're often tied together. And some of you who may be familiar with the work of Hernando de Soto, as in – the economist who writes specifically about this land tenure issue.

But Kibera is obviously not – it's not unique in the world. It's one of the larger slum communities. Somewhere between 250,000 to half a million folks live there in an area about the size of Central Park. It has a history of ethnic strife but it's not unique in the world, because by some estimates, up to a sixth of the world's population will live in conditions like this.

Now, I went there as a 20-year-old, and I wasn't planning on starting an organization. I was kind of going there to learn because I knew I wanted to go into the military. I wanted to learn about episodes that had – of ethnic strife that had happened. And what I wasn't expecting was that I would just be confronted and overwhelmed by the place. I found my way into Kibera

and eventually connected with a fellow who let me stay in his 10-by-10, 10-by-10-foot shack, for \$13 a month. And I spent about six weeks with him asking him about his problems and his life and learned about him and listened to him.

But what I didn't expect to be was so overwhelmed by the sheer magnitude of the place and the depth of the poverty that it faced. And so imagine if you're this little girl's parents, or brother and sister, and you're living in an area about the size of your average dorm room with your whole family, and you're separated by your neighbors by a thin piece of tin. It's no thicker than your thumbnail. And the noises never stop. They never stop because it's so dense. And right outside your, you know, doorstep runs something that doesn't just smell foul, but also can endanger your daughter's life: raw sewage.

Well, that hit me pretty hard. But I was staying in the community and people were opening their lives to me. And after a couple weeks, a funny thing happened. I recognized what I believe is a fundamental truth in the world. I believe this is a truth whether you're here in the United States or halfway around the world in Nairobi. And that is that talent is universal but opportunity is not. Talent is universal but opportunity is not.

So the real question that came to mind, which I think is a natural extension of that, is how can you best connect that talent with opportunity, talent to people with opportunity. And I didn't have an answer to it. And I was talking with young people who were my age, mostly young men, they – I was – I was detecting this cynicism that they had towards organizations, nongovernmental organizations, that had come into the community but that were not locally led or represented. And they felt like they didn't have a voice within them.

There was one exception that folks would – that folks kept telling me about, and it wasn't in Kibera; it was in a neighboring community. It was a slum called Mathare. And it was a sports program. And what they were doing was pretty simple. They were using soccer, in particular, as a tool to help create role models from within. But what was so impressive about this organization, which was led by a young team of doers who themselves were from this community, was that it leveraged partnerships from the outside but it wasn't directed by them. And so I heard about this organization so many times that I decided I needed to go there and figure out what was up, because I was having sort of a natural instinct that I think a lot of Americans would have, which is, you know, what can I – what could I do? What could I do to, you know, help in some way and not be an obstruction to it, not create expectations that I can't live up to?

So I went to this organization and met with one of the directors of it, this fellow. Excuse this shirt; it truly is appalling – (inaudible). (Laughter.) But this guy, Salim, had helped found the Mathare Youth Sports Association, which had recently been nominated for a Nobel Prize. It had about 10,000 young people in it, a very difficult place, at times very violent. And I went there without an appointment and I asked Salim to tell me a bit about what they – how they were structured. And what Salim did was he kind of gave me some – he gave me some of the background, but then he confronted me. And he started talking to me about what he called a Land Cruiser complex. Have any of you all ever heard of this? I see a few heads nodding. Land Cruiser complex, which was basically the idea of hey, if you look at an organization that's in a

community like Mathare, count how many Land Cruisers they have. And then ask, you know, the bigger question of are those resources really being disposed of in the most effective and proper way? Can they do more? Can they get – can they get more directly into the hands of the community?

So – and that was kind of connecting with me. I mean, I was seeing some of that from the experience in Kibera. But then he made it personal. And he made it personal by confronting me and saying, you know, mister, what the hell are you doing here anyway? I mean, what are you doing? You're here, you're going to get research, but what's this community going to see in return? And I didn't have an answer for Salim; I didn't have an answer for him – for him then and I definitely didn't have an answer for him as I returned to the United States. But I was thinking about this idea of connecting talent and opportunity.

And right before I left one of my other neighbors approached me. Her name was Tabitha. This is a photograph of Tabitha. She was 34 when I met her. And she approached me and she said, listen, you're asking all of these kids about their problems. Lakini mimi na kuwa na shida – (na kuwa ?) mpia (ph). I got problems too, and you never bothered to ask me about my life, so sit down and I'm going to tell you a little bit about my life. I said OK, mama, and I sat down and I listened. And she told me a little bit about her life. She had been a widow – she was a widow with three kids – she was a nurse, but she had lost her job when the government cut back on health care expenditures a couple years before.

Towards the end of that conversation she proposed a solution. She said, give me 2,000 shillings, which was the equivalent of about \$26 at the time. Like I said, I had made a habit of not giving out money, in part from the – from the basic security training – all right, don't give out – don't give out cash; don't show that you have resources – but also because I just didn't know where to begin. And so I asked her what she was planning to do with it. And she said, well, I'm going to – I'm going to sell veggies; I'm going to sell vegetables. And I'm thinking to myself, but you can – you can see a vegetable stand on nearly every corner in Kibera. Before I could say anything, though, she explained. She said, I'm going to sell veggies – I'm going to buy veggies here in Kibera, I'm going to sell them across town in Eastleigh, a Somali community where I can undercut the competition. And oh, by the way, in Eastleigh, they don't crack down on vendors for not having vendor's licenses, and those vendor's licenses cost 5,000 shillings a pop.

So, you see, there are barriers to the poor, often unseen, at every level. And so she asked me again for the 2,000 shillings. And, you know, she had a plan and there was conviction in her voice. She knew the microeconomics. And what the heck? It was just 26 bucks. I ate breakfast before this at my hotel. I paid more for my breakfast. I didn't have a lot of money at the time, but I handed her the 2,000 shillings and I didn't necessarily – I didn't think I'd see her again.

I came back to the United States. I went to officer candidate school because I had to – I had to finish the second half of the summer. And a funny thing happened to me at officer candidate school right down the way in Quantico, Virginia. For the first time in my life, I performed at the bottom of my class. I mean, I performed so poorly that – (chuckles) – that I was embarrassed to ask my – to have my parents come to graduation. So I asked them not to

come and they obliged; they didn't come. But as I was driving off of that base, I called my mom and I asked her for some advice. I told her what had happened. And she said, son, you've just been through dual culture shock – Kibera, Marines – it's going to take some time. So you've got to let it take some time and you've got to reflect on what has happened and make sense of it, step back.

So I listened to my mom. I returned to college for my senior year, started writing a research paper about Kibera, started coming across this concept that anthropologists were throwing out called participatory development – sounds like a mouthful; I'm sure some of you have heard of it before – but the idea was connecting with me because I was thinking about Salim and Tabitha and just trying to wrestle with this idea of connecting talent with opportunity. And the core of participatory development was about the reality that we all have a role to – that we can play as outsiders if you come in and you find a network. But that change itself, if it's going to be social change, has to be driven from within. It's sort of a simple idea, but I thought one that had some powerful implications.

