

**International Democratic Institute, US Global Leadership Coalition, One America's
Leadership in the World – U.S. Role in the World**

Blumenthal Performing Arts Center

130 North Tryon Street

Charlotte, NC

Wednesday, September 6, 2012

11:45 am -1:15

Event Transcript

White House Chief of Staff
Jack Lew

Thank you. Thank you so much Dan for that introduction. Good morning everyone. I've had the pleasure of working with Dan in the public sector and the private sector for more decades than more of care to remember in more roles but thank you for your many contribution's both as public and private citizen. I want to thank everyone here at the US Global Leadership Coalition and the National Democratic Institute for bringing us together today and from the work you do every day and to all of our friends and partners that are joining us form around the world. On behalf of president Obama and the American people welcome to Charlotte and the United States. You know it's often said that one of the challenges in sustaining American global leadership is that there's not constituency for U.S. American engagement. Well ten years ago that might have been true. Back then critics of foreign assistance often had the run for the field with little competition and little push back. Today of course the Global Leadership Coalition is a strong and a vibrant voice for engagement and funding. I like to thank you at the G.L.C. and **** for the great work that you do. I like to thank my good friend Secretary Albright and N.D.I. for the work you do in building a better world. If president Obama said that the United States remains indispensable global nation in global affairs then all of you are in indispensable partners and it really is my honor to be here with you today. What I like to do is offer a bit of a scene setter for the speakers and the discussion that will follow. And I do so as one who was privileged to sit front roll seat with both president Obama and Secretary Clinton dramatically reorienting as foreign policy and restoring our standing in the world. I was honored to serve Secretary Clinton as her deputy secretary in recourses management where I had the great privilege to coach there the quadnial diplomacy development review. And our goal there I think everyone here knows was to strengthen civilian power as

director of office manager and budget chief of staff. I have served president Obama as he worked to address the issues that he inherited. Even as he pursues his own initiatives including a positive forward-looking agenda for American engagement in the world. Specifically, I would like to discuss president Obama's efforts to refocus American foreign policy to include a greater emphasis on what we call smart power, and how this enhances the security and prosperity of not only the United States but people around the world, and I think it's worth beginning by remembering the challenge he faced when he came to office was great. Four years ago the United States was engaged in two wars, Alcatraz was dug in deep in their safe havens, many of our alliances were deeply strength; America standing in the world was diminished we were reeling from a financial crisis and the worst recession since the great depression. Around the world and here at home many were questioning whether the United States could continue to play a leadership role. Today we see a different reality; President Obama kept his promise to end the war in Iraq, the last American troops left in December and today there are no U.S. troops fighting and dying in Iraq. Alcatraz's leadership has been decimated; Osama Bin Laden is no longer a threat to the world and Alcatraz's plan is on a path to defeat. In Afghanistan thanks to the courageous service U.S. and coalition forces the Taliban have been pushed back, and next year Afghans will take the lead for security across the country, in 2014 the transition will be complete. Perhaps nothing illustrates this dramatic shift in our foreign policy more than the number American serving in harm's way. When President Obama took office there were some 180,000 U.S. troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, 180,000 with the removal of all of our troops from Iraq and the return this month of the search troops that the president ordered to Afghanistan we will reduce that number by two-thirds, in other words most of our troops have come home, and as more afghans take the lead, more of our troops will continue to come home. I mention all of this because ending these wars is the prerequisite for the new era of engagement that President Obama promised when he came to office for a decade, so much of our foreign policy and our resources were consumed by the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan as a result we were not fully able to seize other opportunities or meet other pressing challenges. As we emerge from a decade of war, we're able to expand our vision and pursue a smarter and more comprehensive engagement with the world, after all in a changing and challenging international environment we have to harness full range of American power, not just our military, but our diplomatic, economic, development power, and the power of our values. As the President states in his National Security Strategy, "we must balance and integrate all elements of American power, to include modernizing our diplomatic and development capabilities", you see this of course in the president's commitment to the embassy generally and to the international affairs budget specifically even in these difficult and physical times the Obama administration has found resources to address our international interest with significant increases in the midst of difficult, physical tradeoffs, and I wish to thank the coalition and so many of you for standing up and being there as force full advocates for these investments. The international affair account may be only one percent of the budget but President Obama believes it's one of the smartest investments we can make, investments in the dignity, security, and prosperity of our fellow human beings today yield huge dividends for our collective security and prosperity tomorrow. It's not just the right thing to do, it's smart thing to do, I would add is the changing nature of our foreign policy has occurred there's been a fundamental challenge and change in our foreign service as well, something Secretary Clinton has championed. In the past diplomacy tended to take

