

[0:21:00]

Joe Sestak:

Could I have your attention? Could I have some of your attention? Can you hear me in the back? Great. All right. We'd all like to begin this event and I very much appreciate everyone attending. I'm Joe Sestak and I'm co-chair with Governor Schweiker of Pennsylvania's chapter of the Global Leadership Conference. Governor Schweiker had a long standing commitment and so he asked me to pass to you his deep regards and thanks for attending today along with mine.

Particularly, we'd like to thank Larry Summers and Steven Hadley for coming here today to talk about the context for strong US engagement overseas because of the value it has to America's security. I'm surely going to introduce Liz Schrayner who is the executive director of the United States Global Leadership Coalition. She'll talk about the very fine purpose and the mission of the coalition. In my introductory comments, what I thought the value of my words might be is if they could be shaped into a sailor's story. Since I spent 31 years in the navy, about the import of what that mission means on the deck plates when you're overseas.

When I was a young naval officer in command of my very first ship, what we call a "small boy", about 150 guys. We pulled into Egyptian port and we are on our way to the Persian Gulf. A number of Egyptian officers got under way with us because we were going to do an exercise and they want to observe how we did it technologically. When we pulled back into port about a day or two later, one of the young officers said to me as he departed, "you know Captain; you treat your enlisted men different than we do. You treat them as though they're equal to you." I said, "Well you know they respect rank." He said, "No, that's not what I mean." He said, "You treat them like your equal human beings to you. We don't do that." I thought about that incident when the Arab Spring was occurring. Our chairman of the Joint Chief of Staff with almost every senior military officer was asked by the administration to call their counterparts in the Egyptian military.

To let them know to tell Mubarak that the game was up and they did that. Then they peacefully accepted the election of President Morsi as well as his dismissal of every head of the defense and intelligence agencies, military officers. My 31 years in the navy convinced me that other nations look at us with great respect for the power of our military that I was part of and with great respect for the power of our economy that Larry Summers will speak about. They really admire us for the value of our ideals and that's what happened during that Arab Spring.

Something else happened the night of that embassy in Egypt was attacked. We had 100 chief executive officers from US businesses brought to Egypt that day. In order to begin investing in that country brought there by the United States government. Which brings me to Afghanistan, I headed Deep Blue the navy's anti terrorism unit. Shortly after that war began, I had to go on the ground for a very short mission, nothing like our army or marine corp. I saw how well our military was doing there. Then years later after the military had kind of put a template of some suspility there.

Years later, I can remember hearing about the economic opportunity that was being provided by the Taliban. As they offered for wages, three times what the police force gets in Afghanistan which is well above what the common citizen there receives. Then the director of the Central Intelligence Agency said the greatest threat to US National Security is the global economy. As a thousand Tajik men left the oil fields of Russia, came back home with no endowment, no jobs, no future opportunity and the warlord who was a Tajik aligned with the Taliban said, "Come and work for me."

That brings me back to those 100 CEOs that were brought by the power of our diplomacy that Steven Hadley will speak about today. To be able to understand that Egypt has a possibility to go the way of Turkey of being two strong anchors out there with their strength of their economy to where, like that Tunisian street peddler, who set himself a blaze and the whole Middle East afire, just wanted the fruits of his labor to be given back to him.

That country can be a stable ball work for us with Turkey and own the suitcase a province sharing them with us forward, if we remember the trifecta that we have here and that will be spoken off about tonight. There is the power of our military but there is the power of our economy and there is the power of our diplomacy. That's what this event is about. What I learned during those 31 years is militaries can stop problems, we can't fix them. If you want to prevent a crisis from occurring or have a possibility of doing it and not just stopping a crisis but then fixing it afterwards if you haven't prevented, it is the trifecta with the military as a backbone.

On that rid crage leading our US engagement overseas well funded is the power of our economy whether it's capitalist going over the CEOs or whether it's economic assistants at crucial moments. Second the power of our economy, for as Larry Summers that surely will speak about tonight or this afternoon. If you look at the genie coefficient that he

probably lives and breathes, that this great globalization of this world has brought us closer together, in common quality among all countries of the world has actually decreased. But income in equality in almost every country of the world within the countries except for Latin America has actually increased.

As the director of the Central Intelligence Agency said, “that global economy and how those Tajiks were attracted to the Taliban not for ideology but for wage is ultimately I think what are peace and prosperity around this world means under strong US leadership not just military but which represented today by Steven Hadley and Larry Summers and the trifecta of strong US engagement. With that I’d like to introduce Liz Schrayner who is the executive director and somehow pulled me in to be a co-person here. It certainly wasn’t for my recent lack of political success probably more with my veteran background and to all the vets out there, thanks a hell of a lot for your service.

Liz Schrayner:

Thank you to Joe Sestak who is been an incredible support and leader. Welcome to all of you. We are thrilled to be here in Philly as the US Global Leadership Coalition partners with three fabulous organizations, Team Pennsylvania Foundation, the Fels Institute of Government at the University of Pennsylvania and Pennsylvania’s Department of Community and Economic Development. To come here today, I took the train in from DC last night and I thought how timely our conversation is.

As you think about the complexities of the world around us and smack in the middle of just 11 days before the election, a few days after we heard the foreign policy debate. I thought about how fortunate we are to have Steven Hadley and Larry Summers share some of their thinking, their experience, their thoughts about America’s role in the world. I want to give a shout out to a few people that are here today particularly those that are walking around with an orange ribbon on their name tag which represents the US Global Leadership Coalitions Pennsylvania Advisory Consul. We are thrilled that Joe Sestak and Mark Schweiker, our co-chairs still with now over 100 business military faith-based and communities from throughout the state that have lend their support to us.

We also have many guests here from the public either representing or our public officials yourself. Let me just ask you to hold your applause but recognize a few of those including Ari Mitt leman and James Lee from the office of Senator Bob Casey; James Fitzpatrick from the office of Senator Pat Toomey; from the office of Senator Chris Coons, Christy Gleason. We have a few folks that are representing the house delegation

from Allyson Schwartz' office Douglas Webb; from representative Fattah's office, Michael Walker and we have some state representatives Tony Payton, and Pamela DeLissio and Mayor Bob McMahon and councilman David Oh, and councilman Brad Koplinski, please join me in welcoming all of them.

I just got to meet a very special guest which is Larry Summers mother, Anita. We welcome you as well. Are you enjoying your entrée, the beginning of the meal? Let me take a minute to just explain who we are and the number of years that I didn't know about your organization, who are you? Few years ago, the Washington Post, dubbed us the Strange Bedfellow Coalition. We got that name largely because we bring together a lot of people that typically don't come together. Today, we are a coalition of over 400 businesses and NGOs and faith-based organizations, everything from care to caterpillar from Wal-Mart to world vision, the Chamber of Commerce, Apac and many, many more.