So I'm writing this research paper and I'm – and I'm also feeling really bothered by the fact that I'm doing it, because I'm thinking about Salim and his comment about research being extractive. And I'm thinking about a line from the Marines, something I'd later see on a lot of our fitness reports, our performance evaluations, when you did a good job. And that line was, "Have a bias for action." Have a bias for action. But what – but what I was doing with that research project was very passive. So one day I shot Salim a note and said, hey, why don't we try and start something together? We can use the model that you've helped create in this neighboring community and we can bring it to Kibera – sports, soccer ball from the community, right? I mean, it's pretty simple, doesn't take a lot of resources – plastic bags wrapped in twine. Use it as a way to help bring ethnic groups together and build role models from within. I thought it sounded like a pretty good idea, shot him the email. He responded with one line. It went something like this. It went, sure, man, comma, whatever. (Laughter.) And I – I'm sure Salim was thinking – I'm sure he was thinking, this crazy "mzungu," this crazy white guy, he's not going to come back. But I didn't know he was thinking that. And I actually found the fact that he responded to be reassuring.

So we started an organization. We called it Carolina for Kibera. I got a bunch of my buddies over to my dorm room, my 10-by-10, and we wrote. We wrote into the night, we wrote into the morning, we wrote 600 letters to our most famous alums, you know, anybody that we could think of. Guess how many replies we got back? Ten? Yeah, OK. I thought – USGLC, I thought you'd be a little bit more optimistic. (Laughter.) It's morning, I know.

We got two replies back and not a single check. And listen – I felt – I felt pretty wounded at that point because that was the first time I had asked anybody for money and I kind of put myself out there. And for a moment I thought about quitting. I went to a mentor of mine who was an Army doctor and I told him a little bit about this and he said, listen, the idea that you are pursuing is a worthy one. This sort of notion makes sense. And for whatever reasons, you have found yourself connected with some talented people in this particular place. So the idea itself makes sense. But you've got to ask and you've got to ask directly; you've got to really put yourself out there. And I listened to that and just cringed because I'm thinking to myself, oh,

God, you know, that does not feel comfortable. And it wasn't. And it was hard. But he was right.

And so we did it, and we raised about 20,000 bucks. And I waited to that moment to have a very difficult conversation, a conversation with my commanding officer, a Marine Corps sniper. Sir – (inaudible) – Barcott reporting as ordered, sir. Barcott, stand easy. I stood easy. I told Major Boothby about this project. I told him we had raised the money. And then I put the ask out. I asked him for three months of unpaid leave as soon as I was commissioned as a second lieutenant in order to return back to Kibera. And he looked at me, sort of like some of you are looking at me right now – (laughter) – and he pointed his trigger finger at me and he said, Barcott, you are one odd bird. (Laughter.) I was like, yes, sir, odd bird, sir. (Laughter.) What do you think of the proposal? And he stepped back and he said, listen, I'm going to support this. I'm going to support this because you've taken a risk, you put yourself out there and because the idea is a worthy one. And that was one of the first instances where those two worlds had kind of come in conflict with each other and where my commanding officer, my chain of command, was supportive of the work that we were doing in Kibera. It was the first of just a handful that would come over the – over the course of five years.

But we returned to Kibera; we started the organization. It didn't take much because it wasn't – I wasn't the one that was convening it. It was Salim and a small team of doers on the ground. And we were – all those teams, all the sports teams, which was the initial conduit, they all had to be interethnic. This is a photograph from our first tournament. It happened one month after we arrived. The fellow in the photograph, Rashid Saif (ph), was 16 then. He's now in his mid-20s. He runs a business, he employs 10 of his peers, he's a role model within his community. We've invested less than \$20 a year into him, but every year, taking a long view. That was the goal of the organization, something simple. Start it from scratch, you know, catalyze something and see where it goes.

I had no idea whether or not I would see Tabitha again. I mean, I barely remembered her and I would barely recognize her when I saw her. But she had sold veggies, she had sold them from a stand like this, and she had collected her savings of about \$100 after six months and she pursued her dream. And from her own 10-by-10 she started a small medical clinic. This is a photograph outside of the old clinic. And I remember walking up there with her hand in hand and really feeling stunned to see it, in part because my name was on the wall. She had named it the Rye Medical Clinic. I felt stunned, but also more than a little self-conscious, right – (chuckles) – because what had I done? Here was somebody who was remarkable in her own right who had some of the solutions to the problems that she faced and who should have been able to access something as meager as 2,000 shillings, 26 bucks, but hadn't been.

So Tabitha approached Salim and I and she said, listen, you're building a youth-based organization to prevent violence. You know all of our problems here are connected, our challenges are connected; health care has got to be a piece of it. Let this clinic be a part of Carolina for Kibera. Made sense to us. I didn't make the call; Salim made the call, and the clinic became a part of the organization.

And I went on to my – to my career and deployed with the Marines. This is a photograph from Fallujah in 2005. We had taken fire. We thought it had come from this house but it hadn't. And I'm the same guy in this photograph as I am in this one, the same guy with two very different contexts: One is the use of violence to pursue national objectives, and the other is trying to prevent violence. In order to deal with those at the same time I tried to create these mental compartments in my mind, and I never talked about Kibera when I was with the Marines. And in Kibera I never told folks that I was a Marine. I tried to keep those mental compartments.

But what I realized was that they often were clashing and converging. And some of the best practices that I was learning from Kibera, particularly around this old-fashioned skill of listening, could be better applied to what we were doing in the military, especially in a counterinsurgency context. And likewise, some of those core tenets of military service, the d-word – the d-word is? Discipline, right? Discipline, structure, having mission-orientation, being able to adapt and improvise, those could – those were – those were super valuable in an NGO context.

Did that mean that the military should be more engaged in development work? I don't believe so. And we can have a – I don't have – we don't have enough time to really go into a deeper conversation there, but I think that the skillset itself is helpful in making that transition, is helpful in being involved in leading nonprofit organizations, but that doesn't mean that the military is particularly effective at it. Why? Principally because I believe that we lack the continuity. By the time I had begun to learn who the who who was in Fallujah, we left. Six months, 12 months, you can only learn so much about a place. You can only have so many – so much depth in relationships. You can only build so much of what the CEO of Google calls the people network, the people network that is so important to actually driving change from within a community. You can only do so much of that when you're – when you're coming in and out of a place in six to 12 months, let alone in a military context if you're carrying a weapon and covered in body armor.

So I was trying to keep those two worlds separate but they were converging on top of each other. And along the way, I continued Carolina for Kibera as a volunteer, the organization really being driven from the ground, and the principal objective has not changed over 10 years. And that objective is to invest directly in young, talented people, and do it in a holistic way. Folks like Moueni (sp) in this – in this photograph here. She's on the right.

This is personal for me, because when I first met her eight years ago, she was too shy to even speak to me. And now if you ask her what she wants to do, she'll tell you she wants to be the president of the African Development Bank. She's in college. Who knows whether or not she'll be the president of the African Development Bank? The odds are still stacked against her. The odds are stacked against anybody that would want to aspire to such a position. But the point is that she's aspiring to it. The point is that there's a goal, and that with that she's creating a multiplier effect within the community.