on more traditional forms, working in capitals, serving behind embassy walls, reporting cables, government-to-government meetings, civil society outreach, now all these things will obviously continue but today our Foreign Service officers are increasingly Expeditionary. Posted not just in capitals but in more remote and dangerous regions in rural Afghanistan and Iraq, in Sudan and South Sudan. That brings its own new set of challenges, from serving on a company without a family to basic security, indeed we've seen these patriotic Americans give their lives in the line of duty and today I want to thank and salute all of our outstanding professionals at the state department in U.S.A I.D. Thanks to these Americans we have harnessed our smart power we've strengthened key alliances from Europe to Asia and we're leading again in the Asia Pacific, a region that will be vital to our long-term security and prosperity, we've engaged more deeply with the United Nations and multi-lateral institutions, we're working with Russia to reduce our deployed nuclear warheads to their lowest level since the 1950s, we've mobilized dozens of nations to secure nuclear materials and prevent nuclear terrorism, we've rallied the international community to impose the strongest sanctions ever on North Korea and Iran, which President has made clear cannot be allowed to threaten the world with nuclear weapons. We're harnessing our economic power, finalizing trade packs with Columbia, Panama, and South Korea to increase U.S. exports, expanding trade with a merging powers from Brazil, India to Indonesia working to open new markets for American businesses, increasing exchanges and collaboration on science technology and pursuit a higher standard trade packing in the Pacific that should be a model and will be a model for the world. We're standing up for the dignity of people around the world, such as supporting the people of the Middle East and North Africa as they seek their universal rights, we joined with allies and partners to prevent a massacre in Libya, we supporting political and economic reform in nations and transitions including to Indonesia, Egypt, Libya, and Indiana, reforms that not only strengthen democratic government but improve economic growth which is absolutely essential for these transitions to succeed. In the face of unspeakable violence by the Assad Regime we're standing with people of Syria working to strengthen the opposition and sure humanitarian assistance and further isolate in sanction the Regime, and hyson the day when the Syrian people will have a government that respects their rights. Beyond the region we are actively encouraging the reforms that are underway in Burma and in each of these cases civil society leaders are helping to lead the reform process, demanding good governments and civics and political freedom for all. The United States is therefore committed to protecting the space for civil society to operate and recognizing the critical role of plays in transitioning democracies in fact all over the world. But, simply by working to end the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and engage in other countries in a spirit of mutual interest and mutual respect...

PANEL ONE

Richard Wolffe: Thank you for that generous introduction. It's that introduction from the White House Chief of Staff Jack Lew that we're looking for. I am the moderator. First of all thank you N.D.I and for all of you for showing up today. As moderator in addition to having to live up to those introduction, I also have to keep the train running on time. So here's the plan. For the next forty minutes or so this august panel will be solving the world's problems. I will try to trip them up even now and again with questions about global hot spots and this election thing that's going on right now. And then we are going to open up the questions from the floor. I believe they're two microphones on either side so start preparing your questions. I tell you we are not a shy group so I expect lots of good questions, but if you are shy or you're tech***** proficient. We can take your question via twitter. Use the hash tag. I'm going to read this so I don't get this wrong ILFNDI. Without any further or due. Let me try and set up a tour of the horizon with if I may Secretary Albright. Every four years I hear people say, this is the most consequential election ever and by the way this is the most challenging foreign policy environment ever. Now I thought the post cold era pretty challenging for you, I thought the post 9/11 era was pretty challenging for your successors. But we also have both those era's and the post Arab spring era. So my question for you would be. Do we have international architecture to deal with all those problems? American leadership is still indispensable but how is that supposed to function in such a complex world with the institution we have!

