

Mark:

Hello. Welcome everyone. Welcome. We have a very tight schedule so if everyone could please be seated so we can begin with the program. Thank you all for coming here today to beautiful Hillsborough County, Tampa Florida.

My name is Mark Sharpe, General, one of the local County Commissioners, I see Commissioner Chris here as well. There's many other local dignitaries. I want to welcome you to Hillsborough County where we have a large population of military veterans, men and women who've served our country.

My dad's been 28 years in the air force. I was born at MacDill Air Force Base and had the opportunity to serve 20 years in the United States Navy Active and Reserves.

Like you, many around this table, you've had the chance to serve and you recognize the importance of military power, but more important, General Zinni and others recognize this and have stood for this, you understand the importance of diplomacy and peace, and civilian lead recovery programs.

Today, some 19 days before election, before a very important debate on Monday evening, where we're going to have a chance to talk about, as a nation, foreign policy. We're going to have an opportunity here to have a dialogue lead by Mr. Sesno and once we discuss some of the important issues facing our nation, issues involving Middle East, elections, Venezuela and Mexico and also obviously the Europe and the European economy.

That, we know this is important, this is going to be a very important dialogue. It's time for strong, mature U.S. Global leadership and I know that that's what this organization stands for. I'm now going to introduce the Executive Director of the U.S. Global Coalition Leadership Group, Ms. Schroyer.

Liz:

Good afternoon and thank you Commissioner Sharpe. Please go ahead and enjoy eating your lunch as we continue our program. It is a great privilege to partner this afternoon with both the Greater Tampa Chamber of Commerce and Tampa Downtown Partnership. I have to share with you, some of my colleagues and I, flew in last night from Washington DC, and I've lived in the Nation's Capital now for about 30 years.

Those of us in Washington, we think we're really important that's kind of being living in the Nation's Capital, but as Mark, you just mentioned, for the next 19 days, the center of the world is going to drive right through Tampa Florida and

we are really glad to be here and be part of your conversation, and all I had to do is look on the television to see how many commercials are playing here.

This is an incredible time to meet, to be able to have a moment to talk about America's role in the world, given the complexities and the turmoil throughout the globe, but also as Commissioner Sharpe said, just a few days before the presidential candidates will meet on their last debate to focus on foreign policy, and to take a look at the issues. What a lineup we have to hear from our fabulous guest speakers, Bob Zoellick, Sylvia Burwell, and General Zinni and to follow that by with Ann Lewis, Al Cardenas, to share with us their perspectives and their party's nominees.

Thank you to all of our guest speakers and we look forward to it. I want to do the special shout out for those individuals who have an orange tag. You are part of a 150 individuals from across the state who are leaders in the business community, the Faith-Based Community, the military community who represent the USGLC Advisory Committee right here in Florida.

Unfortunately, our co-chairs couldn't be here, but I want to give a thank you to them, Governor Jeb Bush, and Donna Shalala who have lent their name, their credibility, and their time to make our effort working the state.

We have a lot of special officials from the state that are here, a special thank you to Ken Lawson who is our, the Secretary of Florida, Department of Business and Professional Regulation is here, Victor Crist, another County Commissioner is here, General Peter Schoomaker, former Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, Lieutenant General Martin Steele from the University of South Florida. We have a few representatives from our Congressional Delegation from the office of Senator Bill Nelson, welcome to Digna Alvaraz, from Senator Marco Rubio's office, Ryan Pedmitra, and from Representative Dennis Ross office, Steven Gatley. Welcome to all of you as well.

While you're enjoying your lunch, let me take just a couple of minutes to tell you a little bit about who we are. Some of you are very familiar with us, you joined us a few years ago when you had the honor of hosting General Petraeus right here in Tampa.

The Washington post a few years ago dubbed our Coalition, the Strange Bedfellow Coalition. As you can see from some of the various names up here, we got that name because unlike a lot of groups, we bring very, very different voices together. We have over 400 businesses and nonprofits ranging everything from

care to caterpillar, from Wal-Mart, to World Vision, the Chamber of Commerce, APEC and many, many more, and they all come around together with a National Advisory Council. I have to say in a world that is way too divided politically, we are very proud that we have a Bipartisan Group of advisors for us, lead by General Colin Powell that includes every living secretary, former living secretary of State, mostly living secretaries of defense, individuals that have health Congressional office from the State of Florida, and it's a terrific group of experts that we lean on and call upon.

One of the greatest excitements of our Strange Bedfellow Coalition is a group of military leaders. Over the year, we have found this to be one of this most important voices. Many years ago, General Zinni, our guest speaker helped me put together a group that now are National Security Advisory Council, includes over 110 retired three and four star Generals and Admirals who will go to Capitol Hill and they're not there to talk about just DOD, the Department of Defense, they are to talk about why the importance of State, USAID and our civilian tools of engagement.

We added a compliment to that group this past year called Veterans for Smart Power. Some of you are in this room. Today, over 30,000 individuals, veterans from all ranks and files across the country have joined this effort.

I just want to take a minute because I know a lot of you are here to ask those veterans that are in the audience today to please stand so we can salute you and thank you for the service to our country.

What brings our Strange Bedfellow Coalition together? We believe deeply in America's need to be a global leader in the world, and part of that leadership is this investment in a strategic investment, just 1% of the federal budget, in investment and global health, in agriculture and economic development, and investment and diplomacy, not just because it's the right thing to do, because we believe it's the smart thing to do.

Last weekend, I was visiting my youngest son who's at my alma matter and he was telling me about his world history class. I remembered my own where we studied the cold war that some of you may remember studying, and I got maps of red and blue. They weren't red for democrats and ... Blue for democrats and red for republicans, but they were blue for our allies, red for the enemies and it was pretty clear the world that I studied.

The world that our kids are studying today is so much more complex and interconnected and independent, and you in Florida understand that. You understand that infectious diseases to terrorism have no borders. You understand that the health, the education, the economic future of those living across the world impact us right here, and you understand that events, whether it is a fruit cart vendor in Tunisia or a child dying of AIDS in Africa has an impact right here in Tampa.

This afternoon, we ask the question, what is America's role in this complex world? When I study our cold war maps, we would argue over hard power versus soft power. Today, that is a very outdated conversation. What we at the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition rally around is the idea of smart power. This idea that you need a full range of tools to advance our national security and our economic interest.

We believe very strongly in Smart Power that it is about this commitment, this focus on making sure you invest in development and diplomacy a long side defense, that it is an investment into our foreign assistance that can make a difference if used effectively to advance our interest.

The world has changed dramatically, since General Zinni and I first started talking about Smart Power, but I think all of us believe in it more than ever. In Washington, I find Democrats, Republicans, independents joining around this framework of our foreign policy.

Toady, I hope we talk about something slightly different, and I know we will with our guest, which is what I call Smart Power 2.0, because Smart Power is now longer just about our security, it's also about how we use our tools to advance our economic interest in a competitive world.

With 95% of the world's consumers living outside of the U.S., we have to make sure we have the tools. The good thing is, if you invest smartly with development diplomacy, we can have that kind of investment both for our security and our economic interest, saving lives, protecting and keeping America safe, creating markets for America's goods and services and demonstrating America's greatness. I invite you to take home this little key ring, which gives you a great snapshot of the incredible successes of how this one percent makes a difference.

I welcome you again, for our discussion today, and I thank you. I thank you for not only joining us for lunch, but I thank you, more importantly, for being a part of our journey going forward, to do what our mission of the U.S. Global

Leadership Coalition is all about, and it's aligned right behind me to build a better, safer and a lot of more prosperous world..

To continue our program, please welcome Bob Rohrlack, who is the President and CEO of the Chamber of Commerce right here in the Greater Tampa area. Thank you.

Bob: I have to follow that, and we've got a great panel coming, so I'm going to be very brief so we can get to the panel. I am Bob Rohrlack with the Greater Tampa Chamber of Commerce, and thank you. We're thrilled that you all are here. We're very excited to have this event here and we think that the issues related to globalization are critically important, not only to our country and our state, but to us and to the business community here.

The Chamber represents over 1200 businesses, both large and small that know there's a strong case to be made for the importance of globalization, and we're working hard to continue to create the interest and create the awareness of what is available to business on a global scale.

Floridians know that our local economy is linked to the economic currents of the world, when the global economy thrives, so do we, but we think we can do better, we think we can do more and we're out to achieve that.

We know that if we are going to access the 95% of the world's consumers that live outside of our borders, we've got to start thinking and acting differently. We need to make sure that the United States has the diplomatic and the programs and development plans that can support that, and we're raising awareness and helping businesses understand the benefits to them, so they can be competitive. If they're competitive, they can export more. If they're exporting more, they hire more. That's how we can turn around the economy and have more job creation in our country, in our state, and here locally.

We don't have to do look very far to see the kinds of evidence that prove this to be true. Here in Florida, we export over \$64 Billion worth of goods and services to foreign markets all around the world. Over 14% of all manufacturing workers in Florida depend on exports for their job.

Agricultural exports contribute over \$2.2 Billion annually to our state's economy. Here locally, we're very excited and proud that our airport has become extremely aggressive and attracting international flights, our port, the Port of Tampa has

always been aggressive internal, and it continues to do the same and we want to help and support that as we can from the Chamber.

Globalization is an economic driver, and we're determined that Tampa be a part of that and try to lead to help make that happen. I don't think you all need to take my word for it, you wouldn't be here, but there's a video to show you what some of the insightful experts think about this very subject.

[Video playing]

Speaker 1: With our economy, the way it is today ...