We're also proud that as a time of frankly too much divide, we feel very proud about having a bipartisan voice of advisors. Both of our speakers today are members of what we call our national advisory consul which has every living former secretary of state, most of the secretary's defense and many other experts and the who's who of foreign policy in this country. One of the most interesting parts of our Strange Bedfellow Coalition is we have more and more military voices.

Today we have a national advisory security consul that's made up of over 100 retired three and four star generals and admirals. As well as a group some of whom are here today of something we called Veterans for Smart Power. Now, 30,000 strong veterans from all walks of life who are willing to lend their name to the importance of the non-military tools of global engagement and I'm going to step out from my script for a moment. I want to ask because I saw so many of you here today that I said hello to just in the hallway. The veterans that are here today, if I could ask you to please rise so we can all salute you and thank you for your service to this country.

What brings us together? We believe very passionately in America's need to be a global leader in this world and we think that part of that leadership is an investment in the small 1% of the federal budget known as the international affairs budget which is critical to investing in global health, agriculture, economic development and diplomacy, not just because it's the right thing to do but also because we believe it's the smart thing to do.

Last weekend, I was visiting one of my kids at college at my alma mater. He started talking to me about his world history class. I remember my world history class. Some of you are too young to remember this but I remembered the maps that we would get and they were red and blue of the world. Those Cold War maps and not the red and blue that we're seeing today often on TV, but the red, that was our enemies and the blue of our allies. My son looked at me as I was telling him this and said how could you shade entire world in just two countries because as you know it is more complex interconnected, interdependent world that I think you in Pennsylvania understand very well.

You understand like we do that infectious diseases to terrorism have no borders anymore. The health, the education, the economic future of those living in the other side of the world impact us each and every day right here. In event, whether it is a fruit cart vendor in Tunisia or a child dying of AIDS in Africa could have an impact on us.

Today, we asked the question with our guest speakers, what is America's role in this very complex competitive world? When I study my Cold War maps, the debate would be very simple. Do you support hard power? Do you support soft power? That is an outdated conversation to have to choose between hard power and soft power. We at the US Global Leadership Coalition believe in what we call smart power. The idea that you need to invest in a full range of tools in development, diplomacy alongside defense that we knew to invest in this 1% of foreign assistance to really make our country more safe, a world more safe and prosperous. I believe in smart power more than ever since the term first came alive of a few years ago.

I see democrats, republicans and independence in Washington D.C and across the country embrace it. I also know that what we like to talk about now is actually smart power 2.0. because the issue isn't just about our security anymore. When you have 95% of the world's consumers living outside of the United States, we have to invest in tools that also make us competitive in the world. The good news is smart power 2.0, this investment in the small strategic investment, development and diplomacy does just that. Just like our science say, keeps America safe, creates jobs, and make sure that we are demonstrating America's greatness. There is a small ring binder that I invite you to take home and take a look at some of the incredible success that this little 1% has made for our country.

It's a great day to have conversation. Hopefully we are ahead of the storm that we have been all hearing about on the news. I want to thank

you and I want to close by thanking you. Thanking you not just for filling this beautiful room today but more importantly from hopefully joining our journey. Our journey that will go on from today and forward to do just what our sign says. We are committed to building a better, a safer and a lot more prosperous world. I look forward to working with all of you to do just that. To continue our program, I'm delighted to invite two of our partners up, Matt Zieger from Team Pennsylvania Foundation and Wil Muskens from Pennsylvania's Department of Community and Economic Development. I hope you enjoyed today's program. Thank you. Nice meeting you.

Wil Muskens:

Thank you. Good afternoon. Thank you for the introduction. I really appreciate the effort. True, public-private partnership here on stage today. I'm part of the public side of the public-private partnership. I'm Matt. We'll talk about the Team Pennsylvania Foundation which is our private sector supporter for international business development in Pennsylvania. I think you talked about smart power in the previous remarks. This is a smart choice to do this event right here in Philadelphia. Philadelphia is a city that is globally oriented, that is already international, have a lot of assets to be even more international. Doing right here in Philadelphia and in the state of Pennsylvania which has the largest international program in the country.

You're in a state here that has really understood the importance of international relations. This has been a bipartisan approach. You've talked about the importance of bipartisanship. This is bipartisan approach in Pennsylvania. I'll just tell you my personal story. I came here as an immigrant in '99, hired by Governor Tom Ridge and his administration is part of his governor's action team. I stayed on through the Rendell administration, was appointed by Governor Rendell as deputy secretary and was kept on when Governor Corbett came into office now almost two years ago. I'm saying that not to talk to you about myself but to show that there's really bipartisan support in the states for what international business development business is about.

It's not about politics. It's about helping create those relationships in foreign countries, helping our companies be more successful, selling Pennsylvania made products like Hershey bars, Heinz ketchup, Zippo Lighters, Westinghouse Nuclear power plants, to name a few examples. We sell all those products overseas, they go all over the world. Pennsylvania has become a major, major exporting state. The other side of international business development is investment. We focus on recruiting international companies in Pennsylvania.

Higher education, we worked with our universities and colleges and some of them are represented here in the room today to help them recruit students from overseas. Having international students in Pennsylvania is a critical aspect of the quality of education here in Pennsylvania. Not only having those people here trying to keep many of those here in Pennsylvania to start new businesses. Even if they go back to their country, they'll be an ambassador for Pennsylvania.

They can help us create those connections back in China, Japan Korea, whatever country they're from. This public-private partnership that I talked about is represented by Matt Zieger. Matt is the president and CEO of the Team Pennsylvania Foundation. We worked very closely together to promote international business. Governor Corbett has personally committed to supporting and being involved personally in international business like many governors before him. He went on his first trade mission this year.

We organized that frame together with Matt and his team. We're working on this second trade mission but has not been announced yet. I'm not going to announce today but it will be very soon. In the spring there will be second trade mission that will be lead by Governor Corbett and his administration to another continent and to be defined probably in mid-November after the elections. We've roll the information on the next trade mission. I hope some of you will participate in that. Thank you again to the USGLC for taking this initiative. I'll let Matt talk about Team Pennsylvania.