Madeleine Albright: First of all thank you to everybody for being here and thank you for moderating us. It is the most complicated and the most consequential and all those things that you said ever. I really do believe that and partially since we're in a political setting, I would say ever county heard from. I mean every conceivable part of the world has spoken up. Every kind of problem is out there. Jack Lew I think describe very well additional the kinds of issues that are now considered national security issue. And we have added to that the whole era of information technology, twitter is not alone. All of a sudden we all know everything about everything that's happening everywhere. Which I think is raises a lot of issues out there to be dealt with. So what are the structure and part of the problem I believe and I am known as any thinks but I am a political scientist. So looking at it in terms of structure. We have been living with institution that have been created in the 20th century that don't work particularly well in the 21st for any number of different reasons and so I think we are looking at institutional crisis in some terms and some kind of incapability of dealing

with the problem. And I don't think there is a lot of faith in many institutions. I think it happens in each country in terms of state institution or federal institution. The greatest faith is actually there with the most local institution, those that are more close to the people and I think that there is a real strain in terms of international institution is working. Part of it is that the system setup to deal with nation-states. And nation-states are not the only players now. We talk about non-state actors. And non-state actors are what we just heard form campaign one, nongovernmental organizations or terrorist or multinational businesses. They're different, I don't mean to equate any of them with each other but they play by different rules and the system is not setup for that so I do think in addition to specific problem in different areas, plus issues that cross lines. For instance dealing with terrorist or nuclear proliferation or poverty or energy environment etc.. those are issues that require a lot of people and country to participate in and then individual bilateral relationship and then the non-state actors means that the institution are deeply strain and we need to work on those.

Richard Wolffe: Okay Michele I had a very nice question about military to military corporations for but I'm going to start off with something about the Arab spring because it strikes me you're an adviser to the Obama campaign as well. Syria throws up all sorts of challenges, practical challenges but also some of what we want to talk about in this panel. In terms of the limits of where American leadership can take us and the limit what institutional or collaborative arrangements other countries can achieve. Does Syria show the limits of system we're in, the world we're in right now or is it very much were you see it as a set of problems?

Michele Flournoy: No it's a combination of both. The challenge in Syria is enormous. There is civil war deepening the humanitarian catastrophe is getting worse. It's very clear that Assad must go and that he will go. He has lost all legitimacy. This government will fall. The question is how long those that take and at what cost. I think that the administration has rightly been focused on what will force a change in the situation and that is trying to build cohesion within the opposition, at the strategic level. Working with them to develop transition plan and a platform that clearly protect minorities rights that invites the Alawites and the others to join in the future of the new Syria, and at the new operational level providing commanding control and communication equipment and so forth trying to give them more coherence. But this is going to, I think everybody wants this to end as quickly as possible but the real key is to get the political cohesion inside the opposition. I think you seen us, because there is no

institution that cannot really deal with this effectively. You've seen U.S. investment in really building catalyzing international consensus in the region and more broadly on outer bases to deal with this very difficult problem.

Richard Wolffe: My follow up would be my webby question here which is. I'm going to criticize my own question. The media, we all focus on the tough dramatic questions about toppling of leaders and the use of military force. But isn't the hard work post revelation and on that level in terms of democracy development for instance the hard work the pentagon been doing democratic control military institutions in these countries. How do we fair on that. Do we have the tools to actually deal with does things if we believe in smart power in that post revolutionary situation!

Michele Flournoy: I really do think that this administration has really tried to operationalize the notion of smart power not only in post conflict situation but also in pre conflict situation. Trying to prevent conflict in the first place and obviously diplomacy and development are the biggest elements of that. But there are cases where male to male relationships. Education, working with counterpart military has enable us to help educate others on what is the proper role in military in a civilian run democracy. That's a new concept for a lot of ***** and when you have an American military that prides itself on responsive to civilian control. Being a political, being a support of a foundation of our democracy. It's a very powerful way to engage these countries and help them adapted their own institution to be fully supportive of democracy as they go forward.

Richard Wolffe: I want to move my biased form right side of the panel to the left. Jim, I've heard for many years about the diplomatic surge that needs to happen in these post war situation. Do we have anything approaching that now and can you really use civilian tools for instance in Afghanistan where our military personnel and the personal threat are very real threat to the lives Afghan security themselves. Is the diplomatic surge rhetorical phrase or those it have reality on the ground.