Speaker 2: Some people are asking why we're spending so much money overseas.

Speaker 3: Not on creating jobs right here at home.

Speaker 4: Actually, we're not spending much money.

Speaker 5: Just one percent of our national budget goes to the international Affairs budget.

Speaker 6: That's not a lot.

Speaker 7: Helping create American jobs is just what that money is doing.

Speaker 8: If you want to create jobs, you have to create more demand for products and services.

Speaker 9: You need more customers.

Speaker 10: Where are American companies finding more customers?

Speaker 11: Not here, but here.

Speaker 12: And here.

Speaker 13: And here.

Speaker 14: Ninety-five percent of the world's customers live outside the US.

Speaker 15: Ninety-five percent?

Speaker 16: When we sell goods to them, they're called exports. U.S. exports counted for a big part of our economic growth last year.

Speaker 17: Want to developing countries.

Speaker 18: Their economies are growing three times faster than developed countries.

Speaker 19: Every 10% increase in exports, it gives us seven percent of increasing jobs here.

Speaker 20: How do we increase exports?

Speaker 21: Build new market for American goods and services.

Speaker 22: Remember that 1%?

Speaker 23: America's International Affairs budget helps fund programs that improve health and educations ...

Speaker 24: Towards agriculture development builds a stable economy ...

Speaker 25: And creates new markets.

Speaker 26: If we don't go to the biggest, fastest growing group of consumers ...

Speaker 27: Other countries will.

Speaker 28: Other countries already are.

Speaker 29: Investing a small amount in global development and diplomacy...

Speaker 30: is not only the right thing to do.

Speaker 31: It's also the smart thing to do ...

Speaker 32: To make our economy stronger.

Speaker 33: To create more jobs ...

Speaker 34: For my mom.

Speaker 35: For my dad.

Speaker 36: For my neighbor.

Speaker 37: For me.

[End of Video]

Larry: Good afternoon. I'm Larry Richey, Senior Managing Director with Cushman & Wakefield, and Chairman of the Tampa Downtown Partnership.

Tampa Downtown Partnership is a membership organization made up of 250 companies, organizations, and individuals who are thought leaders and business leaders.

The partnership serves as a steward of Downtown Tampa cultivating public and private partnerships, encouraging Downtown's physical and economic development and acts as an advocate to the Downtown community.

We're very pleased to be one of the co-host of this afternoon's program. A large part of Tampa's Downtown development is encouraging international business and trade, recognizing that we live in an increasingly complex world where our economic opportunities are tied to what happens beyond our shores.

Today's panel brings together three experts on the central role that the U.S. plays in the world and we look forward to a thoughtful discussion on the future of U.S. Global Leadership. It's my pleasure to introduce our panelist.

First Sylvia Burwell, is the President of the Wal-Mart Foundation and leads the company's charitable giving efforts and Wal-Mart's Global Women's Economic Empowerment Initiative.

She also guides the company's social, environmental, and economic opportunity efforts in Africa. Prior to joining Wal-Mart, Sylvia was President of the Global Development Program at the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation where she lead initiatives on advocacy, in agricultural development, financial services, and for the poor including water, sanitation and hygiene.

General Anthony Zinni, spend 35 years in the military rising to the rank of four star General. My father was a Senior Master Sergeant in the Air force and he'd be so proud of me if he was still alive sitting with all these Generals today, so it's been a pleasure.

General Zinni's deployments took him to 70 countries around the world. His final post was Commander in Chief of the U.S. Central Command right here in Tampa whose area of responsibility includes the Middle East, North Africa and Central Asia including Afghanistan and Iraq. A leading voice on the need for using all the tools of global engagement, General Zinni helped to create the USGLC's National Security Advisory Council in 2008.

Bob Zoellick is our third expert. Was President of the World Bank until June of this year. During his tenure, he prioritized investments in global health,

education, food security and empowering women and girls recognizing that they create important sources of economic growth.

Prior to his service at the World Bank, he served in numerous high level post during the administration of President George W. Bush including U.S. Trade Representative.

Finally, we're pleased to be joined by our moderator, Frank Sesno. Frank is currently the Director of the School of Media and Public Affairs at the George Washington University where he teaches how the media affects the creation of public policy. Those must be pretty interesting classes these days.

An Emmy-award winning journalist, Frank has more than 25 years of experience including 18 years at CNN where he served as Washington Bureau Chief and as a Special Correspondent.

I want to just remind everyone before I leave that following our first panel conversation, we will have a second panel with two leading political voices. Please welcome our experts and our moderator. Thank you.

Frank: Thank you very much, and as everybody comes up and takes their seat, let me tell you what a pleasure and privilege it is to be here. I feel like I'm back for parents weekend because my daughter just graduated last May from Eckerd College across the way here.

We've done our bit for the local economy and we're happy to help again. I also would like to thank on behalf of everybody, this incredible panel for coming here today, but also and especially Liz Schroyer and the leadership that she has brought to the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition. It's an incredible and important, vital conversation to be having today about what role the United States of America plays in the world, how we will lead, where we lead and how we will use these tools that we will talk about today to do that leading.

We'll take your questions as part of this process and specially toward the end, and as was mentioned we'll have another panel when we're done here where we'll get into a little bit more of the nitty-gritty of what the two campaigns may be saying or the candidates addressing in terms of these issues.

As was mentioned, what we have here are three very important perspectives and so I think we should just dive in. Thanks all.

Let me start, General Zinni, with you if we may because one of the really remarkable things about this conversation and Liz mentioned it, is the terrific support that men and women, leaders in the military have given this conversation about Smart Power. Tampa's home to central command, you know it well, you oversaw yourself so many of the hotspots in the world, you know those as well.

2010 poll that we make reference to here shows that almost 90%, 90% of active duty and retired military officers agreed that diplomacy and development are critical to meeting national security objectives.

Perhaps you could address from your perspective, your experience, why the military and so many in the military are coalescing around this initiative in this concept.

Anthony: Thank you Frank. I think it's pretty clear that if you're on the ground in places like Iraq and Afghanistan, you see the importance of building institutions beyond just the security capacity in these societies. I did an assessment for General Odierno in Iraq and one for General Allen in Afghanistan, and the one thing that impressed me the most was how much the military was doing in non-military things. I could go on all day today telling you of things like running the taskforce on anti-corruption to running the recreational swimming pools and the museums and zoos, monitoring the day palm harvest providing pesticides, looking to production rates and agriculture ...

Frank: Military was doing all of this.

Anthony: Military are doing this. People in uniform are doing this. When you talk to them, certainly we should be proud of our young men and women in uniform, they'll step up to any challenge, but they don't have the expertise. They certainly can support these efforts, the military brings a lot of capacity in terms of logistics and other things.

When I looked around, I did not see the representation from the other agencies of government, and it's not their fault because they just don't have the resources and the people. The other thing that's critically important, it frustrates the military, the cultures are different.

What I mean by that, is not that we don't join together well in the battlefield on a personal basis, but you look at the planning culture we have, the deployment culture, the expeditionary nature, the capacity and scale that we work on things

at a National level, that's not present there. It's not that they don't want to do it and they don't see the need. They have not been given the resources and the capacity to do it.

What you're seeing from the private to the General is a crying need for this kind of capability to be matched with our superb military capability. As one General told me, we can't shoot our way to victory in these places.

Frank: I think Bob Gates said that as well. Is the military doing these things because it has to or because these things actually work?

Anthony: I would say the first. They're doing this because they have to. When I talk to General Odierno about all these, I had 54 things on the first day that I saw that were non-military that he was doing.

He said, when General Petraeus was the commander, we had the security situation after the surge pretty well in hand, and Dave Petraeus's tactics and the way he employed them were very effective, but as he drove around, he said other things need to go on. If you're going to make the society feel like they're back to normality, if their life is now getting better, it can't just be that there are more cops on the street and more soldiers patrolling.

Parts of their life need to come together. All societies are built in four basic ways. They have political institutions, economic institutions, social institutions and institutions that provide for their security.

If you're not working in all four of those domains to restructure society in the right way, they're not given the balance then to be able to sustain themselves and stabilize themselves, if it's just a tremendous security assistance program and all military, they're going to ... we are experiences, they will fall back into the problems they had before.

Larry: Just very briefly with Secretary Gates when he was Secretary of Defense said, "We can't shoot our way to victory," so somebody needs to be doing these things was his argument. Sylvia, welcome.

You have an incredible background and you had incredible impact in your life through your work in government, through your work at the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and now through your work in the private sector.

I'm wondering if given your experience and all these things, and reflecting a bit on what the General was just saying, which of the three are most important and

most effective at addressing this diplomacy and development, particularly development question?

Sylvia: I think the answer to that is that all are actually important. It's not one. It is about the efforts working together in different ways. There's not a single one in terms of my experience in the different types of players when you're in the private sector, government or philanthropy.

Some examples when things come together well, I think there's some important concepts. One, you should do what you do well. If you're government, if you're the private sector, or if you're private philanthropy. Think about what your core skills are and bring those to bear on the problems.

The second thing is focus with key measurable results. I think those two concepts apply for all three and I think you have examples of when you bring the three together.

There's a program in Central America for Central American Agricultural Farmers where Wal-Mart the company actually works with USAID. In that program, what Wal-Mart's providing is knowledge about what product is needed, quality of product, distribution, delivery, information that small holder farmers, need in order to produce at the level that they can deliver to retail, and at the same time, USAID has put funding into organizations on the ground to train those farmers in what types of crops, what types of seeds, what type of what we would call hear extension in terms of knowledge of when you plant, how you plant, how you use water and different types of things.