That's the real objective of Carolina for Kibera. We're a nongovernmental organization. We have a base at UNC Chapel Hill. And we run on about 700,000 bucks a year – averaging about \$20 per person who's in the – in the organization. It's charitable work. It's not foreign

aid. But we leverage and we tie into foreign assistance of the U.S. government. And that's why I'm thrilled to be here today. And we principally do that through a relationship with the CDC, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, which has their largest office overseas in Nairobi.

Five years ago the CDC approached us – we didn't approach them – the CDC approached us because they wanted to do a long-term longitudinal public health survey in an urban and formal settlement, and they needed a local implementing partner. You think we immediately jumped to the offer? Hell no, we didn't immediately jump to the offer because, as one of our board members said, if you deal with a big organization – particularly a big government organization – it's like – it's like getting in bed with an elephant. You got to be careful.

And so we took it slow. And we negotiated. And we learned who the people were on the CDC side. And over time we built a relationship that has really worked, where the CDC collects long-term data with the use of handhelds, employing local residents – about four local residents. And in return, patients get free care at our clinic. And this is our clinic. We'd love to welcome you to it sometime. It treats over 40,000 patients a year, has two Kenyan medical doctors and it all started with \$26, but \$26 in the hands of a remarkable person taking a long view together, using this model of participatory development and connecting talent to opportunity. And I should add that it's the Tabitha Clinic. Thanks, you all. Great to be here. (Applause.)

(Off-side conversation.)

JOHN GLENN: Thank you, Rye. Thank you very much.

CAPT. BARCOTT: Sorry to be moving around stage here, I'm just trying to find that ball.

MR. GLENN: (Laughs.) It's underneath there, Rye. It's underneath that one. It's underneath that chair.

So I'm John Glenn, the policy director at USGLC, and I have the privilege – we have time for about one or two short questions for Rye. He'll be with us throughout the day if you want to have a chance to speak with him, but I think I got a couple of my colleagues with a microphone here. Brendan (sp) over here and Felipe (sp) over here. If you'd like to, we have time for a question or two for Rye, for after a really remarkable story.

CAPT. BARCOTT: Thank you. Sure.

MR. GLENN: Anybody, who'd like to – here, sir. Felipe (sp), why don't you come here?

Q: (Off mic.)

CAPT. BARCOTT: Thanks for that – thanks for that question. You're a Marine? Who'd you serve with?

Q: (Off mic.)

CAPT. BARCOTT: (Inaudible.) Thanks for that question. Question is what can we do with vets as they come back and integrate back into society. I'm involved with a – with a couple small initiatives in this. I do think the – I think the skills are transferable. I think that we need – I think that we need more attention being focused on companies of all sizes to recognize that and to embrace that and to give – because at the end of the day, you do have to make more of an investment. A company does have – I'm in a company now. I work at Duke Energy. I've been there for two years.

That – Duke Energy, if they hire a veteran, more likely than not, unless they're a veteran from the nuclear Navy and have already gone through the nuclear skills – more likely than not they're going – they're going to have to invest more in the core training, whether that's project management, programming, you know, plant management – whatever it is, they're going to have to invest more time in the upfront with that veteran, but the payoff will be longer. And companies need to realize that the payoff will be longer. And that's difficult in public company context at times, where everything's quarter to quarter.

So I think that there's one – there's one sort of public advocacy piece that can be done around that. And then I think local community-based initiatives are really important in this regard. I'm working with a guy – and Indian guy from Bank of America. He's never – he's a – he helps run their technology division. He's never served in the military. He's doesn't – he just became an American citizen.

And he started this organization that basically connects programmers to vets and teaches them how to write Java. Good on him. That's a great example of an initiative – small initiative. It's not going to get much publicity or anything; it doesn't need to. But it's going to assist, you know, 10, 15 veterans in a very direct way in getting good jobs. So I don't know, I really welcome that conversation too. It's something that I'm interested in learning more about and being a part of. Thanks for that.

MR. GLENN: Another question? Anyone? Here, in the back.

Q: (Off mic) – opportunity in St. Croix where we went down and did behavioral health for residents who can't live on their own. You were talk about how you want to do stuff with local enablers, what do you see a place for like students and stuff like that, to get the experience of working in a community like Kibera?

CAPT. BARCOTT: Thanks for that question. And we – our program is based at UNC. I wrote this book principally for college students, young-doers who are looking at how they can make a change in the world. And my biggest piece of advice is that you got to – you know, in this word – there's a – there's an acronym out there that I learned from graduate school which is FOMO – has anybody heard of it, FOMO? The acronym means fear of missing out.

And even in – even in down economic times, the number of options that are available to a lot of students is – it's overwhelming. So the biggest advice that I can give is pick a place, pick

an issue, go deep with it and spend – and when you – and when you – and when you go to a place, spend more than four weeks. You know, try and really invest in it. That's what – that's when it's most valuable for us, at Carolina for Kibera, too.

We have a volunteer program. We don't take many volunteers. We're very selective with who we take, because it can be more of a cost to the community than the value they bring if it's not structured in a right way. And what we found is the most impactful volunteer experiences have been those that last over two months and that are very clearly defined, and where the volunteer itself is able to not only learn, but also give back.

Thanks. I'd love to circle up with you after.

MR. GLENN: Last question. Here, please. Just behind you. (Inaudible.)

Q: I hear you talking about young people. What about your senior citizens or your retired military that now they've got a new patience and wisdom that has given them – that they're fantastic volunteers. Do you reach out to the seniors also?

CAPT. BARCOTT: Thank you for that question. I was at a talk a couple weeks ago with a group of folks that runs retirement communities in Pennsylvania. And during that presentation I spoke about someone who served as sort of a grandmotherly figure to me. Who – she looked after me as I was – as I was growing up. She's 91 years old and she has – she has the onset of Parkinson's. She calls it the shakes. And – but over the last five years what she's done is she's knitted these little baby hats and – hand knitted these baby hats and given them Carolina for Kibera.

And you know, you think in this world of plenty, a baby hat – you know, you can go and buy them for 50 cents at Target. But the point is that she's done it by hand and our community on the ground knows that and deeply respects that and deeply admires that. And so there's been a – there's been really meaningful relationships that have developed from that. I think that's been an experience that's been positive for her. That's a simple example of something.

I think, you know, something that may connect more with this audience and with you all is that we work in partnership with an organization called American Jewish World Services. Some of you may be familiar with it – not a secular organization – that looks for community-based organizations that are using participatory development and invest in them. And one of the ways that they invest in them is they bring in – bring together experts, particularly a network of chief financial officers and controllers. And organizations like ours can get a CFO with the cost covered by AJWS on – (inaudible) – for up to a four to six month period. And we've done that. And that has been – that has been deeply meaningful.

But I think that piece of the sort of advice in terms of the timing of it, it still applies too. We – when folks write to us and say, we'd like to come to Nairobi for a week, two weeks – even if they're a medical doctor and have a very core set of skills – it's difficult to make that really worthwhile for the organization. It really is, because you're going to invest so much time in trying to prep it back and forth. So thanks for that question.

MR. GLENN: Rye, I think you've actually sparked more thought in here than we would have time to go on for, but I'd like to thank you for coming here today. And I hope you'll join me in thanking Rye for coming. (Applause.)

