

**U.S. Global Leadership Coalition  
Former Members of Congress Panel  
July 17, 2012**

**Panelists:**

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

**Moderator:**

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

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

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

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

Senator Smith. (Applause.)

OK, we're going to wait.

Senator Mel Martinez – born in Cuba, hailing from Florida – was the secretary of housing and urban development before joining the U.S. Senate and serving from 2005 to 2009. As a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he chaired the Africa Subcommittee, and later on the Banking Committee served as the ranking member on the Subcommittee on

International Trade and Finance. Today he serves as chairman of the J.P. Morgan Chase Foundation and chairman of the Romney Campaign's national advisory council. We're delighted that he could join us as the USGLC's national and advisory committee member.

Ambassador Mark Green is well-known to many of you in this room – four-term congressman from the state of Wisconsin, America's ambassador to Tanzania, a leader in Malaria No More and currently senior director for the USGLC. Ambassador Green also serves on the board of the Millennium Challenge Corporation and is one of the most effective and knowledgeable voices on global development.

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

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

(Off side conversation.)

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

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

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

And I'll start with you, Mel.

MEL MARTINEZ: Well, thank you. I – it's great to be with you all today. And I'm delighted to be a part of this conversation about the U.S. role in the world. But let me say that

when I left the Senate, it was as a result of a lot of frustration with the way things were working. And last night I had dinner with a number – three or four of my former colleagues. And they'd tell me, it's a lot worse than it was when you were here. That's only a couple years ago.

And so unfortunately it seems like we're cascading downward all along. I'm a real optimist, and I believe that post-election we're going to have a new dawn, a new beginning, a new spring. And I really do believe that it's not only because it would be a wonderful thing to see, but I think because it's a necessity. For our country to continue to be successful, we've got to deal with some of the intractable issues that we continue to kick down the road.

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

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

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

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

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

MR. GLICKMAN: And so, Gordon, following up on that, you of course were a businessman. For those of you who don't know, Gordon was in the frozen vegetable business. And then of course after his distinguished term in Congress, he now runs one of the largest trade associations. And he's basically a media person as well, because he runs the National

Association of Broadcasters. So you know, I'm just curious how you view all this as well, you know, given the breadth of your experience.

MR. SMITH: Well, I would simply say that it is bad now, but it's been worse in the past. And I think it's important to recognize that the founders of this republic set up a system designed to be inefficient, and they're succeeding. We're supposed to test everything. They're supposed to be – it's supposed to be difficult to make law. And what I observe, and with some optimism, is that if you study history, the Congress' history is that it does not do hard things until it has no other choice. What forces the no other choice are market forces. If government cannot with wisdom of forethought make reforms on taxes and entitlements that keep us competitive, the market eventually will compel them to do that. That is not unlike what happened to Reagan and O'Neill with the – in the near demise of Social Security. Patriots came to the fore and partisans receded. I'm hopeful that that will happen, because I think if it does not, then markets will be very punishing to the United States. And I don't want to see that, and the American people, the great vast commonsense center, does not either.

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

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

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

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

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

whole lot of difference between that and the Bush administration. There's been a continuum, some change certainly, but there's been a fairly observable constancy in the way America is operating abroad.

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

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

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

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

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

So you know, I served in Foreign Relations, I served in the Armed Services Committee, so I had an opportunity to witness both ends. And the truth is that, as Gordon said, we have a tremendous consensus in this very polarized nation of our today – a reasonable consensus of

what our place in the world should be. What we need is courageous leadership – (inaudible) – act upon it.

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

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

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

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

But I would also argue it's about America's image in the world. It is true that we have competition in places like Africa, but I can also tell you that as I traveled around Africa, America is the indispensable country, and everyone wants to be who we are. They look towards us as a force for good. I absolutely agree. The world is a much darker place if we retreat. The world is looking to us. They want to chase their own version of the American dream, and we have the ability, through smart power, to help them to get there. And when countries are rising, when

countries are looking optimistically, those are not countries that support terrorism, those are not countries that support extremism: Those are countries that become forces for good.