When you bring those things together, in this case, both government, as well as business, straight business in this case, what you see is increasing comes from the farmer, better quality and lower price product for the consumer, a stable provider of product for companies like Wal-Mart.

When you can bring those three pieces together, philanthropy, business or government with people pulling against the oar at what they're best at, that's when I think you get the best results that we have seen and I've had the opportunity to see around the world.

Larry: In the small world department, I just flew in last night from the morning where I was at the world food price, and I was talking to several groups about these partnerships, this is exactly what we were talking about.

One of them is called the Water Efficient Maize for Africa. It just so happens that it was started with funding from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. You have anything to do with that?

Sylvia: That was one of the largest grants I did in my old organization.

Larry: What they're doing is fascinating and leads to the question that's related directly to our discussion here. Public Private Partnership to create these new ... to find these new strains to increase the yield of corn that on which 300,000,000 people depend for their subsistence at a time of climate change and drought and all the rest by as much as 50% increased productivity.

They all talked about the private sector, the public sector and the NGO sector in these partnerships. What is the catalyzing role specifically of the government sector? That's what we're talking about here.

We recognize these partnerships are critical. What is it that government does, should do? What's its role?

Sylvia: I think government, when one talks about government, one has to distinguish between governments on the ground and governments here at home. Remembering that the governments on the ground have to take ownership, and that has been a real difference in the project, like this one, where governments and their leaders committed across the continent of Africa to putting their own budget money against these issues.

Toady, we're here to talk about the US government.

Larry: Right.

Sylvia: In terms of what I think the role of the U.S. government is, the U.S. government has a number of different roles that it can and does play. Sometimes the U.S. government is a funder to do stimulating like in the example I just gave where they are funding the organizations that are providing the services, and that's one important role that the government can play.

A second role that the government can play is because it relates to governments. When the government is able to go in and have the U.S. government have conversations with the other governments about what are their plans for agricultural development in this case? What resources? You create partnerships at the government levels so that they are able to work and deliver against those efforts.

I think the other thing that the U.S. government can add is bringing players like philanthropy, like the private sector together in ways. We saw that at the G8 this year in terms of when a number of different groups both private sector players, not for profits, organizations like the Gates Foundation are brought together to work against a problem together and that convening power, that funding power as well as that doing power with other governments are all three things that I think are important roles to the USG.

Larry: What if this is cut, we hear a lot of talk about budget cuts and the pressures on the budget and this is a topic that often comes up in that context.

Sylvia: Having been at OMB, the Office of Management and Budget, and I was Deputy Director of the first year, we did not have a budget deficit in this country, and that was a number of years ago. We had the first black budget in the number of years. I really do understand the difficulty and the importance of facing down the deficits.

What that's going to take, at least in my experience, in having been a part of getting us to that point, is we're going to have to work ... just like I said in partnership across the areas of government private sector in philanthropy similarly, when we think about solving our deficit problem in this country, we're going to have to work across all the parts together and as a team.

There will be sacrifice across all the parts, and we need to do that in a thoughtful non ... people are using specific examples, but we need to think about it in a thoughtful way, and what I believe that means is you have to look at the analytics.

We're talking about 1% of the entire federal budget. When you think about making the kinds of changes we need to get to a surplus in this nation, which I believe we can do again. This is only a very small component, and when making changes I have to think you have to trade off the cost benefit analysis. I'm in the private sector now, it's what we do every day at Wal-Mart.

That kind of trade off of what this investment means to our nation from a national security, economic perspective against what the cut would be relative to other cuts, and I can remember night vision goggles versus head start in the tradeoff's that I had to think about in OMB, and we need to do that in a thoughtful way again.

Larry: Perhaps you do General with that trade off by the way. Night vision goggles versus head start. Tough, tough choices.

Sylvia: Tough choices.

Larry: Robert Zoellick, it's great to see you and we very much appreciate the role you're playing as head of the National Security Transition Team for the Romney campaign. That's not the context you're here in today. We're going to pick your policy brain that we may touch on some of what's out there.

You made this, some news last week in an article informed Policy Magazine which I commend to you if you have not seen it, I think you can get that pretty easily just by Googling it, and you wrote, and I'm quoting here, "We need a fuller appreciation of the links between economics and security to match the time." What did you mean by that?

Robert: First, Frank, let me just join others here in thanking Liz and Mark Green for their tremendous work with this Leadership Coalition. I really ... does tremendous things for topics we'll have a chance to discuss, but also I want to thank the sponsors here in Tampa and all the Florida. I was the U.S. Trade Representative from 2001 to 2005 and did a lot of work with the free trade agreements in Latin America. I always used to like to come down from Florida in part because it's a very international state and you've got the military community, you've obviously got the links to Latin America, got the business community, you've got the church community, we're talking, I think, there's some port and logistics opportunities here that are going to be changing. Keep it up.

I just very much appreciate what you're doing. It's a good point about sort of the economics and security. I think the broader point is if you look at U.S. history, economics has always been a driving force about how we've seen ourselves in the world and our nature as a country, but going back to some of the things that General Zinni mentioned, when I was at the World Bank, one of the things that you could see and I had this experience that Sylvia did in the U.S. government is, you had the security community, you kind of have the governance diplomats, you had the economics, and they were in separate zones. They really weren't coordinating.

There's one of the things that I tried to launch at the bank was to try to see kind of what were the ways in which you could get some commonality and overlap. This starts obviously with the successes of Western Europe and Japan, or a good one today Korea which was one of the weakest countries in 1950, today is now I

think our seventh largest exporter, we have a free trade agreement with them, and critically is a donor now, a big donor to the developing or the overall foreign assistance community. Just open up your newspaper. You were talking about Afghanistan.

Look at what's going on in West Africa or East Africa with Somalia. In Somalia, the African Union is trying to deal with some of these issues, but frankly they're going to need help for their own economies and to have some of the capabilities. When you see what happened come out at Libya, frankly there's an overflow that you can now see in the Sahel area including Mali and others.

The world is going to becoming a more dangerous place unless that you can sort of stabilize these countries as well as going to give them the resources to deal with the security questions. In this part of the world, Haiti, Central America whether it's narcotics, whether it's immigration issues, whether it's a sense of opportunity. On the one hand, if you're really going to try to deal with the fundamentals of security, you got to have stable growing economies, which is more than just investment, it's also a question of governance.

The other part and some of the opening sort of clip showed this, the world is fast changing in terms of sources of growth. In the past five years, two thirds of the world's growth has come from developing countries and is recently as the 90's that would have been in the low 20's.

Quite interestingly, in the case of United States now, 50% of our exports are to emerging markets, as recently as a decade ago, that would have been about 35%. These are also sources of opportunity. I was talking with some people as we came in about Sub-Saharan Africa, many people aren't aware of Sub-Saharan Africa was growing 5-6% a year for a decade before the crisis has already sort of come back, and sure there's going to be challenges depending on the country and market, but if you're thinking about our overall economic position, this is going to be vital for our future to be able to be engaged in these markets as much as possible.

The last point I want to connect it to is a little bit the diplomacy. Sometimes when we have these discussions in the United States, there's a sense of the U.S. is bearing the full load around the world. That's just not the case. There's a lot of developed countries that, frankly, put in a lot more as a percentage of GDP and even sometimes its total amount.

What's also changed and Sylvia is a part of this, you got a much more network system. Developing countries now are contributing about \$15 Billion a year, their players in foreign assistance, to say and this is separate from their private sector. You got the private sector foundations, civil society groups, church groups, private sector investment, the multilateral institutions like the World Bank. We're a big player and we would make about \$4 Billion a year, we'd actually plow back into the system. The key point for the United States is the 1% investment you're talking about gets leveraged many, many times. The danger if the United States cuts that back is actually we're not going to be a player at the table.

What we've discussed here is partly resources, but it's also ideas. If you believe you want to help 50% of any workforce, women play a role if you want every rule of law development, if you want to have good trade rules, you got to be at the table.

Part of what the GLC is about is not just traditional foreign assistance, but trying to make sure that the United States has some leverage among these other players in a fast changing world.

Larry: I'd like to ask each of you perhaps to play with a word, Bob that you just mentioned which is investment. It's easy to talk about foreign aid and if you go out on a street and if you ask people and you'd look at polls, a lot of times people will equate foreign aid with money that's being given away, with money that's being wasted, and some of it is. Some of it's lost to corruption and other things.

In the nature of investment and connecting both national security and economic security of these things, perhaps each of you from your perspective could talk about where you seen a good investment, what you mean when you talk about investment in terms of using government as a catalyst to drive this kind of thing because I think bringing that notion of investment to the table, which is what this administration and the Bush administration have tried before it, have both tried to do is important. Let's explore that for just a minute.

What do we mean?

Sylvia: I'm happy to start with two versions in investment. In the first one I'll talk about actually is the private sector investment and mention that when Wal-Mart has just recently purchased Massmart which is a South African business that has presence in a number of countries, and for us to be able to do that type of investment, and the trade rules that we need, whether it's Indian FDI Foreign Direct Investment and the changes in rules there for a company like Wal-Mart

that being at the table that Bob was just talking about, that investment that allows our leaders to be a part of the conversations, that shape the context that a business like ours will go into, is incredibly important. The partnerships that we, Wal-Mart had with the US industry and the relationships we have with the Department of Commerce because it is so important the U.S. Trade representative throughout time has been a very important part of that investment. Our investment as a company is built on the back of the investment of the U.S. government both in the dollars they put in, and the influence they have.