Matt Zieger:

Thanks so much Wil. It's really a pleasure to be here on behalf of Team Pennsylvania Foundation, our board of directors and that partnership is really strong and is critical to our work in helping in give national context in international context to the work that we do and the businesses that we work with within the state. As the commonwealth's public-private partnership, our fundamental belief is the true collaboration between the public and private sector done with integrity and vision. Now, that's really an important part, integrity and vision is really key to accomplishing good work in this state and in this nation.

The USGLC is really I think a great model of that for us and with us in this work. The Pennsylvania's economic prosperity through investment scenarios that drive our competitiveness globally and those are education, innovation and all the areas that we're going to talk about today. We believe that helping every business, every student, every public official to see themselves with an international context is not just valuable but really crucial in today's modern era.

The international context changes the game when you talk about state policy. It changes the game even when you talk about local policy. That's a lot of our work these days in helping those business leaders. Helping those students, helping those elected officials see themselves on a global stage, more than just in a local context. That's really why we formalize these partnership and we are privately funding really a very unique partnership providing staff capacity and support to Wilfred's shop at the Department of Community in Economic Development directly with the governor's office now for four governors.

Expanding our work in that doing more trade missions, more international work in sending Pennsylvania experts overseas to not only to share what Pennsylvania is doing but also to learn from other countries to identify best practices and bring them back here and to deploy them here. That work has really cored who we are as a foundation and we're really proud to be here together with you with fellow citizens in Pennsylvania that really believe in this work as well.

The last few years have reminded us all too well our economic prosperity is tied to the rest of the world in really unprecedented ways, with all the uncertainties and seemingly infinite opportunity. The Pennsylvania business community understands these and we truly believe that this investments that we'll talk about today. International affairs program are critical to our future, investing in this programs do create opportunities in Pennsylvania for economic growth. As one of the top ten states in manufacturing and we don't have to look very far to see this first hand.

A couple of stats for you as to Pennsylvania's role currently in the economy globally, we export over \$41 billion in goods and services from the states. \$41 billion dollars that's in excess of the entire state budget, over one in every five jobs in Pennsylvania are supported by trade very directly and if you take that indirectly it expands probably almost half of jobs in the state, about third of jobs. Agricultural exports contribute about \$2 billion dollars in gross domestic product to the state, \$2 billion dollars agricultural loan. Don't just take my word for it, together USGLC have brought together a few experts, topnotch experts in the field to lay out today's case in more detail with a video. Please join me in watching the video.

[Video plays 0:43:25]

[00:58:22]

David Thornburgh: Folks if I could get your attention. You are most welcome to continue eating but I know there are a lot of busy people in this room and we'd

like to begin with the program. Good afternoon. I'm David Thornburgh, executive director of the Fels Institute of Government at the University of Pennsylvania. We're really delighted to work with the coalition on this terrific event on a very timely set of issues in a very important set of issues.

Just a brief commercial, if you will about the Fels Institute to Government for about 75 years, we have been at the University of Pennsylvania educating men and women in the early stages of their careers to take significant public leadership roles in our cities, our states, our country and increasingly around the world. We're celebrating our 75th anniversary this year and we've centered that celebration around three well chosen in alliterative words which I think are very much in the spirit of today's discussion.

We think about what we do at Fels in terms of purpose, practice and possibility. There's a nice linear flow there that if you bring a purpose to public life and you practice that purpose in various ways, you create new possibilities in very exciting ways. I think today we're clearly focused on the middle name of practice to really think and learn and get energized about how our world ever smaller and bigger at the same time can function not only for the interests of this country but for citizens around the world. To do that we're really blessed to have two thought leaders, par excellence to join with us in furthering that understanding. I'd like to introduce them in turn and also our terrific moderator.

First, I'd like to introduce Steven Hadley. Few people understand the complexity of today's world better than President George W. Bush's formal national security adviser, Steven Hadley. He has extensive experience in shaping foreign policy during his tenure in the White House recognizing the various tools of smart power diplomacy, engagement and trade are increasingly necessary to protect our national interest. He served with the president during the creation of both the Millennium Challenged Corporation and the president's emergency plan of AIDS relief. Before taking on the role of national security adviser, Mr. Hadley served as Condoleezza Rice's deputy when she held the position and is now a member of the consulting group RiceHadleyGates which he cofounded with Secretary Rice and former secretary of defense Robert Gates.

Also delighted to introduce and even welcome home in the fashion, Dr. Lawrence Summers. A person who needs little introduction, I think as does Steven Hadley served as treasury secretary under President Clinton and more recently as the director of the National Economic Council under

President Obama. During the Obama administration, Dr. Summers co-chaired the presidential study directive on global development which sought to elevate the role of diplomacy and development alongside a strong defense.

After leaving Washington in 2001, Dr. Summers served as president of Harvard University. He since returned there as a president emeritus and professor at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government. My alma mater, I must add. We're delighted as was mentioned earlier to be joined by Dr. Summers, mother Anita who I had the pleasure of working with for many years at University of Pennsylvania. I think the Summers family is one of the great gifts to this country. There are few with the analytic rigor and contribution to our world that the Summers family has given us.

Finally, I'd like to introduce our moderator for today. Frank Sesno. He was currently the director of the School of Media and Public Affairs at George Washington University where he teaches how the media affects the creation of public policy which is I'm sure not just confined to one course, probably a lifetime of study. Frank has more than 25 years experience including 18 years at CNN where he served as Washington Bureau chief and as a special correspondent. Please join me in welcoming to the state our moderator and our terrific panelist.

Frank Sesno: Thank you very much. Can you hear me in the back?

Steven Hadley: They'll turn them on.

Frank Sesno: The mike is on. How's that? Got me? Okay. Well, thank you very much. Absolutely delight and honor of pleasure to be here. I can't think of a more propitious time to have a conversation like this. There's a huge amount writing on this conversation and I must say I feel pressured a little bit. It's not really that we're just 11 days before the election or that the world is a global place or that a massive hurricane is bearing down on all of us. I don't believe I've ever conducted conversation like this with two gentlemen of this distinction. One of whom has his mother sitting in the audience. We will do everything we got. You should be very proud of him by the way, has he done okay?

This is a remarkable moment to be having this conversation. What I'd like to remind all of you before we begin is that during the course of the conversation, staff will circulate. There should be card on your tables. If you have questions, they will be brought up to me and we will incorporate your questions into the discussion before we conclude here today. Gentlemen, we heard Liz Schroyer talked about this globalized world and we heard her talk about what engagement is all about. We are

in the midst of an election campaign and presumably you bought watch the debate last week, a foreign policy debate of these two candidates.

In many ways they have very different visions of the world and America's role in it. In other areas, they seem to agree, in fact I heard Governor Romney congratulating the incumbent president a couple of things. What struck both of you the most when you think of America's role in the world engagement in the world and what you heard from the two candidates? Steven, you want to go first?