CAPT. BARCOTT: Thanks so much. Appreciate it.

MR. GLENN: If I can, if you'll just stay seated, we're going to move directly into our next panel. And I'd like to invite to the stage, if I could, Nancy Ziuzin Schlegel, who is the treasurer of U.S. Global Leadership Coalition. Nancy, thanks so much. (Applause.)

NANCY ZIUZIN SCHLEGEL: Good morning. My name's Nancy Ziuzin Schlegel. I'm the director for global security policy for Lockheed Martin and also a board member for USGLC. Lockheed Martin has been an active member of the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition for over a decade. Like many businesses here, we recognize the importance of the international affairs budget. As international markets become increasingly important, we realize that development and diplomacy play a critical role in creating stable trading partners, opening markets and creating jobs.

Today I'm pleased to introduce four former members of Congress, all of whom played active leadership roles in supporting the international affairs budget while they were in office, and continue to do so now.

Senator Gordon Smith served two years in the Senate representing the great state of Oregon. Known as one of the most thoughtful and well-respected members on the issue of global engagement, Senator Smith was a true champion of the international affairs budget. Informed by his experience as a successful businessman, he led efforts in Congress to promote trade expansion with countries such as Peru, Singapore and Chile. He currently serves as the chairman and CEO of the National Association of Broadcasters, and we are thrilled to have him as one of our newer members of the advisory council.

Senator Smith. (Applause.)

OK, we're going to wait.

Senator Mel Martinez – born in Cuba, hailing from Florida – was the secretary of housing and urban development before joining the U.S. Senate and serving from 2005 to 2009. As a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he chaired the Africa Subcommittee, and later on the Banking Committee served as the ranking member on the Subcommittee on International Trade and Finance. Today he serves as chairman of the J.P. Morgan Chase Foundation and chairman of the Romney Campaign's national advisory council. We're delighted that he could join us as the USGLC's national and advisory committee member.

Ambassador Mark Green is well-known to many of you in this room – four-term congressman from the state of Wisconsin, America's ambassador to Tanzania, a leader in Malaria No More and currently senior director for the USGLC. Ambassador Green also serves

on the board of the Millennium Challenge Corporation and is one of the most effective and knowledgeable voices on global development.

Last, but not least, is our moderator for today's discussion, former-Secretary Dan Glickman. Secretary Glickman has held numerous positions within Washington, nearly 20 years in the House of Representatives, representing the 4th District of Kansas, as secretary of agriculture, chairman and CEO of the Motion Picture Association and today runs the Aspen Institute's congressional program. But of all of his titles, his title as chairman of the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition is our favorite.

Please join me in welcoming our esteemed panel of experts. (Applause.)

(Off side conversation.)

DAN GLICKMAN: Well, welcome everybody. It's a joy to be here, a joy to be part of the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition. Thank you, Nancy, thank you, Liz, for the great work that you do. I'm surrounded, three Republicans, one Democrat. It shows you how bipartisan we are. I'll let you figure out who's the Democrat as we go through this thing.

But anyway, we're fortunate to have three very distinguished people here. (Served ?) Mark in the House and Gordon and Mel in the Senate – all distinguished folks with careers. So I – first question I want to ask all of you before we get to the specific thing about foreign assistance and America's role in the world is just give us your observation about Washington and about civility and about are we able to get together and do anything? You know, Norm Ornstein and Tom Mann are two political scientists. And they wrote this book which says it's even worse than you think it is. And that's been on The New York Times bestseller list.

And you know, we have dozens and dozens of years of experience. And I think that there's a lot of negative stuff being said about how bad it is and how terrible our government is working and nothing gets done. And I wonder if you might give us some of your just quick observations about whether you see us being able to kind of – maybe you don't think we're in a funk at all – but get out of the funk we're in and how we're going to be able to try to deal with all the myriad of problems that this country has to deal with, including the issues that we're talking about today.

And I'll start with you, Mel.

MEL MARTINEZ: Well, thank you. I – it's great to be with you all today. And I'm delighted to be a part of this conversation about the U.S. role in the world. But let me say that when I left the Senate, it was as a result of a lot of frustration with the way things were working. And last night I had dinner with a number – three or four of my former colleagues. And they'd tell me, it's a lot worse than it was when you were here. That's only a couple years ago.

And so unfortunately it seems like we're cascading downward all along. I'm a real optimist, and I believe that post-election we're going to have a new dawn, a new beginning, a new spring. And I really do believe that it's not only because it would be a wonderful thing to

see, but I think because it's a necessity. For our country to continue to be successful, we've got to deal with some of the intractable issues that we continue to kick down the road.

There was a great piece today in The Washington Post by Michael Gerson, that I had the pleasure of serving with in the Bush administration. And it is on civility. And I commend it to your reading because it is kind of outlining where we are. How we get out of it, I think requires a larger vision in the next election, a vision for the longer-term good of the United States. And I think honestly that we have reached such a low point that the recognition is there among the current members that I talk with that we had just got to do better. We cannot continue down this path.

MR. GLICKMAN: Mark, let me ask you as somebody who served in also both the executive branch, legislative branch, as we deal with a lot of these issues – like the issue we're talking about today which we think have historically been pretty nonpartisan or at least bipartisan, how do you observe the question that I raised to Mel, especially from a House perspective?

MARK GREEN: Well, as to the question of whether it's really that bad, I – to prove I'm not that far removed from Congress I'll answer yes and no. And I'll begin with the no. I'll begin with the negative. First off, in fairness to the institution, I think the institution in some ways reflects society. I think the country is polarized on some of the great issues of the day. And I think there's some frustration out there. So in some respects it's not really that bad in the sense that it's a natural product of where we are.

But now let me give you the, yes, it really is that bad. I think there is a real danger. We're at a point in our history where if things continue we may lose the ability to build compromise and consensus. You know, we have a freshman class on the House side in Capitol Hill of 100. Two years ago, we had a freshman class of 50. So you have more than one-third of Congress elected in the last two terms during these polarized times.

And so their formative years, if you will, have been during a time of bickering and partisanship. And this becomes the new normal for members, then we are in trouble, and then we will lose the ability, I fear, to build the compromise, the consensus, the coalitions that I think everybody wants and, quite frankly, we simply have to have.

MR. GLICKMAN: And so, Gordon, following up on that, you of course were a businessman. For those of you who don't know, Gordon was in the frozen vegetable business. And then of course after his distinguished term in Congress, he now runs one of the largest trade associations. And he's basically a media person as well, because he runs the National Association of Broadcasters. So you know, I'm just curious how you view all this as well, you know, given the breadth of your experience.

MR. SMITH: Well, I would simply say that it is bad now, but it's been worse in the past. And I think it's important to recognize that the founders of this republic set up a system designed to be inefficient, and they're succeeding. We're supposed to test everything. They're supposed to be – it's supposed to be difficult to make law. And what I observe, and with some optimism, is that if you study history, the Congress' history is that it does not do hard things until it has no

other choice. What forces the no other choice are market forces. If government cannot with wisdom of forethought make reforms on taxes and entitlements that keep us competitive, the market eventually will compel them to do that. That is not unlike what happened to Reagan and O'Neill with the – in the near demise of Social Security. Patriots came to the fore and partisans receded. I'm hopeful that that will happen, because I think if it does not, then markets will be very punishing to the United States. And I don't want to see that, and the American people, the great vast commonsense center, does not either.