Larry: Really? You would not have made that investment if the government hadn't been there or ...

Sylvia: It is a part of what we do, I mean the calculation one's ability and then the other part is, is we think about expanding the market. When one thinks about the continent of Africa and the growth that Bob has mentioned certainly, we think about that and analyze it, but we also think about what roles government's going to play to continue that growth, that change in the economy, the growth that Bob's talking about in Sub-Saharan Africa, part of it is helped by the type of investments that USAID is currently doing in agriculture in Tanzania, in Kenya. We see the success of that work in terms of farmers whose productivity has increased and therefore their incomes have changed, and because agriculture is such a large percentage of these economies. Those are the results you see.

Larry: General?

Anthony: I think there's a classical examples, historical example of the Marshall plan when it was first proposed had less than 19% approval of the American people, George Marshall, President Truman and others conducted a series of speeches around the country to get people to support it.

I think looking back now, we would say it was an investment. If you looked at Japan and Western Europe and what have ... we built trading partners, we built security partnerships, we stabilize the part of the world that went unstable and caused global conflict as a result.

To me it's the most significant and the lessons learned from there should carry over. I had a friend of mine who's a Prime Minister of a country in the Middle East that say to me one time, "You know the image of an American in this part of the world is a soldier in full combat gear. The image of a Chinese person here is an investor." That's the term he used. An investor.

It caused me to think about who's exerting greater influence and who will get greater pay back. Certainly there are security requirements, and certainly it's a vital part of the word where energy resources, access, freedom and navigation are all important things to maintain, but I think if your only seen as the cop on the beat, and you're not the investor, you're not interested in the other aspects of society you don't get to the pay back in the end, and I don't think you get the image and the influence in the end that you get from just being the soldier.

Larry: Bob?

Robert: Let me give you three different examples that cover different types of this because I think it's a good question. One of the things that President Bush 43 invested in was his campfire program for HIV/AIDS and Malaria, and he was very results driven. You're saving millions and millions of lives and what it also demonstrates is you got to get the fundamentals. If you don't have basic health, nutrition, it's going to be hard for societies to grow, and there's obviously a morality to this too. We talk about saving lives and security situations. These are millions of lives you're saving.

Second, at the bigger stage, I checked now about 45% of foreign direct investment is now in emerging markets. I was talking with some people here about changing business models and we talked about Chinese resource investment in Africa, but you're starting a Chinese manufacturing investment in Africa, and it's something the World Bank was connected with, and frankly this is going to start to pose to business people if you're not aware of changes for example in logistics and ports and how the world economy's changing, you're going to miss the boat. That's the second type of investment.

A third one is in Sub-Saharan Africa, by simply changing the rules for Telephony, you've gone from about 10,000,000 mobile phones to 400,000,000 mobile phones in 10 years and you've had about \$78 Billion of private sector investment and all the job associated with that, in another area that Sylvia and the Gates Foundation worked on is, then country start to say, "Hey, how come we use this maybe for mobile banking? How come we use this for information for our farmers?"

To tie it together, the key point here is whether you're doing it as a health program, or a financial investment or senior security, some focus on accountability results in governance is critical, and I think that's the direction in a lot of these programs have been going to, and if they don't, then they shouldn't

get funded, but I think this is a good example of how from a U.S. interest, this covers the full gamut.

Larry: Let me turn to the audience for a minute. I just want to ask you all a question. How many of you have seen Charlie Wilson's war? Raise your hands. Remember the last scene? Last scene the Congressman couldn't get the funding of that school in Afghanistan.

Bob, I'd like to start with you with this because whether you're candidate wins or not, whoever the next President is going to be facing this issue of resources and getting our own fiscal house in order. I'm just wondering what you think it's going to take to preserve this investment if that's what it is, to protect the progress and the games that our men and women in military, in uniform have achieved to protect the investment that the private sector, I'm hearing, needs to go forward. This is an intensely difficult time.

Robert: I think is in any question political leadership, it depends on making the case. I kind of go back to where Tony mentioned. In the middle of the 20th century, after World War II, you had leadership in America that said, "You know what? The 20's and 30's didn't work so well and just lost about 60,000,000 people. Let's create an internationally economic system, the World Bank, the IMF, the Trading System, Marshall Fund and others so we don't repeat that mistake."

Interestingly enough if you go back in the 70's, it was another pretty down time in terms of OPIC, and the breakdown of Bretton Wood System, and Reagan Thatcher, but others also said, "Look. Let's revive capitalism at home, but let's also extend it abroad," and President Clinton took it the next step in terms of globalization with trade and some other aspects.

I think the challenge for whoever wins is obviously to focus on the budget, the deficit, the debt issues that you were talking about. I think those are critical. I enjoy this line, the Australian Foreign Minister said to me, he said the United States is one budget deal away from restoring its global preeminence, and that's the link about economics and security because it's the image of the United States.

What I haven't heard much talk about is, "Okay. If you do that at home, how are you going to link that to your global position," and this deals with trade policy, and deals with the growing middle income states, it deals with the Middle East in North Africa. That I think will be the critical question for the next President in Congress.

Larry: Let me just remind the audience here that on your tables you have cards and you should feel free to pick them up and jot a question. They will be brought up to me throughout. We'll spend the last several minutes with almost exclusively your questions, but I'll weave some through, and I'm going to start with one right now because it follows up on something, General Zinni that you mentioned. Here's a question from the audience, and it's a lot of talk about China. I'm sure we'll hear this on Monday at the Presidential debate as the reference.

Should we worry about China's footprint in Africa and Latin America? Should we worry about China's footprint in Africa?

Anthony: From my experience in the Middle East and Africa, and the places I've been involved in, I see a growing influence. I don't see necessarily, it's a threat in terms directly to us, what strikes me most is our absence, not their presence. Our absence, not their presence.

They're doing what naturally a rising power would do, an economic power. They're looking globally in terms of investment involvement, the influence that comes with it, the payback that comes with it.

I was recently in Saudi Arabia and they were amending the fact that American investors were there like Chinese investors, Western European investors and other. This is an economy that's beginning to diversify and stretch out and come to a realization they need to change this sort of single resource based economy, and we seem reluctant or scared off, which is not characteristic of who we are.

We shouldn't be shocked by what the Chinese do. We ought to look at it and say if they're making these kinds of investments, and they're willing to look at the risk and accept it, why aren't we there? Where's our presence?

That's what strikes me about it more than looking at it is as some sort of threat to us directly.

Larry: Wal-Mart got anything to say about to China?

Sylvia: We have a large presence.

Larry: One point two billion potential consumers.

Sylvia: Yes. Yes. Yes. I think obviously ...

Roberts: Imports too by the way, This only talks about exports. Your imports keep the cost down.

Sylvia: That is true as well. In terms of the question of China in Africa, I think when we think about our consumer markets, we think about the world one customer, one associate or what we call employee a time or one store at a time. We focus on it from a ... when we think about Africa, we think about that issue of what we're building for to serve.

The question of sourcing and that sort of thing I think is another question, but we're very helpful as a grocer. We're very helpful that on the continent of Africa, and you can actually do what we call direct sourcing.

Direct Sourcing helps local economies, we try and do it here in the United States as well. Any time you can do that agriculture product closer to you, that's better. From a sourcing perspective, we think about it that way.

From the other perspective, just in my old roles, at the Gates Foundation, one did come across the Chinese quite a bit as we worked on the continent of Africa, and you saw them, and my impression is the same as the Generals.

It's one of those things where it isn't a worry in terms of a fear about our national security or economic security, but just a question of, "Well, let's look and think about what role we should play when we see this Proactive role is being played," including educating African farmers and China, and you know they're going back. The Chinese have a special department at their ... in one of their Science and Technology places where they do all their reading, where they bring Africans to train them and are investing in human resources as well as the resources on.

I think it's a question of as the general said, "What should we be doing as we see this happening?"

Larry: Bob Zoellick, let me come back to the question of choices and budgets under siege and decisions that are going to have to be made because we have a good example here of this that I think leads to a very interesting question and discussion.

A midst all of the budget pressures and political diplomatic pressures, a midst the Arab Spring there's some choices that have had to be made and things that have been brought before.

A few weeks ago there was an amendment in the senate to cut off aid to Egypt, Pakistan and Libya. It was defeated overwhelmingly 81 to 10, but in the process,

in fact, there was a letter read on the floor from one of the advisers, military advisers to the USGLC, where he was concerned that a wholesale suspension, is what the letter said of U.S. Assistance to Nations in this region is not an American security interests.

Yet, there's this big question mark as to where the region is going. My question is this, as we think about how the region is going to move ahead and how the United States of America is going to be engaged in the region, what level of engagement and foreign assistance is necessary to be meaningfully engaged, still have in demand, accountability, and move the goals, American goals forward?

Robert: This is going to be a critical issue, and it's not only those issues though, it's also what the governments do. When you come back to all the examples we've talked about, one core lesson of development is, if the local people don't own it, it won't work. You can have the best experts, lots of money, all things.

What has changed over the past 20 or 30 years is now there's a lot of lessons from other developing countries that people can look at. For example, the subsidies programs in Egypt and others are extremely wasteful in terms of energy and food and others, but you have some examples from Mexico and Brazil, which have now gone to some 40 other countries how you can help the bottom 15% or 20% while requiring kids to go to school, get health checkups, all for about half of 1% of GDT, so it makes our entitle in this program suspect in terms of their efficiency.