Steven Hadley:

Well I did not hear the debate because I was in Beijing, China. At 9:00 p.m. eastern time it was 9:00 a.m. China time and I was with Li Keqiang, who was the Vice-Premier and soon to be Premier of China. It was interesting to see the commentary about it. One reaction was the number of people came up and said, "You know, Chinese people are watching all of these and their reaction was how come we can't have one of these?"

Yes, we're a one party state, it's the communist party but why can't we have our leaders having this kind of discussion which I think is an indication of the power of the American idea. Second of all, I have a little jaundice view about foreign policy, I don't know if Larry would agree but my sense is that in the campaign and in the debates, the foreign policy discussion is generally not particularly informed and has a lot of red herrings and straw men in some sense, an effort to find differences.

When in fact, when the election is over and someone becomes president, I think the real message of our foreign policy is there is an awful lot of continuity from administration to administration. I think one element of continuity as I have now read the transcript of the debate is there is very little disagreement among the two that America has a very special role in the world. Governor Romney has talked about American power and all the rest but President Obama talks about his Madeleine Albright does, America as the indispensable nation.

One of the things that they would disagree, about how they might exercise that power but the notion that the world needs American leadership and America really uniquely can provide that and needs to provide that. I think is a consensus point between the two of them. They're absolutely right about that. A lot of people say, "well, China is going to replace America as a global leader and if you talk to the Chinese, they're answer is "we don't want it. You can have it. It costs too much. It's too aggravating. We've got our own problems in terms of development."

There's really no country that can do what we can do that has the economic muscle, the military capability, our wonderful university systems are tradition of innovation. Functioning capital markets, I mean we have a very unique role that we need to play in the world. I think you saw that actually reflected in the debate. I tend to find these things as ... I tend to look for the more continuity in agreement because I think in the end that's the dominant theme of how presidents govern.

Frank Sesno: We live in something as basic and just to follow it up and then Larry please your bid. They disagree completely for example about military spending Governor Romney says, "Don't cut it." Barack Obama says "you got to," but you've also heard Governor Romney say in so many words, "we're not going to be able to shoot our way to victory around the world. We've got to be engaged in the world." This very interesting issue of engagement, they seemed very much aligned.

Steven Hadley: Again, military spending is a good example. It is true and Governor Romney made a lot of this that the Obama administration made about \$500 billion worth of cuts about, \$570 something over a ten year period. It was worked out by Secretary Gates who had after all been Secretary of Defense under President Bush in consultation with the chiefs. Now, a lot of discussion about that I think Governor Romney might put some of that back but \$500 billion over ten years is not a huge dent in the defense budget.

They both agree actually the sequestration which would take another \$500 billion out of the budget would be a bad thing and we don't want to do it. I think even on defense spending where they have a lot of disagreement. They're talking about the 10%. They're not talking about the 30 or the 40 %. Again, yes there is some difference. Yes, it's important. I think the country will somewhat decide how this goes but the range of disagreement I think is bounded by a pretty strong consensus in this country that we got a great military. We've called upon it to do very difficult things in the last ten years. We have an obligation to our men and women in uniform and we need a strong military going forward.

Frank Sesno: What struck you?

Larry Summers: I had to agree with Steve to a point. There's agreement on resistance to isolationism and on American internationalism. There was agreement on a range of tactical issues of how to manage the withdrawal from Afghanistan and so forth that our alliance with Israel has to be in violate. There are broad strands of continuity on where there's a very wide range of views. The fact that somebody like Secretary Gates was able to serve

successfully and so impressively first in President Bush's administration and then in President Obama's administration, speaks to their being some very broad continuities in the national security area.

With that said, I think there are some differences in philosophy and there are some differences in frankly degrees of realism that I really was struck by in the debate. Governor Romney frankly carried on a long tradition of challenger candidates and presidential elections saying entirely irresponsible and ultimately not credible things about the relationship with China. Bill Clinton in 1992 said things about how we'd cut off all trade to China if they didn't fix human rights. Farm policy experts at the time recognized that it wasn't a sustainable position and in the end, he did not sustain it when he was in the White House and its fortunate. In the same category was the assertion that we would declare them and exchange rate manipulator ...

Frank Sesno: The Chinese?

Larry Summers: ... China an exchange rate manipulator on day one of the presidency. First of all the whole idea was you're supposed to do a study and carefully analyze the matter not simply implement the president of slogan. Second of all, the day you called them a manipulator, you feel really good. What do you do the day after you've called them a manipulator? Do you launch a trade war? Do you launch a real war? Do you say they're a manipulator and not do anything about it? This is why those discussing these issues apart from political advantage have not made choices of that kind. That's a kind of difference that comes from the responsibility of having to govern rather than having to politically posture. As I said, this is not something where one party has any monopoly on virtue or sin. The other thing I would say is I think there a real difference in the degree of militarization of the policy. That is a continuing difference between the two parties.

President Obama is insisting that the Simpson-Bowles recommendation on defense is about somewhere between 500 depending how do the accounting somewhere between \$500 billion a trillion dollars unrealistic. He's hardly off in some hyper-dove place. I promise you and Steve knows him better than I do but I promise you that Bob Gates would not have, as defense secretary of the United States, signed off on any defense budget that he thought was inadequate to meet the national security needs of the United States.

\$2 trillion dollars over ten years more than what Bob Gates thought was necessary is a stunning and I would argue irresponsible amount. To put that in perspective list ...

Frank Sesno: That sensible [inaudible 1:15:38]

Larry Summers: No. President Obama is close to trillion dollars more than Simpson-Bowles. Governor Romney, \$2 trillion dollars more than President Obama. That's \$3 trillion dollars more than Simpson-Bowles. To relate to the need to the way this group would think about and Liz can probably help me out with the right number. That \$2 trillion dollars would be enough to increase about 150 %, to more than double. Everything we do to fight AIDS, everything we do to give people visas. Everything we do to promote US exports. Every bit of diplomacy we have to watch out for future Rwanda's.

Every penny we spend to guard against a global pandemic. I don't think that we should necessarily double that kind of spending overnight. I think we should increase it. If I ask myself, assume the pure objective is the advance of the United States national security. Is \$2 trillion dollars more for war fighting, a better way to spend that money than 1 trillion dollars for the forward defense of our security through the diplomacy and development. That's a very, very hard argument to make.