Jim Steinberg: It's a work in progress but I think it one of the highlight of what president Obama and Secretary Clinton have tried to do. Is to really rethink the way we do diplomacy and development. To train a new generation of people,

to bring in a new approach. One of the real hallmarks of the last couple of years was drawing on the experience of the pentagon *** defense review. Secretary Clinton establish the Q.D.D act democracy and development review because she recognize is that we didn't have the capacity to meet these needs of a diplomatic surge, development surge or stabilization surge. We had to think about the structure our *** and also our people. What kinds of people we need to meet what kind of resources, what kind of trainer? To do the kind of man range planning the pentagon has always been so good at. And to marry all that up together so that we don't have two self-pipe. Have the military on one side and the state department and the A.I.D. on the other. And the partnership that had been developed between the pentagon, the state department and the A.I.D I think is unprecedented in recognize that all these groups have to work together. That they each have a role to play but that they work better if they're integrated from the beginning in the planning as well as the execution. So we're seeing a change in the way the state department does business. Institutional change bringing together more of the operational parts. Bringing together development with democracy with human rights with other aspects how we deploy forward and so how we can plan better to continue to be ready to go as these crisis develop if they are unanticipated and can anticipate for prevention but obviously we need resources to do that. It's a challenge with time by just its type but I think what we seen is a recognition that you can't just do a one legged story here it has to be all three parts together.

Richard Wolffe: Senator if I'm being the superficial journalist that I plan to be. I'd say that the shift we seen the Bush era to now would be characterize by this debate uni-naturalism and multi-naturalism. When you boil it down to a country like Pakistan with all of its challenges the way we want to approach collaborative fashion on development military to military. But then you got times when you need take uni-natural action specifically counter terrorism action. How do those thing match up when the real intelligence demands pressure, counter terrorism pressure. How the democrats, how does the United States square that circle!

Dianne Feinstein: I think that all these are warped up in the same situation. I think right now with Pakistan there is a reality and that reality is that Pakistan is a nuclear power with several dozen war heads and the ability to have positive relationship with that country is important. Our goal building trust and credibility which candidly rend sander. There are some changes specifically there's a new head of intelligence. He's been to this country; some of us had the opportunity to meet with him. He could well be a

breath of fresh air. I don't know events will show that but he is willing I believe to being a new era of cooperation between our intelligence and the Pakistani Intelligence service. I have become concern and if I can quickly say something about Syria. Because our government has made very clear in the new and practical world that Assad must go. However the thing that puzzle's me after ten years in Iraq. After our lost people. After nearly a trillion of dollars expenditure. The Iraqi government will not freeze the air space and prevent Iran from sending equipment in to Assad. And we have asked and we have asked and they have not. This to me a very important signal of whether Iraq could go. I would hate to see the development of another Iranian proxy in the area. I think this need a great deal of attention right now because as Michele said. Syria is a serious situation. And we have begun to work multilaterally and cooperatively. And countries like Turkey and Jordan are taking a much greater role and even the Saudi's in trying to be helpful and put a region and a promoter in that area. Assad must go and it has to happen rather soon. I think the loss of life is becoming intolerable and the way this loss of life is taking place is intolerable. So that appears to me to be a major question. Many of us have talked about what happens the Arab spring and the fact that we have nine nations that been buffeted from the inside and there's no way of telling what kind of stability is going to emerge. That's a huge issue. Egypt is a huge issue. Egypt is kind of like that eight hundred pound gorilla in the area. Whatever you want to say about *** he recognized Israel right to exist. How he recognized his two state solutions was the only way and he was helpful in many respects. Which way this new president may go no one knows. So I am strongly of the opinion that this next year is a very important year to get these things sorted out and we have to watch very carefully and that we should compel countries. We can try to be flexible with them but Kennedy I'm not so sure we should put a billion dollars in to Egypt unless Egypt is willing to move in a direction away from radical Islam.

Richard Wolffe: Let's open this up to everyone in the panel because you raise a very important question about Iraq. What tools could the United States used in the next four years to try and influence Iraq and specifically with the situation with Syria? Are the tools that are not being used now are the leverage that the United States could use obviously in the realm of smart power since we have exhausted hard power avenues right Tim?