I think it also depends on which country, and so this has to be tailored, so I don't happen to believe, let's take Egypt, that we should just keep doing things the way we did before. I think that it should be conditioned.

Larry: More condition than it's been?

Robert: Yes, on ... you have a change in regime, so number one, it's keeping the international treaties, but also ... and we were doing this actually at the World Bank is to say, "Look. One of these things we've learned from these revolutions is you got to bring in your society? What transparency? What accountability in your budget process? What citizen involvement," and with the whole role of information technology now, you've got wonderful opportunities, not just have ownership at the country level, but at community level so people have a say about their future.

These become not only lessons from the U.S. frankly. Most of the lessons are from other emerging market countries. In the case of Libya, look, Libya doesn't fundamentally need money. Libya's got a lot of oil. What it needs is some help in terms of governance and being able to sort of set up one of the things that the World Bank was doing, was trying to focus on some of the auditing and accounting functions and fiscal management functions.

I think a pull back and a walk away is obviously a mistake, the stakes are very, very high here. On the other hand, in a country like Tunisia, which is a little bit ahead of the others, we got the government to also engage women more effectively.

You're not going to make these economies work if you leave out 50% of the population. No blank check, it's got to be accountability, but lessons aren't just from the United States, it can be from others around the world.

Larry: I want to turn back to the audience for a minute. How many of you in the room, I'm curious, are involved in manufacturing here in the State in some way? How many involved in trade, international trade of businesses who are trading? There's some interesting numbers here as to how Florida, as a state fits in to all this.

About 15 of all manufacturing workers in Florida are connected or dependent in some way on exports for their job. About 11% of jobs supported by trade have increased by about 11% so we're seeing that export driven economy.

I'm wondering how you would connect this 1% of the budget to building the markets, expanding trade, maybe you want to start with this. It's not just about you investing there, but it's also connected to expanding trade that drives American jobs.

Sylvia: I think that what we want to do is grow those economies and create a large middle class. If you think about India now, India has a middle class of 250,000,000. That's ...

Larry: Is that helping our jobs in this country?

Sylvia: When those people are ... when you develop the middle class, there are demands for the goods that we will offer. That is why when 95% of consumers are outside the U.S. borders, we want those to be consumers that we serve, that good American products go and serve, and we believe that ... I believe that

that can happen and that's an important part of development and our relationships, why we want to create consumers that can purchase and desire and want great American products.

I think at the root of this is as that export, it's going to happen. Those consumers are going to, as they grow, and we want to be a part of that growth in terms of they understand that Americans are helpful to that process. I think people do remember, there was an announcement that was made when the World Bank and the Gates Foundation joined with others to announce a global fund on agriculture.

Bill Gates announced it with the South Korean Foreign Minister. He talked about actually how he remembered when he was hungry, and it was American food that he was given, and he remembered that and now they are a donor country.

I think the role that American's play in development isn't forgotten and is respected and appreciated. When you look at the statistics about President Bush and PEPFAR, which Bob mentioned. The continent of Africa was a place that always held very high in terms of that presidents respect, and so when we make those investments, we see that benefit. The people understand it and I think we will see that economic benefit in the form of exports.

Larry: Bob, a question from the audience. Years ago, there was a Mantra trade, not aid, today Chamber of Commerce says, "Trade and aid. What's the balance and how do they relate?"

Robert: I think you do need both, but let me come back to your question on this, is that the numbers I have here, about 2.3 million people employed in this state because of trade, and as these countries grow, then they will also invest and I think there's about another quarter million that are working at companies that are at least 50% owned, so as they grow, they invest. Going back to the China question, this isn't only going to be German or British or Deutsch companies, you're going to see, Brazilian companies, Chinese companies and others investing in jobs.

If you think about farmers, the American production, it is highly dependent on International market, so as people eat more, as the nutrition gets better, as they get the higher incomes. This is another huge possibility. I'll tell you the one that's kind of the sleeper out there that you're going to hear a lot more of.

A lot of the middle income countries are starting to run into what they call the middle income trap. This is the big discussion in China.

Larry: Who are the middle income?

Robert: Middle income countries are countries that are instead of say five to \$6,000 per company year up to 10 or 15,000, so it's not the bottom billion that are in the poorest condition, but ones a little bit higher

When you see over history is, is those economies can go rapidly with certain policies, then they tend to slow down. This is the discussion coming out of China. The World Bank did some work that showed that there were 101 middle income economies in 1960, by 2008 almost half our century later, only 13 had made it the middle income and one was Greece so you can decide whether it's 13 or 12.

One of the lessons is that they often are effective because of competition in the tradable sector, but there's services sectors are often terribly inefficient. This is logistics, it's transportations, it's communications, and some of the effective retail.

This is where about 75 to 80% of the U.S. economy is, is in the services sector. There's a great win-win possibility, if they start to liberalize in these areas, which they'll need to do to be more productive. You're going to have more opportunities for businesses all across the United States and other in the develop world.

You ask what is the ... how does the foreign assistance affect this? It's everything from, frankly, the bottom billion, which is actually about a billion and a half is that are you ever going to really have security if people don't have growth and opportunity and hope?

Two, helping countries grow, to building rule of law and governance and open trade systems. It's the investment across that whole chain. One other little reference point I find interesting is you talked about the Marshall plan.

In 1947, the average production, so GDP per capita in the United States is about a third of what it is today. You ask yourself, "If that generation could do it about a third as rich as we are, do we really walk away or should we feel that maybe we have an investment on this too?"

Larry: General Zinni, can I put you on the spot here for a minute? You're a military guy, you're a General, you're a tough guy. I can do this right?

Anthony: He's a marine.

Larry: There's all this talk that people who are doing this Presidential debates have to be journalists. I'm one. That would be fun, but what if we had a General moderating the debates? What ...?

Anthony: Things would run on time, that's for sure.

(clapping)

Larry: If you were moderating Monday's debate, on foreign policy, and you had a shot at asking these two people in front of the whole world, one question on foreign policy development, diplomacy, you name it, what would you ask them?

Anthony: I would ask, what I think is the underpinning of any discussion of where it has to begin on foreign policy, explain to me your national security strategy. What do you see as America's role in the world? What should we be doing? What is our place? How do we do it? How do we afford it, which are all of the tenants of a strategy?

There's a requirement for the president to develop a national security strategy by law and present it the first 150 days of his or her presidency and they very rarely do it.

It's supposed to be the guiding document when the budget process every year goes about. It's supposed to inform the budget decisions. Instead, we have a congress that resorts to earmarks and pork, and cherry picks programs, and you don't see a strategic basis for what we do.

My question would be, Mr. President or Mr. potential President, describe to me your national security strategy?

Larry: Would this conversation that we've been having here today be part of that national security?

Anthony: It has to be because a national security strategy has to be all encompassing. Maybe we should even drop the term, national security strategy because it's really a global strategy that describes our place in the world, our involvement and how the president intends to do the principle things that his office has required to do and that's to ensure our protection and also our prosperity, and our well-being, way of life. That goes into all the things we've talked about here.

It also needs to recognize the world we live in today. This is not the cold war era or the era before that. This is an era of globalization, information technology, massive diasporas, environmental issues. All these things come into play, and these dynamics have changed this world significantly.

I still feel we govern and act like we're still back in the cold war.

Larry: You do?

Anthony: I do. I don't think anybody understands the world we live in today, that probably a dozen to two dozen factors are constantly churning and changing this world day in and day out, and we still act like ... we still have a government system that's back there.

We need another 1947 National Security Act. We have a government that is a bloated bureaucracy, it's ponderance, it's a difficult to make decisions, and get it done the right way. No business could function this way. We streamline, what we do, we act faster, we decide faster, we capitalize on information technology and globalization, and yet we still like to act like this is the 50's and the 60's and the 40's, so when Bob Zoellick becomes Secretary of State, we can fix all this.

Larry: Maybe you shouldn't be moderating the debate. Maybe you should have some other role up there on stage. Bob, you're here not in a political capacity and not on your capacity as transition adviser to the Romney campaign and national security, but I would say this, I'm sort of struck by ... and Governor Romney spoke at the Clinton Global Initiative not long ago and he talked about the need for investment driven engagement in the world, very similar to what I'm hearing from this administration. What's new on the table?

Robert: I want to come ... I'll try to address that, but I think this point you mentioned, you posed to Tony is a very important one because if you go back and you listen to the primary debates, or frankly I looked at the categories that Bob Schieffer put out for the foreign policy debate. There's not a word on international economics. Not a word.

Let's just think, we've talked about the Marshall plans and so forth. There's a little crisis going on in Europe with Eurozone. Do you think that maybe it might be of interest to people to have a sense of, "If the Eurozone breaks up, and our traditional ally for 60 years is under threat and that affects Europe's ability to be a partner, does that matter to American foreign policy?" You raised these questions.

Larry: You actually want us to have a conversation like this in a political [inaudible 01:19:10] Imagine that.

Robert: You raise these questions with people and they say, "That's economics," and I guess part of what we're talking about here whether it's aid, investment, trade, "Yeah. It's economics and it's darn important to your foreign policy as well as it was in the mid-20th century."

I think the core question that I come back to and it goes to your question. I like to believe that one of the things that for, Governor Romney, but I'm not going to be here and trying to do a political capacity as a business person, this question I post for whoever wins, that clearly number one issue is going to begin the budget and the spending, the deficit debt down because otherwise we just go broke as a country and we can't handle this, but you can't stop there.

What will be your international economic component with middle income countries, bottom billion, fragile states, trade agenda, and that's what I think will be the most important issue for whoever the president is.