MR. GLICKMAN: Well, moving from that note – and I think you all reflect a general belief that while it's bad, we hope it can't get worse, because America's leadership is at risk here – let's move to the subject a little bit of what we're taking about today, which is the role of America in the world and particularly as it relates to development and diplomacy. And by the way, that was great, your presentation about Kenya and what you're – what you've done there. I thought that was just spectacular in terms of the relationships that we have, how inextricably linked we all are as a people.

But it was Will Rogers who once said years ago that America has two of the greatest friends in the world. They are the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans. OK. So those days, we hope, are over, in terms of, you know, America's role in the world.

But you know, I'd like to talk a little bit about how we build support in the country for a smart foreign policy that recognizes diplomacy and development as part of the whole panoply of issues.

And Gordon, you know, you're – you've been in the economic business all your life. You've been in the frozen vegetable business. You're now representing all the broadcasters in the world. How did development and diplomacy not only maybe help others abroad, but how does it relate to our economy at home? There are folks here who may want to go back and talk about this.

MR. SMITH: You know, a lot is mentioned in the press and in commentary that America has two powers; it has hard power, which is our military, and it has soft power, which is our culture and our economy and our trade. And it needs both of those. And – to cut the foreign assistance budget is to literally throw one of the arrows of the quiver of America away. And I can tell you as a former member of the Foreign Relations Committee, to be on that committee is something of an electoral hazard, because people have wrongly concluded that we spend, you know, half of our – of our federal budget on foreign assistance, and it's – I suppose it's hardly a percent. And yet the amount of good that is done through that is enormous and indispensable and must continue. And I would also note that all of our domestic disputes are much greater than our disputes over foreign policy. I mean, as I observe the Obama administration, I don't see a whole lot of difference between that and the Bush administration. There's been a continuum, some change certainly, but there's been a fairly observable constancy in the way America is operating abroad.

And so I think economically, America simply has to have a government with all of its tools available in order to keep the trade lanes open, in order to keep relationships good. And so whether it's governments or NGOs that come out of this essential budget, an awful lot of good will is fostered by America's involvement through foreign assistance.

MR. GLICKMAN: And Mel, I wonder if – I mean, given your background, your history and everything else that you do, I wonder if you might want to comment a little bit about – I'm thinking a little bit about 9/11, the attacks on America, and how that changed America's perspective and its role in the world, particularly as it relates to national security. And how does that relate to the whole issue of smart power and what we ought to be doing as a nation?

MR. MARTINEZ: Well, I think it's important to keep a balance between hard power and soft power, you know. And unfortunately, 9/11 – and I was in the Cabinet at the time – and you know, it's something that shook our country to its core. And unfortunately, we then went on a – not unfortunately, we had to go on a bit of an offensive, which was really more projecting our hard power than it was our ability to use diplomacy and other means to achieve foreign policy goals. We were essentially attacked and responded in a military way, which was necessary and appropriate.

Having said that, over that period of time, we also have become viewed a little differently around the world than we would like to be viewed, and I think that's why it's so important now, after that decade of necessary power, exposure around the world, that we begin to now play our other card, which is so vital and important, which is the card that is through diplomacy, through what we do at AID, what we do in so many other ways around the world to show the face of who America is and what we are.

I notice a number of you veterans here in the room, and I want to tell you I spent the 4th of July in Luxembourg and had the privilege of visiting our cemetery there, where General Patton is buried, and another 5,000-plus young Americans that lost their lives in the Battle of the Bulge are buried there. And you know, it is such a stark reminder of the price that we have paid over years in the conflicts in which we've been engaged. And my gratitude to our veterans knows no bounds and – but yet that sacrifice, if it can be avoided in the future, it can only be avoided by our ability to engage our potential enemies, those that are in the world that wish us ill, and to find ways in which we can be persuasive about who we are as a people and what our intentions are around the world. And we can only do that by a demonstration of who we are; and that's only best done, in my own life experience, by the generosity and charity of the American heart. And so I think that we diminish ourselves when we don't use that dimension of who we are as a people, we project that around the world and show people who we truly, really are and what our character is as people.

So you know, I served in Foreign Relations, I served in the Armed Services Committee, so I had an opportunity to witness both ends. And the truth is that, as Gordon said, we have a tremendous consensus in this very polarized nation of our today – a reasonable consensus of what our place in the world should be. What we need is courageous leadership – (inaudible) – act upon it.

And you know, from my view, America's role in the world is the indispensable power. There is no alternative but for us to be engaged in the world. We are a force for good around the world, in my view. We make mistakes like any other entity, country, person, individual. But having said, I think our intentions, through the history of our country, have been honorable and good for the most part, and that we try to do the right thing. And our influence around the world I think errs and tends on the positive side.

MR. GLICKMAN: Mark, I'm going to veer off for a moment. You're ambassador to Tanzania, so you actually have on-the-ground experience in the developing world. From your perception, having served in a sub-Saharan African country as ambassador, how – what benefit does the United States get from smart power, from development and diplomacy? I mean, we see the Chinese are all over East Africa building roads and in some cases extracting minerals and other assets out of there. You know, we – so it's not as if this is a world where the United States doesn't face some competition. But for folks who are wanting to go back home, they're going to say, well, what difference does it make? I mean, you were on the ground. You were where the rubber meets the road. What difference does it make to us as a country?

MR. GREEN: Well, let me put it this way. We talked a bit about 9/11; let's not forget Africa's 9/11. I mean, 1998, Dar es Salaam, Nairobi, the embassy bombings, 5,000 casualties. It was a terrible moment in Africa's history. In the years leading up to that, Tanzania, Dar es Salaam, was a nonaligned nation, which meant it was essentially leaning a little bit leftward, friendly but not a close ally. Ten years later, February of 2008 when I served as ambassador, we saw the first-ever official visit by a sitting U.S. president, President George Bush, greeted by crowds that were 10-deep along the roadway. And when the embassy bombing occurred, al-Qaida – though we didn't call it al-Qaida in those days – clearly thought that they could chase America out of the region, off the continent and maybe back home with their strikes. Ten years later, as I stood next to President Bush seeing those crowds, I remember thinking to myself: The bad guys lost. It's over.

The engagement that we had between those two points of history – which was our smart power, the AIDS initiative, the Millennium Challenge Act, the malaria initiative – all of the investments through the American people that we've made brought together these countries, made them close allies, to the point where one of the final acts of President Bush's visit to Tanzania, he posed for a photo in front of Air Force One with Tanzanian soldiers who were about to be deployed as peacekeepers in Lebanon and Darfur. So again, 10-year period of time, a country that was perhaps leaning the other way to one of our closest allies, and a country that became a contributor to peacekeeping and forces of stability. So in a security sense, it's about sharing the burden and building those key coalitions.