I just can't see how we can get to that conclusion at a time when the chairman of the Joint Chiefs is saying that the accumulation of national debt not the lack of weapon systems is our top priority. I think there's a really important philosophical difference between, let's put more into forward defense of our interests and more into debt reduction which makes us vulnerable versus that \$2 trillion dollars in extra defense spending which after the experience of the last decade seems a surprising priority choice to me.

Frank Sesno: Could you respond to that?

Steven Hadley: Yes. I think a couple of things. One, a lot get said in these debates that makes you wince and Larry has his example. My example was the president, I've heard the vice president do it saying, "When we came into office Iran was an insendancy and there was nothing in place to do with the Iran nuclear program. It's laughable. The sanctions regime which I give the Obama administration a huge amount of credit for pursuing what started in the Bush administration. The person who did it for the Obama administration Stuart Levey was a Bush administration appointee who was doing that for Hank Paulson.

Once again, laboring in a campaign context to show a difference when in fact the realities are continuity. You see every time. Every administration that comes in, defines himself initially not being their predecessor but in the end of the day, examine their policies, there's a

huge amount of continuity. I think on the military thing, I'd like to step back and when you get into the issue, I think we would agree that ... and what I say when I speak is the biggest national security in foreign policy challenge we have is our debt and deficit problem. Our physical situation and our lack of economic growth because those things undergird everything we do overseas and vindicate the American model that free people and free markets lead to stable societies and economic prosperity.

We have got to get to those things in hand. I think there's consensus among those two candidates, we need to do that. Again, there is a difference in the parties because the first thing that when you say, "well, you got to get the deficit under control." The first thing republicans say is nondefense discretionary spending. The first thing the democrat say are cut the defense budget. I think both are wrong. You could zero out in the defense budget. You would not solve the deficit problem over the next ten years. Now there is the economist and he may challenge that but I think that is right.

What I say to people is, "I'm prepared to talk about defense cuts but only if we're serious about dealing with our deficit problems. I will know we're serious about dealing with the deficit problems when you start talking about entitlements because my understanding is that that's really what drives the out year deficit numbers. I would say let's have a broad conversation with everything on the table. Let's not start with defense budget cuts particularly since we've already taken half of trillion dollars out of the defense budget over ten years and we have not done so far as I know anything similar like that on an entitlement. Again, we'll get to the defense budget but let's put it in the context of the total package we're going to need to do if we're going to get the deficit ...

Frank Sesno: Well, we're probably talking about ...

Larry Summers: Steve, my friend.

Steve Hadley: Yes.

Larry Summers: You're right. People make claims about what their predecessors did all the time both ways, they can go either way. I'm not going to argue about any of that. What people say about the policies that they will implement is a more serious thing. Like the dollar business and like the defense budget. Let me just be clear about what I'm saying and what I'm not saying. I was proudly explaining how the president I was proud to serve had rejected the Bowles-Simpson defense cuts because they would be

dangerous to our national security and that he was going to follow Bob Gates' lead.

There's nobody here who needs the lecture about how you can't just demagogue it and get everything from defense. There's no one here who thinks that. The question is as friends of national security at a moment when the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff says that the debt is our principle problem. How do you responsibly run for president advocating \$2 trillion dollars more in defense spending and \$5 trillion dollars more in tax cuts? I assure you that the arithmetic of what else you can cut to find that \$7 trillion dollars is nowhere. It is nowhere. If you cut entitlements in half, you wouldn't get enough money to balance the budget while you're doing that so the first rule of holes is stop digging.

We've got a big debt problem in this country and it seems to me that what you do when you have a big debt problem, what a company does when it has a big debt problem is it doesn't fail to fix the elevator. It doesn't stop its advertising. It makes targeted necessary investments but it doesn't do massive new outlays in new directions until the thing's under control. That's why I have such a hard time with this truth and that's why I was for doing more of the promotion of our exports and the prevention of pandemic in a limited targeted way but I just can't get the \$2 trillion dollars more than Bob Gates thinks is necessary.

Frank Sesno: Let's pretend we're having a debate here. I'm the moderator and I'm going to assert myself.

Steven Hadley: Yes, [inaudible 1:24:19].

Frank Sesno: You both said wonderful things and it's all full of politics and it's all full of numbers and it's all full of all of that. What we're talking about here is what America can afford? How it's going to engage in the world at a time of immense budget pressure, of the total interconnectedness of all of these issues where we heard the candidates the other night. They continue to bring it back to American jobs.

Let me package all that up to say, thinking about the 1% of this budget that goes for a development and diplomacy, thinking about the pressures on the budget today. Thinking about what the public says, "wait a minute, I'm worrying about my job right here in Dayton," never mind what you're doing half a world away. How do you make that sale and increase spending on what you say is so necessary at a time like this.

Steven Hadley: Well, look I go back really. One of the problems of this debate that we've been having if you stand back from it is its very difficult and I'm not part

of the Romney campaign. It's very difficult to know what these proposals are in the first place, the president lays out a whole bunch of things and Governor Romney says, "That is my plan." I don't know where we are in the \$2 trillion dollars but what I would tell is this. One I go back to my original point, and the best thing we could do for American jobs is get our economy going and the best thing we can do for our economy going is have a plan over time to get out of this deficit problem. That will mean jobs and I think that is right.

Second, in terms of the military context, oddly enough I'm going to flip right to the other side. I have a lot of problems with the packaging of the Pivot to Asia. I have no problem with the notion that Asia is where a lot of the future is. If you look at where the projection for economic growth is, it's in Asia. We need to be there for all kinds of reasons but one of the problems I have is the so called Pivot to Asia. The examples are all military. We're going to put 1500 marines in Australia.

Frank Sesno: Australia is a threat.

Steve Hadley: The coin of the realm in Asia is economics and trade. I would love a Pivot to Asia that involves expanding our trade opportunities in Asia which is being knit together by a whole series. I seem to be playing all on Larry Summers ground which is very dangerous. See, I want to get back to the military stuff but Asia is being knit together by a whole series of free trade agreements. Most of which were not in. One of the things I think we need to do I think, focus on Asia is absolutely right. That's where a lot of the projected growth is and I think we need a very active set of policies that will advance our interests there and get American business in the games.

Second of all I think this whole issue and this is the point Liz is trying to make were so imbalanced in the tools we have for dealing with international problems. We have spent 50 years learning how to recruit train exercise, fight and improve and our military. We put a lot of money into it, a lot of effort into and it is a fabulous military. We have not done anything like that on the diplomacy and development side. To develop a cadre of none military people who can go into a post conflict situation and promptly get police trained, courts built, prosecutors in place, judges in place, getting small and medium enterprises up and running, getting fundamental risk. We don't do that. We don't that well.