Larry: If you were the debate moderator, what would you ask?

Sylvia: I think I would build on the question that was asked and ask about how do you, each of the candidates, as president, how will you ... what will your objectives be with regard to promotion of security, promotion of prosperity and promotion of our values, and give the three priorities in each of those areas so we can have a picture of the tradeoff's you'd make.

Larry: General Zinni, a question from the audience. Big debate in the Presidential campaign on Libya, and the failure of our security and diplomatic intelligence agencies. What happened?

(laughing)

Anthony: I think it's time, time is running.

Larry: They have a follow up by the way.

Anthony: Obviously Tom Pickering is running the investigation as I understand it, and obviously I think we need to see what the investigation reveals. I'm sure the investigation will look at the intelligence part, but did we know and maybe didn't get disseminated, what didn't we know and why didn't we know it. I think we

look hard at the security and the facilities there. I think it's important to look at satellite facilities.

I'm sure our embassies are in good shape. When we start talking about our consulates and other satellite facilities that we have and institutions in these places. We need to ensure we don't forget security there.

We also, I think, need to look at how security is provided. I had some instances ... we had the embassies in Dar Es Salaam in Nairobi attacked when I was at CENTCOM, and we were scrambling to get the right security, and then what is the role of Department of Defense?

The marines that are there for internal security, marine security guard are different than the ones that were deployed, they come from DOD, the Fleet Antiterrorism Support teams and others have come in there, the special operations teams that do specialized work in that area.

I think I would hope out of this investigation looks at, how do we streamline communicate, command and control and not only harden the facilities from the construction point of view, but look how the physical security is increased and ratchet it up or decrease.

We caught ourselves deploying teams out there that weren't acceptable in some countries, I think Sudan and others rejected it, some didn't make it to the scene of the crime.

I think from all this, there's a lot to be learned and fixed. I don't the details of what happened. I do know from people on the ground this was a coordinated attack, when people are mortaring you and they're hitting targets they've obviously ...

Larry: It's not just some random things from ...

Anthony: Not random, it was a complex attack, it came from many angles, it was coordinated. If that's the case then that ratchets it up a whole different level in terms of the kinds of security you needed in places like this and satellites that we have like this.

Larry: We have just a couple of minutes before we segway into the next panel where we will talk about the two campaigns and what the presidential candidates are saying.

I want to ask each of you just a couple of quick ones here with one great one from the audience that will wrap us up.

You've talked a lot about investment, about how these tough choices are going to be made when the budget is just squeezed as it is. What a lot of Americans will say is, "What we want, of course we want to stay involved in the world. Of course the Marshall plan was a good thing, but we want to make sure we're getting value for our money. We want to make sure that we're getting a return on our investment." I, as Joe citizen, read my newspapers or what's left of them, or go online or wherever I'm getting my information. One of my worries is, I read about corruption in these governments. I read about pay offs. I read about billions of dollars in Iraq that just go missing.

Tell me please, how we make sure that corruption is not running away with the money that we're doing, that you assure citizens, businesses and American investors, that these investments are going to have the transparency and accountability that they would have if we were making them in this country? Mr. former World Bank, you want to ...

Robert: I dealt with this everyday at the World Bank where we get about 60 to \$70 billion of investments a year and I think you have to deal with it in a couple of different levels.

One is, within your own systems, there's ... you need to be extremely rigorous in terms of no tolerance, the types of accountability you build in, the transparency, but there's not only the level of whether money is stolen, it's even if it's not stolen is it effective?

That's another critical area, and it's hard in this field. To be honest with people, there's a lot of devoted people in this field of development trying to help people in very difficult circumstances. What we have to safeguard against is what I used to call the, Gee, it should have worked, it could have worked, it would have worked, but they deny that it actually didn't work, and then we have to learn.

It's not so easy if people invest years of their life in something. We have to build in the culture and, frankly, the feedback loops where you create this rigor, and this goes to the third point.

I mentioned the criticality in this societies. You can always run your own fiduciary programs in certain care. I think the bigger challenge is also taking some of these

changes in information, and that's why I was emphasizing the transparency of the accounts, so that you build in the community.

Let me give you one of my favorite examples. Somebody came up with the idea that you would post on the door of a school the fact that you were supposed to have 150 textbooks and two teachers. Rather than have my auditors run in and out to see whether this is the case or not, if you could have the people in the community say, "Hey. We only had 100 textbooks and only one teacher shows up. Who was this?" Then you've got the ability, and now you do have this capability, so that people can participate in this process through their mobile phones, through other aspects.

Larry: Social media.

Robert: Build ... Exactly. One of the other things I start at the bank was actually support for civil society groups to be socially accountable sort of checks on the system. I think on the one hand, one has to recognize, look at our own society and others, some of these take time, but stealing from the poor is the worst thing imaginable.

I think for those who are stewards of the system, you need to have good fiduciary systems, but you need to take advantage of trying to build in a systemic check.

Larry: You dealt with this all the time at the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. You've giving away incredible amounts of money and you want to make sure that they're not just falling through the rat holes, right?

Are there systems ... are you convinced that can do this? Are we doing them now? Can we do them as a government so we can assure American tax payers and others that their dollars are going where they're supposed to go?

Sylvia: I believe that we can. One of the pieces that's a piece of good news is that, Bob from where he set, and where I set, we actually have the exact same recipe for success. That's number one, clear measurements of effectiveness. That gets to not just the question of corruption, but are you spending the dollars well?

Start up front by agreeing with the countries, with the grantees, with the partners on how you're going to measure impact and outcomes.

The second is zero tolerance. You have to pull out. You have to be willing, and that's ...

Larry: That's get's really hard, right? If you've got humanitarian or their aid going in there because people are hungry or starving or dying, and you're going to pull out because there's corruption there, you can do that?

Sylvia: You can do it on a grant by grant basis, you can do it in terms of how you think about agreements, Madagascar in terms of a place where the U.S. government I think has recently taken it's aid down.

You have to ... I think that's a very specific ...

Robert: And which program do you work with? You may not pull out of every country, but what you will do, whether you give support to budget, which people. I agree, this is a critical point and to sustain ... it's a bigger message ... to sustain foreign assistance, you have to be able to say no at times.

Sylvia: Even in our own organization, there have been time where one part of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation shutdown a grant, but they were very successfully delivering in another part of the organization and we didn't, to Bob's point, about programs.

I think that it is putting together the plan to do it. The third thing is I completely agree. The engagement of the people, strengthening people's ability to hold their governments and their societies accountable, through information and things they've never had before. People will use the tool.

When it's their health, their kids education, they will do the example that Bob just did times a hundred.

Larry: General?

Anthony: I think there's a model here. We provide security assistance. If you looked at the structure of the Security Assistance Programs that we put in place, in places like Egypt and Saudi Arabia, in other places, we are held accountable, the U.S. The providers of the resources and they're answerable to our administration and to congress for that expenditure, and monitoring how the money is spent, where it goes. Is it a full proof system? Obviously not. No system is with that kind of money.

We have this structure in place to ensure it goes where it's intended to go. Secondly, as a Regional Commander, I was called back to justify the investment. When people ask, "But what are we getting for \$1.3 billion?" I can tell you, the

Egyptians have a division show up in the Gulf War, brigade goes to Somalia. When we need to get in to the region, we get priority through the Suez Canal.

We get over flight rights and diplomatic clearances immediately. We could use their bases to operate from. They provide us the largest training area, air, sea and land space in the world to train and exercise our war plans every other year. Plus, they converted their military from a Soviet style military to a U.S. style, in operational design, doctrine and equipment. Obvious benefits come here.

I'm just saying there is a model, but this is the whole point of why we're here. We are given the resources in defense to build the structure, to monitor this, and ensure accountability for where it goes.

We need this, I think, in the other areas that we're involved.

Larry: Your last question and we're going to go to this panel, and I'm going to involve the audience even more if I can do that with you when we talk about the campaigns and the candidates.

Here's a question. Since I've already asked you to role play once on if you were a moderator. It's January 20th, 2013, and President Obama-Romney, Romney-Obama call you into the Oval Office and he says to you, "Oh my gosh. I got four more years or four new years to do this job. We have a mess in the world. We have a heck of a budget problem here at home. We got all this technology running around. We also have opportunities. What should I do for the next hundred days in the world, for the world?" What would you would tell him?

Sylvia: I would probably start with, "In the next hundred days, you need to take actions that are symbolic of the overarching direction that you need to take in this fear that we've been talking about in terms of whether you call it national security or global participation.

We need to define those actions quickly and hopefully in the transition, Bob, that it'll be taking care of and that that will be happening.

Larry: Are you suggesting something?

Sylvia: No. I'm just suggesting that it will be happening.

Robert: We're friends.

Sylvia: The second thing is that you need to put together the clear plan that you're willing to articulate to both the world and the country about what we've all been talking about in terms of this overarching plan.

The third thing that I would tell the President is, whether it's President Obama or President Romney, that it is very important that in these early stages, you create the relationships, both outside this country and inside this country, that will make whatever strategy you're going to implement over the next four years, that you put in place the relationships that will make you able to succeed, both in the Congress, in the country and our external partners that you start with that.

Larry: General?

Anthony: I would say Mr. President, the first thing to do is erase the board completely. What I mean by that is, don't accept any assumptions, don't accept any legacy commitments that you have, take a fresh look and making assessment of the world you're in today, decide what role we're going to play here, ask the hard questions, as the Department of Defense, why do we have troops in Germany? Why do we have them in Japan? Why in South Korea? Why are we a native?