But I would also argue it's about America's image in the world. It is true that we have competition in places like Africa, but I can also tell you that as I traveled around Africa, America is the indispensable country, and everyone wants to be who we are. They look towards us as a force for good. I absolutely agree. The world is a much darker place if we retreat. The world is looking to us. They want to chase their own version of the American dream, and we have the ability, through smart power, to help them to get there. And when countries are rising, when countries are looking optimistically, those are not countries that support terrorism, those are not countries that support extremism: Those are countries that become forces for good.

MR. GLICKMAN: Well, to follow up on that, OK, so, you all, including myself, have had town hall meetings at home. I'm not sure I've ever been in a town hall meeting where the first question is: Mr. Congressman, what can we do to support more foreign aid from America in the world, so – unless you're maybe at a humanitarian crisis and then people are obviously very good about wanting to make sure that people are fed and families dealt with and everything else. Ok, what – I mean, these are folks from all over the country here who are coming here to try to not only learn but carry the message back home.

So as – you’re still politicians, you know, and so what do you recommend? What’s the message to people at home? How do we – when we have a national deficit that’s kind of out of control and we have all the pressures on a country where the economics of this country are at best flat right now. We have high economic anxiety, job problems, all these kinds of things. How do people get motivated not to punish politicians who support this kind of thing? And I’ll start with you, Gordon.

MR. SMITH: Well, first, I think it’s important to recognize that America does have a huge debt problem. It’s the greatest vulnerability not just to foreign assistance but to the United States military. But I’d like to give you some reason for hope. While America cannot remain the world’s superpower and at the same time be the world’s super-debtor, I think it’s important to recognize what some are beginning to recognize, is that the tectonic plates are beginning to shift a bit. Much of our foreign trade deficit is related to oil. American technology – not just Apple, Google and those things – American technology has developed capacities for horizontal drilling and fracking that – which, if we can do it environmentally responsibly, could very likely shift the economic balance of power back into the way of the United States. If that happens, because of the vast resources that are now being discovered on the North American continent, what will happen is our trade deficit will go away. Our debt will begin to abate. The pressure of – on politicians to divide up a shrinking pie will be relieved because the pie will be expanding. If we do this, I think what’s you’re going to see is a re-emergent United States, because we won’t be the super-debtor. We’ll again be the superpower unencumbered.

And I think if you look at other competitors in the world, China is resource poor and politically stagnant. The Middle East will be in some serious jeopardy if we’re not dependent upon them for our energy. And of course, Europe is unraveling as we speak. The world needs a strong America. It needs smart power, which I believe includes hard power and soft power. And we can have that again if we are diligent about using technology to exploit natural resources in a way that preserves the environment. And I would just simply say that if we can do that with all that has been discovered in recent – literally within the last 18 months – you’re going to – you’re going to do more to clean up the environment with using our abundant natural gas resources than 10 million windmills. And so it’s truly a win-win that is in the horizon for America, but we have to – we have to pursue it. And it will improve our economy. It will make this debate over foreign assistance go away, because the American people are fundamentally generous, if they have that ability.

MR. GLICKMAN: Mel.

MR. MARTINEZ: Well, here’s how I would address it. I think, number one, that during the years of the Cold War it was not that difficult to persuade folks that we had a place in the world in which we had to play; that in fact, you know, there was a competition, that there was a competitor, that we had a problem and that we had to be very present in the world to preserve our way of life and also to expand our influence, because it was very clear that the forces of darkness and the forces of good were out there in this world that’s so complicated.

That’s become more nuanced since then, and it’s become more difficult to make that very clear contrasting case for the need for us to be engaged in the world. But let me just say that because it’s more nuanced doesn’t mean that it isn’t important, and that’s why I think it’s a challenge for our congresspeople to begin to have a debate. By the way, I think the one place of

leadership on an issue in this country is only a few blocks from here, in that house right over there, and that is the central place of leadership. So I think as we are all influential people and talk to our favorite candidate – and it's only down to two now, so it makes it fairly simply as to know who to focus on – is to suggest to our presidential favorite that the foreign affairs issues, the diplomacy, the – all of this is an important component of American foreign policy, and that it should be a part of what they plan to do beginning January 20th.

Having said that, I think, at the more local level, I think you also can be persuasive, because our place in the world is not unchallenged, and we need to look no further than Latin America, an area that obviously is here I'm from, but it's also an area that I know reasonably well. China is all over the region in a way that is appropriate, because they do what they will, but it's also challenging of us. And I think it's very important that we recognize that if we recede from a place like Latin America, that others will gravitate to that vacuum created by our lack of presence in the region, and in fact, some would suggest that we've been receding from that very important part of the world, our very close neighbors, and that therefore the Chinese influence is at an ever-increasing rate.

Let me just say that if we could influence the world, I would prefer to see U.S. influence than I would to see Chinese influence. And you know, they're a great trading partner to ours, and thank goodness they continue to lend us money. But having said that, I also believe that it's very, very important that we recognize that our values are vastly different. And when we talk about – you know, we take pretty seriously the anti-corruption laws of this country as the way we act abroad for our business. That's not a universally shared value, by the way, in case it comes as a surprise. There are some who would have no qualms about doing business with those who may engage in the drug trade at night and do some legitimate business in the daytime, or a corrupt politician that would prefer to give you the business if you only would bribe them.

We don't do business that way around the world. Others do. And so our influence comes from our ability to project ourselves as something more than just someone who wants to do business but someone who is engaged with you, who wants to make your country better, more successful, and by the way, we also want to do business. So I think it's dramatically important in this shifting world that we're in that we recognize that just like during the Cold War, we do have competitors abroad, and our influence can only be sustained through the engagement of diplomacy and our ability to engage with others through the aid that we do.

MR. GLICKMAN: OK, so Mark, I'm going to end with you and then go to questions. So again, designing a message that's appealing to voters and constituents, because, you know, that does make a difference. If people are hearing positive messages, they'll be more inclined to be, you know, positive, facilitator to their elected – what do you think is the best message in terms of communicating smart power?

MR. GREEN: Well, first off, let me say I agree with Mel and Gordon and what they laid out. I guess let me offer a couple of tactical points. First off, I always find it amazing when I have private conversations on the Hill with former colleagues and I talk about smart power, you know, they'll lean forward and say, well, I support it but my colleagues never will. And I've had, like, 200 members of Congress say to me, well, I support it but they never will. I think a lot of members don't realize that there is bipartisan broad support. So I think most importantly,

stressing the breadth of the coalition that is represented in this room, which – and I think one of the reasons that I’m so proud to be with the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition is because of all of you and who you represent, the variety of backgrounds, the geographic diversity that’s in this room, that’s what I think you stress over and over again.

Secondly, I think keep it simple. I think sometimes people don’t get involved in discussions of foreign policy or foreign assistance because they somehow think it’s, you know, it’s got to be a deep, intellectual conversation, you know. Wisconsin, where I’m from, my father-in-law, who is a corn and soybean farmer in the southern part of the state, will be the first to say he’s not the most sophisticated guy in the world, but he understands that 95 percent of the world’s customers are outside the borders of the U.S. He understands that if he can’t sell his corn and soybeans overseas, he might as well plow the fields under. So I think keep it simple and point out the obvious facts like that. And I – you know, trust in the good faith and common sense of the American public. Don’t hide from it; talk about it very directly; talk about the breadth of support; talk about the accomplishments. I think if you do that you’ll see an advance; I really do.