When we've had to do it internationally in Bosnia, we did it one way with international institutions in Afghanistan. We divided up among individual countries. Nobody performed in Iraq. We gave the US military the lead and we found out that the military didn't have the skill set and it's not

just post conflict situations and it's not that I want to do more Iraqs and Afghanistan. Those same set of skills is what you need in countries that are teetering on the bridge of falling into conflict to help keep them out of conflict. We can talk about the defense budget. The real issue is we have under invested in the other instruments of diplomacy and influence which I would call development diplomacy and democracy promotion which really are what we need to confront the challenges effectively in the 21st century. We can talk about the defense budget, that's a subject that we're not even talking about as a nation.

Frank Sesno: It's interesting because in a conversation that I was fortunate enough to have with Secretary Gates and Secretary Clinton. He said, "I have more people on a single aircraft carrier than she's got doing development for the entire country all over the world. That sort of stops the conversation in its track.

Steve Hadley: It does.

Frank Sesno: The question then becomes in the environment we're in now, where the economic realities and budgetary realities we've got now. How do you change that equation?

Larry Summers: I'd make a few judgment and comments on what we've heard. First I think it is more realistic and actually more realistic in the political environment and more appropriate substantively. If you ask the question, where are we going to get more resources for diplomacy and development? Are we going to get it from domestic spending on developing Ohio and Kentucky or are we going to get it from foreign oriented spending on the military side. I think it is more realistic in the midst of the most serious economic down turn we've had since the second world war to aspire to get it from redeployment from the military, than to get it from redeployment on the domestic side which is why I'm so insistent on not launching massive new increases on the military side. I think Steve's right that ...

Steve Hadley: They can't here you.

Frank Sesno: Yes.

Larry Summers: Can you hear me now?

Frank Sesno: Yes.

Steve Hadley: There we go.

Larry Summers: I think Steve's right that there's a lot of thinking through what we do in Asia. I read the headlines about what's happening over various islands between China and Japan. I listened to the things that my Japanese and Korean and other friends whisper at night. I don't think the idea that we're working a bit at maintaining our presence in the Asian region is a mistake. How that's best presented and something you can very much debate. One of the most important things President Obama has done is launch the Trade Pacific Partnership which is an effort at achieving a multilateral trade agreement bringing together a number of nations in Asia. I think that there was a very good initiative and if that has its roots before President Obama.

Frank Sesno: You know he just whispered don't you? Launch by the Bush ad ...

Larry Summers: Yes. I said if that is its roots, if that has its roots before ...

Frank Sesno: That's you.

Larry Summers: ... before the Obama.

Frank Sesno: Bipartisanship is a beautiful thing.

Larry Summers: ... before the Obama administration, I congratulate President Bush something that absolutely the Bush administration initiated to the country's very great benefit was the trade agreement with Korea.

Frank Sesno: Answer my question.

Larry Summers: I think I did.

Frank Sesno: No, I don't think you did. You said you'd take it from the military not from the domestic spending but you're going to have convince Americans, you're going to have convince policy makers on the hill that this is a good investment right? I have to make that fix ...

Steven Hadley: I can help him out.

Frank Sesno: Help him out.

Steven Hadley: Bob Gates actually and Conde worked this out and started transferring money because Bob basically decided that \$10 million dollars, \$100 million dollars in some of these state accounts would be advance the agenda of our country and so we set up an account whereby there was transfers of money from DOD to the state department because the congressional committees would not adequately fund, this is our view,

the state department budget. The biggest hurdle to that was the committee jurisdiction in the congress.

One of the problems we've got is I think there does need to be a shift in resources. To the civilian side, I think some of that can come out of the defense budget but again I go back to my original point is the question should not I think, you don't start with the allocation be doing defense and nondefense. I think the first question is what is the overall strategy to get this country on a firm foundation for getting solve its debt and deficit problems and get its economic growth going.

That is the prerequisite over the long term for generating the revenues that we're going to need. We get that framework in plays and Larry and I can have this wonderful discussion about how much defense should be and what should be the balance between defense and state. We got to get real and serious about the tough part of this problem which is going to be dealing with entirely.

Frank Sesno: Let me bring the question to a slighter different level and Larry let me ask you to go first with this in the getting real. The conversation about where the money comes from and how the budget gets balanced is very important because that kind of drive critical decision making but what we heard up here a few moments ago was the number of jobs in Pennsylvania directly connected to international trade.

Somebody stopped me the other day, a very successful investment banker says, "what are we spending all this money for all over the world? I'm sure you're stopped and asked this sort of question all the time. What kinds of examples do you give? How do you demonstrate that this investments if you're going to call them that and both administrations have tried to refer to this as an investment are paying the kinds of dividends that helped American workers, that helped business leaders like this in this room? What do you say?"

Larry Summers: I think there are a few different things you say. One thing you say is that if you look at a dollar for the World Bank or a dollar for the Ex-Im Bank and you just asked how much that translates into in procurement in the United States and extra jobs, you are creating jobs more cheaply than you can by building airports or doing other things that the export promotion expenditure is a highly efficient engine of economic growth and it also has the virtue because we're selling things to the rest of the world of helping us to get us out of debt. That's one answer.

Second answer is that the right kind of much softer international interaction stuff over long time periods pays huge benefits in terms of

social, in terms of our national security, to give you an example that I like because it involves universities. When Mikhail Gorbachev instituted perestroika and glasnost. The man who influenced him most was a named Alexander Yakovlev who is his ideological advisor. Yakovlev encourage all of this radical opening and change.

People said that you grew up in a communist system, how did you do it? What led you to urge Gorbachev in this direction? He said I never forgot what I saw in 1958 when I spent a year at Columbia University sponsored by a US exchange program. That showed me a whole different way to think and it stayed with me and it influenced what I told Michel Gorbachev and what Michel Gorbachev did. Now, obviously, the Berlin wall did not fall because we had an exchange program for Alexander Yakovlev but ...

Frank Sesno: Columbia University.

Larry Summers: ... but if you think about the fact how much safer the world is. The fact that we as a country have save to the better part of \$10 trillion dollars because the Cold War ended, investing and making it more likely that that's sort of thing will happen is an incredibly high return investment for us as a country and that's an example that nobody sees a direct tangible benefit to tomorrow but we are a vastly safer country because of it.

We would be a vastly safer country if there were people in the Islamic world who understood the United and more people in the United States who understood the Islamic world. Well that requires supporting the people to move in both directions. Look I was privileged and had the responsibility to lead or help lead the US response to a number of foreign financial crisis. Frankly with respect to a number of them, you could get better information about what was happening in the foreign country by calling a friend who worked at a hedge fund, then you could by calling the relevant US embassy and that was because the people whose job it was to watch the economy of those countries that had been scaled back as the foreign service budget had to be reduced.