Maybe there's good answers, maybe there's not. Why are we protecting the flow of energy out of the Persian Gulf when virtually no other allies are there with minimal exceptions?

That's the Carter Doctrine. That's a lot of presidents ago. We're still enforcing it. If you have these legacy commitments that you've always assumed were right, and they're costing the American tax payer money, justify the dollars. Do an assessment and then go to that strategy based on a new assessment. Don't accept the assumptions.

Larry: You may actually have this job of walking into the Oval Office. You're probably thinking, I'm not endorsing, I'm just commenting on the viability of the questions ...

Robert: Let's deal with the hypothetical. I think these are both very, very good answers. I guess ...

Larry: What would you say?

Robert: What I would emphasize is, look, I believe that the budget debt deficit problem is not only fundamental to the American economy, but as the Australian Foreign Minister said, "The ability of the United States to revive itself." We've all been

around the world. We've seen one of the things that always distinguishes the United States from other countries is this ability ... People don't quite understand it. It looks messy, it's cacophonous and all that, but the United States somehow can reinvent itself in ways that Japan and Europe can't. The key to that is a pro-growth package, I won't ... with tax reform and other things so that we not only get the economic fundamentals right, but we unleash the incredible possibilities we have, which are in innovation and energy and other things.

The United States has got enormous potential here, but that would be kind of the number one focus. The number two though, coming back to Tony's point is I've been in both campaigns in government. There is a little dangerous transition there, I mean in which you can go back and look with missile gaps in 1960 or Bayou of Pigs and others. I would suggest that the President be very careful with the campaign team that says we must do this, and this, and this. I would sort of say, "Look, you're going to bear these crosses for four or eight years. Get good advice, think through carefully exactly for the big steps that you're going to take."

Third though I think that Sylvia's point about some of the symbolism international is important. I guess I would start with our hemisphere. I really think that one of our strengths again is North America with energy and others, you got a new Mexican President coming into office in December 1, you've got a very good Canadian partner, so I would ... while I'd do the things with Europe and Asia and others, I would start by saying, "This is North America. This is going to buy our economic in human future, so I'd do some symbolic things on that firm.

Anthony: Can I just ... one really quick follow up? It was triggered with what was said. When President Eisenhower came in, the first thing he did was form the Solarium Group. He went to Dean Acheson, he says get me smart people who disagree with each other, they decided this in the Solarium room of the White House, that's why it was called that. Eisenhower used to convene them to do just this and he didn't intervene or give guidance, he just took notes. He wanted to hear their debates and discussions to better understand what he was in for, and what the world was like.

We could use a repeat of that to follow up ...

Larry: I think that's the usefulness of this conversation actually is to have that debate and have this discussion for this room and people beyond through the camera to be part of. I would just say to all of you and I hope you'll stay with us. Please do

because now we'll go from policy to politics and we'll see how this might turn into a conversation at the debate on Monday.

You've had access to an incredible group of people here with unbelievable experience and service and dedication and commitment to this country, and I hope you'll join me in thanking them for their insights.

(clapping)

Before anybody can move ... Thank you very much. I'd like to bring to the stage Ann Lewis. I'm going to move over here. Ann Lewis is going to join us and as the Service of Senior Advisor for Hillary Clinton's Presidential campaign, and as Director of Communications, then Councilor to President Bill Clinton.

She is active in a number of organizations and a number of issues, such as healthcare reform, economic work, family policies, International and National Women's Rights and security matters.

Al Cardenas? Where is he? Chairman of the ... Oh, he's here. Chairman of the American Conservative Union, founding partner at Tew Cadenas, Cardenas which is ... as well as the Senior partner at Cardenas Partners.

You both heard the conversation. You both heard what everybody had to say. I'm going to start with you. You're a democrat, you're a Republican. If you were the moderators, what would you start by asking and if you start with a question to Barack Obama, what would your question to Obama be?

Al: Mr. President, the world ... you found the world in a difficult place. We're now four years later. Arab Spring hasn't turn out the way our country wanted to. Our economy is faltering, part of it because some of our foreign competitors are beating us to the punch.

What is it that you have failed that in the last four years and how would you correct these mistakes in the next four years?

Larry: What would your question to Obama be?

Ann: Very good. Can I just start before we do this and before we get into places in which Al and I are going to disagree, and say how much I love that last panel. What I felt listening to was we agree on that. That the common sense, the ideas of your panelist have about the importance of international engagement. Those are shared. The good news is, there's a basis here that we can work on.

So much for agreeing and now we get back to ...

[cross talking 01:38:59]

Larry: The agreement is significant and its important. You know it used to be said, I was there with Ronald Reagan at the Brandenburg Gate, when he said Mr. Gorbachev tear down this wall. We commonly reported on and talked about when our world was seen through the prism of the cold war about how partisanship stopped at those sort of water's edge of foreign policy.

It doesn't do that quite so much anymore, but It appears that it is reemerging around this notion of American engagement in the world. That is significant, and the partnerships and all the vested interest, if we are going to compete as a country on any level.

Al: The truth of the matter, Frank, is in spite of the anxiety that this lack of partisanship has brought to America, truth of the matter, if you look at it, is we really share in the same objectives, it's how do we get there that we disagree.

We all know that we need to get our education for our kids in a better place who are going to be competitive. We all want to lower the unemployment rate in this country.

We all want America's role in the world to be as enhanced as it can be for there to be greater opportunities and peace abroad, and hopefully share some of our time, test that values with the world. The challenge always is, is how do we get to those places.

Larry: Let's hear your question for Obama.

Ann: We were stronger when we thought the politics stopped the water's edge, I hope we get back there. I think my first question to Governor Romney would be something like, "Governor, you have been very critical of President Obama in a number of areas including Iran and the Iran's nuclear weapons program. What is it ... and yet when we looked at what is being done, President Obama has lead us in international sanctions, he has said directly and more than once, "We will not permit Iran to get nuclear weapons."

What is it you would do differently? Not what you've said, but what is it you would actually do differently?

Larry: What would he say? What do you think?

Al: I think Governor Romney would say, "This is about optics, about perceptions, about conclusions as to the fortitude and resolve of our country." I would have met with Benjamin Netanyahu at the United Nations instead of going to the view.

I would have met with him and shared my thoughts as to what we need to do to save the world in Middle East from nuclear Armageddon. I would have told the world and Iran in particular that we share Israel's concern for their survival. We frankly share the Arab world's concern for nuclear proliferation because if Iran gets these nuclear weapons, other countries in the Middle East will raise to do the same. You need to talk to Iran and you need to talk to Iran in a stronger sense of commitment that will not allow this to happen.

Second, I would say to you, that for a matter of such intensity, for a matter that is coming quickly to appoint in four months from now where these nuclear grade materials are going to be available. You need to get the rest of the world more tuned in with us. It can't just be the United States talking to Iran, and I don't see enough of our friends by our side when these conversations are out of place.

Larry: Ann?

Ann: I go back and then say, again, I think our agreement is perhaps greater than the rhetoric might suggest, the conversations between President Obama and Prime Minister Netanyahu about the dangers of Iran have been ongoing. He has met with Prime Minister Netanyahu more than any other leader, I believe, and not only at the presidential level, but at the military level.

Again, the diplomatic level, those conversations are ongoing and they're real and, in fact, as we meet today and talk, there was a joint exercise, the largest ever. U.S./Israel military exercise underway or underway within the next few days, the troops are arriving now, and what they will be going through are how to defend Israel from every level of attack. It's not just conversation, but it's putting our strength, our power where our values are. I think that's very important.

The second piece is, I sometimes get frustrated with our allies. The good news is, on the issue of sanctions to Iran, the European union has continued to ratchet up sanctions and you can look at the results in the Iran economy. Is it enough to turn them around?

No. A regime that will shoot down its own people in the street because they dare to protest a rigged election. May not care that their economy is failing. We will

see in a couple of months if it begins to hit the revolutionary guard and some of the top leaders, whether that's enough to change them.

I do believe our allies have gone farther, have done more than we have ever seen before.

Larry: I asked our previous panel to role play, now I will. I asked you to role play. I'm the moderator of the debate.

Ann: Can I be the general?

Larry: You can be whatever you want. I would ask Governor Romney to start with, Governor Romney, recently you spoke at the Clinton Global Initiatives, and you talked about the legitimate objectives of foreign aid, of U.S. foreign aid. You talked about three basic tenants of that; Humanitarian needs, fostering strategic interest of the United States and aid that connected to what he referred to as something that would elevate people and brings about lasting change and communities and nations.

My question to you is, what's different about that than what we've been doing all along. What would you do in terms of U.S. Foreign Aid that's a change?

Al: Look, Frank. The challenge that this country has is not only to Foreign Aid that's destined to help these countries, but destined to help them beyond our assistance so that they can help themselves, so that nations can graduate from aid like South Korea has for example.

We have a challenge in how we're doing this, and that is engaging the rest of the world in a multi-faceted basis, beginning with trade as our center piece. There are a hundred trade agreements being negotiated in the world today. The United States is involved in one of them. That is a far cry from the days of Bill Clinton, when we had the America's initiative. We had world trade agreements being discussed everywhere.

This administration has been laxing in promoting free trade. The free trade agreements that we've finally passed were actually negotiated by the Bush Administration and it took three years for this administration to be willing to invest a political will to bring it to Congress and get it passed. Still, they're just about to begin, but we've lost four years and thousands of job opportunities, of that delay.