MR. GLICKMAN: Well, let’s – I wonder if we have time for some questions from the audience or – before we get to it, I might – I might just tell you there’s an interesting book out there called “The Presidents Club.” It’s the relationship with the presidents. And the story begins with this relationship between Harry Truman and Herbert Hoover. When Truman asked Hoover to basically rebuild Europe after the second world war and it was America’s leadership – first of all, it took a Republican and Democrat – interesting story is Franklin Roosevelt wouldn’t talk to Herbert Hoover even though he had creamed him in the election. But Harry Truman did, and he brought Herbert Hoover in to basically rebuild Europe and do it with development assistance, and with that became the largest development effort in the history of the United States of America, bipartisan effort and an effort which showed America’s leadership in the world. It’s just a good example of an – how our – (inaudible) –

MR. MARTINEZ: Well, can I throw another one? I mean, there’s a more recent example. There’s a fantastic example, which is Colombia, Plan Colombia. We invested \$8 billion over about a six to eight-year period of time on a bipartisan basis. It was started by Clinton, it was continued by Bush and what is the result that we’ve had there? Today Colombia is a prosperous, thriving country. (Inaudible) – in J.P. Morgan & Chase as we look around the world, it is one of the key places where we want to be in Latin America. A decade ago, you wouldn’t think of going there. And the fact of the matter is that our projection of power through assistance to that country has been able to stabilize and pacify that country, and today it is a – not only a close ally and partner, but it is also a country that is really thriving and helping their people live happier and better lives.

MR. GLICKMAN: Let’s – any questions that folks may have? Yes, yes ma’am, right there. And if you could keep them as succinct as possible.

Q: Hi.

MR. GLICKMAN: And you might state your name and where you’re from.

Q: OK.

MR. MARTINEZ: You need to be succinct because we're not going to be. (Laughter.)

MR. GLICKMAN: Yeah, right.

Q: No problem. Robin Eckstein, U.S. Army veteran, Appleton, Wisconsin.

MR. GREEN: Hey, there we go. God's country. (Laughter.)

Q: OK, so my question basically is what I've found – I've actually worked with Oxfam before and done some lobbying on the Hill for international aid, and one of the biggest things that I always come across is budget cuts – we're budget-cutting, we're cutting, we're cutting, we're cutting constantly. If you can give more of, like, specific examples, especially – I mean, I know it's not a partisan thing, but I hear it from a lot of Tea Party people. And we have Ron Johnson in the state of Wisconsin and that is – he's like, I'm cutting everything; I don't care what it is. So what do you say to that?

MR. GLICKMAN: Who would like to respond?

MR. SMITH: Let Wisconsin defend Wisconsin. (Laughter.)

MR. : Let the Wisconsin guy go, yeah. (Laughter.)

MR. : If you're so sure this is God's country, you take this answer here. (Laughter.)

MR. GREEN: Well, I mean, a couple thoughts. I think one of the first things to stress is the international affairs budget didn't cause our deficit, can't cure our deficit. That is about 1 percent of the federal budget. It's a rounding error when it comes to the federal budget. Not to say that it isn't on the table like everything else; it's that going after the international affairs budget, first off, I think is counterproductive in terms of growing our economy and avoiding the real costs of hard power allocations.

But secondly, it didn't get you there. It is – it's a red herring in terms of the real debates that I think need to take place. But again, secondly, it is stressing how these investments are part of the solution. It is certainly the case when it comes to growing our economy. Talk to manufacturer after manufacturer, talk to the agricultural community. If we can't get access to the newly emerging markets of this world we're in serious trouble, because that is where the future is. We need access; and in so many cases, you can't get there without smart power investments.

Secondly, whether we like it or not, this is a dangerous world, and it's a rapidly changing and challenging world. We were talking before we came up about how when President Bush, Bush 43, came into office, he came into office fully intending to be a domestic president. That's what he thought would govern his time in office. And the world reared its ugly head. The truth

of the matter is that we have to think about the long-term challenges and threats to our national security, and we have to make those investments.

And finally, again, the other part to it is – and Michael Gerson has written about this so beautifully – there are some things we do because we’re Americans. We are a force for good. We are the indispensable nation. The world humanity is so much worse off if we’re not engaged. It’s who we are, and I think it’s something that we should be proud about and I think it’s something we should talk about. We should not rear from these discussions. And yes, absolutely, these are tight fiscal times. And I used to represent Appleton, Wisconsin, so I know how conservative it is, rightly, but the monies that we’re talking about are modest, and secondly, I think they’re a great force for good in this world, something we can be proud of.

MR. SMITH: I – I’d like to double down on what I said before. No one has a job, no economy works unless someone produces energy first. And we have the potential to get into some clean energies – cleaner energies – and get off our dependence upon foreign suppliers. And if we do that our economy will be growing and Senator Johnson won’t have to be carving up a shrinking pie, but a growing pie. And Republicans and Democrats are going to look at things far differently and the debates will become less acrimonious if we have growth instead of decline. And so I think we’re on the cusp of a new opportunity, a new age in which the American architecture of international relations of the 20th century can carry over to the 21st century. But it – we cannot provide leadership, either hard power, soft power, smart power, if we don’t have ability to finance it. And so priorities are – this is an important priority, foreign assistance.

MR. GLICKMAN: Mel.

MR. SMITH: It becomes easier –

MR. MARTINEZ: I’ll just be very brief, but I’ll – I was just going to say that I think the key point to stress would be that it is like preventive medicine; you take a pill, you avoid a stroke. You do a little bit of diplomacy, you do a little bit of assistance and you may be saving billions of dollars. Think how much we spend in Afghanistan per day and just think of how much help it could be if we were helping people turn their hearts in a different direction rather than just relying on power. So when we have to turn to military action, that is very, very costly. If we can avoid it by what we do through aid and other means, that’s a real good investment in saving money down the road.

MR. GLICKMAN: OK, let’s see. There’s a lot of questions up. What I may do is if you all could do your question in 30 seconds we can do two or three questions.

MR. MARTINEZ: We’ll be brief, too.

MR. GLICKMAN: And then – so let’s see. There’s a gentleman there and then there’s people over here, so just – if you could state your question and then we’ll hold it and we’ll get a couple asked here.

Q: Thank you. I'm Andrew Lupin (sp). For Senator Martinez, you and I shared a C-130 back in October '06 going up to Biap.

MR. MARTINEZ: Wow.

Q: You stayed – you were fortunate enough to stay in – (Baghdad ?) – which is ugly, and I was going on to Ramadi, which is worse. (Laughter.) And I'm going to blow the 30 seconds right away. But I was out there with the Marine Corps, where their idea of soft and hard power – clean, hold, build, transition – was very successful, as is in Afghanistan. I'm not hearing that from the Romney campaign. I'm hearing more ships, more troops, more planes. How does the – how would a President Romney talk about soft power in diplomatic use?

MR. GLICKMAN: I think we're going to let him answer that question before we go on to other people.