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

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

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

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

MR. GLICKMAN: Mel.

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

That's become more nuanced since then, and it's become more difficult to make that very clear contrasting case for the need for us to be engaged in the world. But let me just say that because it's more nuanced doesn't mean that it isn't important, and that's why I think it's a challenge for our congresspeople to begin to have a debate. By the way, I think the one place of leadership on an issue in this country is only a few blocks from here, in that house right over there, and that is the central place of leadership. So I think as we are all influential people and talk to our favorite candidate – and it's only down to two now, so it makes it fairly simply as to know who to focus on – is to suggest to our presidential favorite that the foreign affairs issues, the diplomacy, the – all of this is an important component of American foreign policy, and that it should be a part of what they plan to do beginning January 20<sup>th</sup>.

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

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

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

MR. GLICKMAN: OK, so Mark, I'm going to end with you and then go to questions. So again, designing a message that's appealing to voters and constituents, because, you know,



that does make a difference. If people are hearing positive messages, they'll be more inclined to be, you know, positive, facilitator to their elected – what do you think is the best message in terms of communicating smart power?

MR. GREEN: Well, first off, let me say I agree with Mel and Gordon and what they laid out. I guess let me offer a couple of tactical points. First off, I always find it amazing when I have private conversations on the Hill with former colleagues and I talk about smart power, you know, they'll lean forward and say, well, I support it but my colleagues never will. And I've had, like, 200 members of Congress say to me, well, I support it but they never will. I think a lot of members don't realize that there is bipartisan broad support. So I think most importantly, stressing the breadth of the coalition that is represented in this room, which – and I think one of the reasons that I'm so proud to be with the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition is because of all of you and who you represent, the variety of backgrounds, the geographic diversity that's in this room, that's what I think you stress over and over again.

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

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

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

assistance to that country has been able to stabilize and pacify that country, and today it is a – not only a close ally and partner, but it is also a country that is really thriving and helping their people live happier and better lives.

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

Q: Hi.

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

Q: OK.

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

MR. GLICKMAN: Yeah, right.

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

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

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

MR. GLICKMAN: Who would like to respond?

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

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

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

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

But secondly, it didn't get you there. It is – it's a red herring in terms of the real debates that I think need to take place. But again, secondly, it is stressing how these investments are part

of the solution. It is certainly the case when it comes to growing our economy. Talk to manufacturer after manufacturer, talk to the agricultural community. If we can't get access to the newly emerging markets of this world we're in serious trouble, because that is where the future is. We need access; and in so many cases, you can't get there without smart power investments.

Secondly, whether we like it or not, this is a dangerous world, and it's a rapidly changing and challenging world. We were talking before we came up about how when President Bush, Bush 43, came into office, he came into office fully intending to be a domestic president. That's what he thought would govern his time in office. And the world reared its ugly head. The truth of the matter is that we have to think about the long-term challenges and threats to our national security, and we have to make those investments.

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

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

MR. GLICKMAN: Mel.

MR. SMITH: It becomes easier –

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

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

MR. MARTINEZ: We'll be brief, too.

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

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

MR. MARTINEZ: Wow.

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

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

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

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

MR. GLICKMAN (?): Good – (inaudible).

MR. MARTINEZ: Glad we had a safe flight.

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

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

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

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

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

MR. GLICKMAN: Badger people?

MR. GREEN: Cream of the crop.

MR. GLICKMAN: OK.

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

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

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

MR . GLICKMAN: OK, any comments?

MR. GREEN: I think they're a competitor. You know, I know we spend a lot of time talking about the threat from China. We should focus on ourselves in the sense that I have every confidence in the American economy, in American entrepreneurs and the ability to compete, so

if we tackle those hurdles that are holding our economy back, we'll be just fine; we'll be just fine.

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

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

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

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

MR. GLICKMAN (?): Yeah, right.

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

MR. GREEN (?): Oh, you're not.

Q: But I'm one of those.

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

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

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

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

that creates that, the design of our government of checks and balances, which, on the whole, does more good for us than bad.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you, everyone.

(END)