What Governor Romney is suggesting is that we need to interlink our trade policy with our foreign assistance, develop private public partnerships. Go beyond the micro financing opportunities that we have into a second level for small and middle class businesses that can't quite, in these developing countries, get financing, and be able to be providing the synergy of capital so that they can, themselves begin to begin entrepreneurs and create a middle class.

Larry: Since I'm the moderator, I would say, "Governor, your time is up. Mr. Obama, your response?"

Al: Which they do to him often incidentally.

Ann: I would say ...

Larry: We're not running the little clock thing here.

Ann: Darn.

Larry: We can give you dials if you like.

Ann: Because we could run over you. Yes.

Larry: I won't let you.

Ann: I got it. I would say two things. What I also read, Governor ... in fact I heard Governor Romney's speech at the Clinton Global Initiative, my thought was terrific and again, it was an example to me of how we agree on. The day before Secretary Clinton had also spoke of at the Global Initiative. She talked about foreign aid in Tunisia going forward, she also talked about a larger role for the private sector, and how the State Department in U.S.A. to working with the private sector, and then of course the next day Governor Romney came in and talked about the private sector and I thought, "Okay. We got this right. Whatever happens next, we are going in the right direction."

I would say look again at the record, look at the many ways we have found going through the state department, going through USAID, going to against smaller version compacts, not necessarily country to country treaties, but look at the agreements that have been made to increase imports, to increase training and facilitate imports and exports back and forth. Look at the Eximbank, the record of the Eximbank over the last three years. Look at the record of OPIC, Overseas Private Investment Corporation. Again we are totally committed to that, and I think it's a record feel good though.

Larry: What do you expect from Romney on Monday night in this debate?

Al: This debate ...

Larry: It's built all around the foreign policy.

Al: In terms of style and substance, Foreign policy has always called for all, for participants, to be at their best behavior, so to speak. I think that we talked about becoming the Commander-in-chief of our country, the leader of a free world. Both candidates hopefully will rise to the level that the occasion calls for.

I'll see Mitt Romney as a measured leader, someone who will speak about our general policies, our policies of engagement in the world. He will be obviously ... he'll distinguish himself in terms of believing that our country needs to take more of initiative rather than delay our leadership in places like Syria and others where we think that we've lacked in that time frame that's required of a world leader.

I think frankly that our role in Afghanistan and Iraq, I don't think our parties will have that much of a difference. We take great exception with the president, calling for a timeline, not that Mitt Romney's timeline would have been any different, but I think you ask most respect at military leaders and they'll tell you that frankly that's a political decision, not a military decision to tell the world about a timeline.

I think things like that where you interject politics into military decisions are really not very wise.

Larry: What do you expect from President Obama?

Ann: I think President Obama is going to say, "When I became President four years ago, I made a commitment to the American people that I would be a wise steward of our global leadership and I have met that commitment. We have ended the war in Iraq, we are winding down the war in Afghanistan that's a direction in American people were ready to go, they had gone on too long, costing us in not just the resources, but in the men and women who've been over there. We are moving forward aggressively to build alliances, to strengthen our friendships, which again to use all the tools in our power to build a safer and more secure world.

Larry: Let me ask you both to address this and then we're going to wrap up because I think people have to get on with their lives and we'll invite some closing remarks. We had a very interesting conversation with General Zinni and Bob Zoellick and

Sylvia up here a few minutes ago about some of the successes in the investments and the place that this 1% goes.

Whoever comes in to the Oval Office for the next four years and I'd like each of you to represent your person. How will they, do you think, build on those successes, if we accept the successes that we've heard of as successes? The objective would be the build on those. Ann, go first.

Ann: I think I'll pick up where I left off and say the president said, when he came in, he was committed to being a wise steward, that while he has wrapped up some engagement so he think had come to the end of the term, he is ready to move forward, for example on the pivot to the Pacific. The United States is and must remain a Pacific power. We should be spending more time and attention with our allies and our, their neighbors if there is an ocean between us. It is also in our interest both, again, national security, economic prosperity, and with Latin America, that these are areas that deserve more attention, it's good for us to be there. He will be talking about moving forward, building on what's been achieved in the first term, building on our record of, again, friendship, of development, of the kinds of new institutions.

He's continued PEPFAR for example, the Millennial challenge, both of which were started by President Bush, but adding new programs like the N2 food and security.

It's hard for people to think about democracy or human rights if their children are starving. We will talk about continuing to go forward in that way, and again coming back to the argument, international engagement is in our national interest. He wants to continue to lead us there.

Al: Frank, I ... Obviously, I agree with the President that our engagement in the Pacific rim is as critical. The challenge that I have in coinciding with him as does Governor Romney, is that while it's a wise policy it requires a significant amount in investment and expanding our Naval capabilities. The sequestration agreement that the President had as proposed, the military budget that he has in mind just does not match the needs that we have in our military and we have like a \$2 trillion difference over the next number of years in terms of what we need for our Defense Department in order to meet basically the similar objectives that we have. We think that the present objectives are too generous for the budget that he's trying to assume and frankly that's just not responsible in meeting that criteria that we need.

The second point I would add is the fact that our trade possibilities, the interaction between trade and foreign assistance is as much dependent on our National Economic Domestic Policy as abroad.

We're looking at our needs for the future to be competitive in the world, 60 some percent of our workforce will need to have some sort of college participation, it's now at 40 some percent. We have a Tax and Regulatory Policy that's not competitive with the rest of the world. Frankly, lastly, we haven't taken the initiative to engage these other countries. As I mentioned, there are a hundred trade agreements on the table and we're participating in one.

Larry: I'm going to add, that's the chair to ask people who are sitting in it, a trick questions. I'm going to ask you a trick question now. Is that all right?

Al: Yes.

Larry: I was just joking. It's all about partnerships. Two weeks ago, I had the thrill of going over the State Department when there was a World Food Program event, and awards were being given away. One of the awards was given to one of America's Ambassadors to the world on the World Food Program, and it was Christina Aguilera. Not bad, right?

Who would be Mitt Romney's Christina Aguilera? If you're advising them right, how do you one up that?

Al: That's a great question. Let me think through my realm of favorite participants. I think she would be fine. I'd like to see high profile entertainers who obviously introduced ...

Larry: Who's your favorite?

Al: Oh my gosh. Listen, I go back to the soul days of Otis Redding and Wicked Pickett and James Brown and I go to ... Frankly, one of my favorite entertainers was at the Democratic National Convention and I thought that Mary Bilch. I thought she did a great job. I'm kind of a sold man when it comes to ...

Of course I like my Latin flavor and Salsa and I sponsored. Probably, I say the best party right here in Tampa, the Republican Convention which is at Cuba building with Willie Chirino, we had a great Salsa moment, and thousands of people and I'd certainly ask Willie to help with South America and Latin American.

Larry: If we can capture some of this talent, and some of this commitment around the issue of American Leadership in the world of engagement, that would be a great thing. Al Cardenas, thank you very much and Ann Lewis.

Al: Thank you.

Ann: Thank you.

Al: Hey, Ann. Welcome to ...

[crosstalk 01:55:51]

Ann: We're in the same generation.

Mark: I'm Mark Green, Senior Director of the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition. I have the toughest job, I have to follow all these great speakers. I will do so and I will be very, very brief.

First off, obviously thanks to our speakers and our moderator. All of our speakers, I learned a great deal today. I thought it was an extraordinary session. Thanks to our Partners, the Greater Tampa Chamber of Commerce and the Tampa Downtown Partnership.

As I looked back at some of what was said today, I think we have great lessons that we can take going forward. We heard from a soldier that soldiers were being called upon to do things that soldiers don't necessarily have the full capability to do.

They will do what they're called upon to do and do so bravely. We also heard a warning that we should not conduct foreign policy as though the cold war is still on.

We heard a lot about how this very complicated multifaceted world. We have a number of institutions playing remarkable innovative roles, philanthropy, business and government, and how each has a certain core competency that we need to see brought forward to have true sustainable success.

We heard about how the U.S. government must be a player at the table in this multifaceted world. If we aren't a player at the table, it will hurt us not just in terms of our policy but in terms of our economic interest.

We also heard over and over again accountability, accountability, accountability and the need to demand results. We also heard from Al the great parties that he throws here in Tampa. I was there. It was a great party.

I would invite all of you to look on your table, you'll see one of these cards. Take the card. We need your partnership. The U.S. Global Leadership Coalition, we have something called impact 2012 and Florida is particularly important. I know the saying is that all men are created equal, it's not true, some are more equal, Florida is more equal every four years. It's always Florida, Florida, Florida. You have an outsized voice in this process.

Over the next 19 days, and I suspect, over the next 19 days and four years, our leaders will listen more closely than ever to all of you. What we're looking for is not your money, we're not looking for a lot of time, we're looking for your voice.

Raise your voice, make sure you reach out to our leaders in both sides of the isle and talk about the importance of these very, very key diplomatic, economic and national security tools because what we heard from all of our speakers today is that for the U.S. to lead, for the U.S. to be successful, for the U.S. to be strong, our leaders need all the tools of power and leadership. That's really what the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition represents.

I saw Avi Glandon here. Where's Avi? Avi is our Associate for Florida, a Regional Associate. Get to know him if you don't. He will tackle you as you walk out the door, but he is our key pivotal leader here and again, we're not looking for a lot from you, but we are looking for your voice because this is Florida's moment as always every four years to shine. You do have a chance to do so much and we look forward to working with you. Again, thanks to all of you for your time. I hope you enjoyed as much as I do. Thank you.