MR. MARTINEZ: Well, I – let me say first of all, I can't speak for Governor Romney because I just shouldn't. But I do believe that he is someone who does understand the variety of ways in which we can exercise our power. He is someone who has had a lot of experience abroad as a – in a personal level, through his own religious participation. His children have lived abroad. I think anybody who has got foreign experience and understands and knows the world also understands the need for there to be a balance in what we do.

I would say that between now and November 6th, I think it is, I would discount just about anything that either one of them says – (laughter) – as it relates to foreign policy, because frankly, I think the whole discussion of outsourcing – we love when Honda moves a plant into Alabama; we consider it a crime if, you know, a job goes out of the country. So the truth is we're in a global economy, there's a lot of things being said and done right now that are not constructive or positive, and I would say let's just hope that their inner angels that are not apparent during a campaign will prevail later on.

MR. GLICKMAN (?): Good – (inaudible).

MR. MARTINEZ: Glad we had a safe flight.

MR. GLICKMAN: Yes. (Laughter.) Yes, sir.

Q: Thank you. First, gentlemen, really appreciate your service, both in Congress and since. All of you have shown great support for veterans in your – in your work in Congress as well. That's been an area that's – historically been an area that has had more bipartisan support than perhaps some other areas as well, and so I sure appreciate that. Senator Smith, your work on the state veterans' home loan program was a wonderful piece as well that benefited Wisconsin, Oregon and a bunch of other states.

But my question is of particularly Secretary Martinez and Ambassador Green. I'm Anthony Hardy, by the way, from Madison, Wisconsin.

MR. GLICKMAN: What are you – just – did you prime this audience? (Laughter.)

MR. MARTINEZ: Yeah, what? No Floridians? (Inaudible.)

MR. GLICKMAN: Badger people?

MR. GREEN: Cream of the crop.

MR. GLICKMAN: OK.

Q: So Secretary Martinez and Ambassador Green, my question is primarily for both of you and others that might be interested as well, but China has been mentioned here a bit as well, and that's – for those of us – some of the veterans here in the room have served on foreign internal defense missions around the world and have seen China right nearby in some of the places we've been in Latin America, across Africa as well. And so my question is how much of a threat do we see? China is clearly doing economic development kinds of things now, but how much of a potential threat do we see there for the future, and what sort of an impact might that have on some of our lobbying visits now as well, for those that – we heard the tea party folks mentioned, and some that are, you know, particularly focused on budget cuts? I –

MR. MARTINEZ: I would call them a competitor, for sure – currently a competitor, potentially a peer threat. And I think that is the way we should view it. I don't think we should assume that they're necessarily an enemy but – or an adversary in a – in a confrontational sense, but I think we need to view them as a competitor. They clearly are that, as we look around the world, and I think a potential peer competitor in a more military sense.

I think when you look at the South China Seas, by the way, that's a very, very complicated area right now. I mean, China is in a very complicated situation. You know, their conflict with Vietnam and with the Philippines – anyway, I could go on on China, but I think competitor and potential threat.

MR . GLICKMAN: OK, any comments?

MR. GREEN: I think they're a competitor. You know, I know we spend a lot of time talking about the threat from China. We should focus on ourselves in the sense that I have every confidence in the American economy, in American entrepreneurs and the ability to compete, so if we tackle those hurdles that are holding our economy back, we'll be just fine; we'll be just fine.

MR. GLICKMAN: OK, let's take one more question. I would have to say that if you watch the discussion about Olympic uniforms you would – (laughter) – kind of get the feeling that we're at war right now, which is probably slightly – we've gotten a little over the top on that. (Chuckles.) Yes.

Q: Tony Beam, North Greenville University in South Carolina.

MR. GLICKMAN: Good – (inaudible) – not another Wisconsin question. (Laughter.)

Q: One of the hats that I wear – (laughter.) We’re moving south.

MR. GLICKMAN (?): Yeah, right.

Q: One of the hats I wear as a radio talk show host; I am a tea partyer who believes in international aid, U.S. global leadership, soft power, which I may be the only one; I don’t know.

MR. GREEN (?): Oh, you’re not.

Q: But I’m one of those.

MR. GREEN (?): No you’re not. (Laughter.) No you’re not.

Q: But one thing that – back to the previous discussion – that I think we’re going to have to do is convince the people who are listeners to my radio show, people across the country, who believe that compromise and bipartisanship are bad words. We’ve got to come up with evidence that compromise and bipartisanship is producing something that is great and worthwhile and worthy, because the perception is that once you begin to compromise or engage in bipartisanship, you immediately have jettisoned the values that you stand for and you’re worse than a traitor. And so somehow that perception has to change, I think, if we’re going to be successful. It has to be in a positive way so we point to success stories that rise out of a compromise without giving up values that are key and precious to people.

MR. GLICKMAN : (Inaudible) – anybody – I think that’s an excellent point. Anybody have any comments on that?

MR. SMITH: Oh, I just – I think he’s right on. I mean, our country has been on the brink many times because compromise became a dirty word, and we once went to war against each other because of that, over very important issues, to be sure. That said, if there hadn’t been compromise, we wouldn’t have had a Constitution. And ultimately, compromise will occur when we get to a certain point where there’s no alternative. As Winston Churchill once observed about Americans, they can always be counted upon to do the right thing when they’ve exhausted all other alternatives. And there’s something to that and there’s something to the – our design that creates that, the design of our government of checks and balances, which, on the whole, does more good for us than bad.

MR. GLICKMAN: Well, we thank you all very much. This has been a great group and we appreciate all the work that you’re going to do now going up on the Hill to spread the word, and we hope we’re all successful in that process. So thank you all very much. (Applause.)

MS. SCHLEGEL: Thank you. Thank you for the depth and breadth of that conversation. Next, Billy Kriesberg is going to come up and give you some instructions on how to get to the meeting at the State Department. So thank you again. (Applause.)

BILL Kriesberg: Thank you, Nancy. Let me just cover a couple of logistics, starting with if we never got your security information for the State Department, there is a very good chance you will not get in. So my recommendation given the weather is that you remain here and not head over there. They're very, very strict about that. If you're not sure whether we got it or not there are bus captains standing outside each bus and they will have a list of who is on the approved list that went to the State Department yesterday afternoon and they can tell you.

What we're going to ask you to do in one minute is you're going to get up. We have people stationed to direct you outside to the buses. If you have any bags, if you have luggage, if you have briefcases, backpacks, anything that you can leave here, please do. We have a coat-check room just outside the ballroom where you'll be directed. It will greatly facilitate your getting through security at the State Department and then getting through security coming back here after the State Department. You can bring your binders, that's fine, papers are fine, but any bags we would encourage you to leave here.

And finally, on your nametag, for when you come back from the State Department, there should be a colored dot on the back and that indicates the lunch that you'll be going to. In your program the lunches are all color-coded. You'll see they're red, blue, orange and green. We will have staff to direct you to the right room. One lunch will be here, one next door and two will be down the hallway and around the corner. And again, we'll direct you when you get back, so just so you know which lunch you're assigned to, just check the colored dot on the back of your nametag.

And with that, I would ask you all to just make your way out through these doors here. Again, please drop any bags in the coat-check room and then make your way directly upstairs to the buses.

Thank you, everyone.

(END)