It's always the problem with these things that when the causal chain is a little longer and when the investment takes longer to pay off that it's easy to just dismiss it. I'll tell you one other thing. I want to give one other example because it's very important. I've got my differences with the administration of which Steve was a part but there are several hundreds of thousands, if not millions of people who are alive today because of the PEPFAR program that that administration initiated who would be dead without that program and who know and whose families know and whose neighbors know that it was the generosity envisioned of

the United States of America had caused to happen. That's a pittance in the grand scheme of what the federal government spends but I don't know when the next Rwanda is going to come, I don't know when the next major global health problem is going to come but that investment will surely pay off many times over for this country.

Frank Sesno: You know one really interesting and I will let you continue on this. There's a small group at the state department now working on innovative technologies and communication technologies and some other things we look at it in my program. One of them blasts text messages to recipients of medication, HIV AIDS medication and other medication in African all over the world to remind them to take their medication and it says at the bottom brought essentially, brought to you by the United States of America. That's an incredible piece of technology and diplomacy right in of itself. You wanted to jump in.

Steven Hadley: I'll just be brief. In 2000-2001 when the Bush administration came in, the projections were that HIV AIDS was going to decimate the middle class in African and set back development a generation or two. African would continue what many people thought it was to just be a drag on the global economy. Fast forward ten years, the HIV AIDS program global AIDS program that had bipartisan support, many people think that African is poised to be a take off in this next generation. That means a high number of the fastest growing countries today are in Africa. That of course means markets. Markets for American goods which puts American workers to work, so it's a classic case where the right investment now for good humanitarian reasons actually is going to pay dividends economically for the American economy and American workers, that is what's called a virtue of circle. We need to be finding those.

Frank Sesno: I want to go some of the questions that coming off the floor. I'm going force you both into a bit of lighting round, so we can get as many of this as we can. Even though some of these are not conducive to lighting round-type answers but let's give it a try. Here's one, last month there was a vote to cut foreign aid to Libya, Pakistan and Egypt, it lost overwhelmingly on the hill. The question is what is the right balance between American influence and American interests when it comes to foreign aid?

Steve Hadley: That's a good example and again one of the good things that came out of the debates. Despite the reaction in the country to the death of four Americans, both of these people said, the right answer is not for us to disengage from the Arab world but it is to engage in the Arab world.

Why? Because it is in America's interests to have these transitions come out with stable societies that are democratic, that are inclusive and it become prosperous. It's in our interests. We've seen a revolution in the name of freedom that when [inaudible 1:44:45] and it is Iran in 1979 hijacked by the Mullahs and it's been an enormous national security problem for the country for four decades and cost us a lot of money.

We have interests in how these revolutions come out. We need to be engaged but we need to be engaged in a smart way and simply having programs that say "Made in the USA," given the history of US involvement in the Middle East is not necessarily the best way to do it. I think it is not just a question of supplementing defense with diplomacy and development and democracy but it's also moving beyond government to use the power of our private sector, our universities, our charitable foundations to find a way where they can participate in supporting the transitions in this countries because aid and assistance and support from those institutions may be more acceptable than something that says brought to you by the US government.

Larry Summers: I want to give you a follow up on that.

Frank Sesno: I'm turning that into a question to you Larry. Just this past summer, more than 50 US corporations send a letter up to Capitol Hill and elsewhere, Coca Cola, Caterpillar, Glue were among them saying how important it was for the public and private sector to work together and to pursue foreign aid for assistance. What are these businesses is seeing? Why are they stepping up and making the comment so explicitly like that? What's in it for them?

Larry Summers: What's in it for them is they're known as American corporations and more goodwill towards America is good for them. What's in it for them?

Frank Sesno: A comfortable partnership with US.

Larry Summers: What's in it for them is that more prosperity in the countries we aid means more incomes and more ability to buy their products. What's in it for them is that a scent of the world becoming a more open and integrated place is something that brings much more opportunity to everything that they do.

I just want to say quickly about something Steve said and I think we can probably agree on this. It's right that we need to find more resources for all of this. It's absolutely right and imperative. It's absolutely right that we focus too much on the military and not enough on the civilian side. Absolutely right. One needs to recognize that there are important

intellectual problems and problems of strategic design as well as resources in achieving this.

If you think about it, we've declared war as a country on poverty. We've declared war as a country on cancer. We've declared war as a country on drugs. We don't tend when we use the war metaphor outside of real war. We don't tend to win the wars decisively and it's in part because we tend to think the problems are simpler than they actually are and nowhere is that more true than in this be an outside or come for a given period, with given resources and try to turn the place around and it's not just a matter of figuring out how to marshal the resources. We don't have our Klaus Witz of nation building. In the absence of Klaus Witz of nation building, we also need to develop a lot of thought and strategy around this and very importantly and that's why I think the Bush administration's PEPFAR program was so positive, a thing. One of the most important things that would help us with respect to foreign assistance would be a longer catalogue of dramatic successes. That's why what they did was so important.

Frank Sesno: Let me try to get to another couple of questions and again these are great questions, full of nuance, murderously difficult, you have 30 seconds. To what extent with Europe's economic difficulties burden economic and political global leadership from the United States?

Steve Hadley: It means we don't have strong partner as we've had in the past or need in the future. That's what it means. The sooner Europe can get its house in order, and stop looking so much internally and turn against aren't looking externally. The sooner we will be able to have a strong partner again in dealing with some of those problems and we're disadvantaged until that happens.

Frank Sesno: How soon will that be?

Larry Summers: I think the overwhelming likelihood is that the relative economic position of the United States versus Europe that the American situation will improve substantially will rapidly than the European situation, over a decade.

Frank Sesno: Over a decade?

Larry Summers: Over a decade. I think we impart because in the short run it's about the macro and the finance and the Euro. In the medium run, it's about the demography and the capacity to accept immigrants, we've got a growing population and a capacity to accept immigrants, and they do much less. I think we need adapt ourselves to a world where the capacity of Europe

to be very much behind us and with us in addressing global things is probably going to diminish and that's not something to be welcomed by us very, very much the contrary.

Frank Sesno: It's going to be a complication. Okay, we have about three minutes remaining, lots of questions from the floor about the role of ... or several questions anyway about the role of women in the world and economic empowerment. How important is it for America to invest and identify specifically these priorities built around women and women empowerment?

Steve Hadley: Hugely, I served the president who used to say that women are going to be a principle vehicle in democratization and economic development of the world and I think that's exactly right. I think that's something that the Obama administration shares and I would hope that around the administration would as well. The world needs cannot perform the way it needs to perform if it does not take advantage of the skills and talents of half of its population. It's a very simple equation.

Frank Sesno: Okay, gentlemen, we're going to have one last question because I know everybody in this room is very busy and needs to get on with things and we've gone over our time just a bit. The last question is as follows, it's January 20th, 23rd team for whatever reason you're invited into the oval office to meet with the new president, maybe you're working for him and maybe you're just passing through and he says to you, "okay, I got 100 days, I'm looking at a really messy world, a lot of problems and challenges but also some opportunities. What should my top three priorities be?"

Larry Summers: If it's January 20th as opposed to January 21st, I would tell him to go outside and enjoy his inaugural parade because the job is going to be pretty hard. If however, it's January 21st, I would tell him number one, make sure that we are pursuing everybody's idea for growing the American economy, that let's be trying to do many things rather than too few things because that the American economy grows at 3% or 4% a year for the next eight years that will solve an enormous number of problems. If it's not able to grow faster than 2%, it will be very, very difficult.

Frank Sesno: Okay, that's one.

Larry Summers: That's number one. number two, I would tell him you have got to put together a comprehensive approach to getting the size of the public sector right scale relative to revenues that a great nation cannot run on a shoestring and the world's largest debtor will not remain the world's greatest power. There needs to be a long run fiscal thing put in place.

Number three, I would tell him that he needs to take an amount comparable to 5% to 10% of what we are spending on hard power and redeploy it towards the promotion of our exports and towards the forward defense of our interests by supporting the stable successful evolution of developing societies and that that should be thought of yes, as a way of getting some jobs here by promoting exports but that most fundamentally, it should be thought of as forward and cheaper defense of our interests. The preventive medicine is much cheaper than curative medicine. Diplomacy is much cheaper than the application of force.

Frank Sesno: Your oval office conversation?

Steve Hadley: This will show a measure of bipartisanship. I would do exactly what Larry said but I would say, "Mr. President, you need to call in the leaders of the congress and you need to say to them, and this is what I hope would happen. I think the chances are one in thousand but I would call, Mr. President, you got to call in the leaders of the congress and then say, "I'm going to invite you into a partnership that is going to really get America in shape to handover to the next generation." We're going to do it in two parts and Larry has properly described the first part. We're going to do that for the first year or two. That's probably what it's going to take.

I'm going to call you back and we're going to take on three issues. We're going to take in next step in education reform, there's a lot of consensus on what needs to be done, started in the Bush administration, continued to the Obama administration, we're going to do immigration reform, everybody knows what the formula is on immigration reform, toughen the borders, temporary worker, path to legalization that is an amnesty and we're going to talk about social security and Medicare reform. We're going to do that. Then when our generation steps out, we're going to hand this nation in good order over the next generation and that's what I hope whoever is elected president will do because that's what the nation needs and that's what the next generation deserves from us.

Frank Sesno: Want another five seconds, sorry ...

Larry Summers: Fifteen seconds. It's been a terrific discussions and I have really enjoyed it. One thing that worries me is we've been at it for an hour and nobody has said the words global climate change. American leadership with respect to that issue, it has fallen hugely on the national scale. There is nothing the science that should suggest a diminution of concern, very much the opposite and part of responsible global leadership and stewardship is engagement. I just didn't want us to finish without mentioning the global environmental concern.

Frank Sesno: It's terrific and I will merely I asked the question like this to Madeleine Albright one time. She said, "you know what I'd say, remember Mr. President, you wanted this job."

Mark Green: Thank you everyone. Indeed. Thanks to our great speakers. Thanks to our moderator for their insights. I want to thank our partners today the Fels Institute of Government, Team Pennsylvania and World Trade PA. I'm Mark Green, senior director at the US Global Leadership Coalition and past life I was United States ambassador to Tanzania. I'm thrilled to be with all of you and part of this coalition. I will keep you but briefly.

Today's event is part of Impact 2012. We have efforts like these in many states to engage in educate candidates running for office on the importance of what you've heard. It was smart power. It's co-chaired by Secretary Albright and your own Tom Ridge. We've efforts going in states like Ohio, New Hampshire, Florida, Virginia, I'm sure those states all sound real familiar to you. You can sort of figure out why we might be there. The truth is we are there because of something that Thomas Jefferson got wrong. Thomas Jefferson said many years ago, all men are created equal. It's not true. At least not in campaign years, it's not true. In campaign years, there are states like yours that have a huge influence on the outcome of elections to be sure but I think also the outcome of discussions of the great ideas of the day.

We're here because we not only need to hear from great speakers like the two you've heard with their ideas but we need your partnership. We need to work with you. We're not asking for your money. We're not asking for much time but we are asking for your voice. Over this next 11 days, they'll be an awful lot of discussion and awful lot of talk about so many of these issues. We would ask that you take this actions cards that are on your table, fill them out. It's something that you can do concretely, give it to the USGLC staff as you leave and we'll make sure that we engage you.

If you're a veteran or know a veteran, please consider joining Veterans of Smart Power. It's a wonderful organization growing day by day of so many veterans 25 – 26,000 across this nation who are rising up to talk about the importance of soft power about development and diplomacy and democracy alongside defense. Visit our own website. You can download our smart power tool kit. That will give you great questions that you can ask those many candidates as they come through.

Come this January, we hope that you will join us for conference calls as a member and learn more about some of the ideas and events that are going on out there. I'd like to briefly recognize Steven Leiser-Mitchell.

Where is Steven, our regional outreach associate for Pennsylvania. If you don't know him, please say hello or he'll tackle and trip you as you walk outside the door. Give him that card but get to know him because he is your great contact for this organization. We've heard a lot of things today. We heard I think right off the back that with Governor Cuomo said is true. Candidates campaign in poetry and govern in pros but we also heard some very serious ideas about the challenges facing us.

The Pivot to Asia and how it must be not just a military pivot but an economic pivot, how we have to boost our tools to build prosperity and to expand ideas. We heard from Larry Summers about the importance of ideas boosted by education, how it can be one of the great transformative forces in the world today. I think we heard in those closing comments that the challenges that are facing us maybe great but in this room and with leaders on both sides of the aisle and candidates who are putting their names on the ballot today, we can find those answers to export American ideas and to make sure that America continues to be the great force for good in this world today. Thanks to all of you for coming out. Hope you've enjoyed yourselves and again thanks to our speakers. God Bless.