Tim Roemer: Well Richard I want to combine your question and go back to the question you asked senator Albright about what the structure looks like I think the president has done a great deal of thinking in his foreign policy

formulation over the last three or four years over how the world has changed over the last twenty years. From the demise of the Soviet Union and we had a bipolar system between the United States and the Soviet Union in the cold war to more a uni-polar system and now it's an indispensable leader the United States forming a partnership with invaluable allies in the world on different sets of issues. An Indian scalar came up with term balancing power. Balancing smart military power. Soft and hard power. I like to give you a couple of examples to come to your second part of your question. The United States worked with a coalition of military powers to remove Gaddafi from power and try to work on democratic regime coming in afterwards. They worked very closely and carefully with the Indian government and people and Afghanistan on development issues economic and educational issues. Where Indian had devoted over two billion dollars to smart development in Afghanistan for a regional settlement there. The United States is working with partners in the Indian Ocean. This is part of the rebalance towards Asia when you have the states of Hermods through the state of Marloka to the South China Sea an area where we see ninety percent of trade now is on the ocean and about two thirds of petroleum trade goes on the ocean so the United States is a country that needs to make sure those sea lain are protected and we work with a different coalition of partners on anti-piracy effort's in that part of Indian Ocean. So you have development partnerships you have military partnerships you have smart power partnerships around the world that I think that the president and Sectary Clinton have done masterful job in trying to balance the use of these powers and the challenges that's coming in America and the world over the last several years. Where that balance goes next four years the next ten years. I think you'll see more of that kind of formulation.

Richard Wolffe: Anyone what to pitch in?

Jim Steinberg: I just add picking up on Tim right there! I think one of the insights that the merger of these new powers is not at the expense of the United States. We need all the capacity that the world can bring to better deal with these big challenges whether its piracy or terrorism or dealing with energy problems and the more we can bring them together to the table and recognize that working together and seeing the capacity of countries like Indian and Brazil and China and others to be partners with us means we have a better chance of solving these problems. Doesn't mean we are always going to get agree. We see over Syria that we had an important disagreement and we can't shy away from making clear where we have those difference or being able to recognize those needs that the big problem of our times need

more than less capacity means building these new kinds of flexible arrangements. Finding partners where we have shared interest is real critical to success.

Richard Wolffe: Okay so let me try and trip up the panel here. This is election time and obviously we are in an election where surprisingly foreign policy had not played a huge role but still there are differences that people on both sides have tried to raise. We have an international audience here so explain, take a crack at this if you will. Are the differences we hearing on foreign policy between these two campaigns. Are they matters of Roderick, are they real difference in policy approach here. Obviously as a nominee Mc. Romney didn't really talk about war at all, about Afghanistan at all in his acceptance speech last week. So in some context trying to step back from where we are today. Are there significant differences between these two sides moving forward in the next couple of years or is it just part of the campaign.

Dianne Feinstein: My own view is that any candidate has to be very careful in what they say. I think to make the statement on my first day I'm going to declare China a currency manipulator is not the wisest thing to do. And I think for one I've spent a long time getting to know Chinese things and China and watching China's development. And I see the real need of course I'm a westerner and the pacific and all of the trade and so forth. China is expanding, China has a more aggressive young military, China is moving in the South China Seas which I have always be assured prior to this time be handle in a legal way in terms of legal solution. Hopefully that can be put forward. I think one of the things secretary Clinton has done and Madeleine has tried to do and did is really establish a big relationship with china. And Jim did as well and I think that's extraordinary and very important and there is no reason for us to be anything other than allies. And I think we really need to look to develop that very much. And saying you going to declare someone a currency manipulator on your first day in office doesn't make much sense to me.

Madeleine Albright: I actually do think there are differences. And part of it has to do with Roderick I have to, I did say when I was secretary of state I had all my part surgically removed but I've been back (laughter) and but basically that the Romney people are living in a different century. And just the flat out statement to say that Russia is our biggest political problem is a twentieth century concept we are living in the twenty first century that

makes it a very different story. And I do think that there is a kind of one or two dimensional view that the Romney people seem to have in terms of what national security is about. They haven't made a lot of statements quite frankly just belligerent ones if I might say. I do think that one has to take it in to sense the mood of the American people and clearly we are focused domestically. Jim and I have been involved in many campaigns together. One of the things I used to say, we were both foreign policy advisors in order to make ourselves more important we would say that domestic and foreign policy are interrelated. They are we succeed right? (Laughter) The bottom line never has it been truer than now. I don't think it's been pointed out in any kind of intelligent way to explain it. And the issues that have been raised here. What foreign policy and national security is out there these days. That has not been out there. And I do think there are major differences and the point that Dianne makes, what's he going to do on day number two after his been declared. (laughter)

Richard Wolffe: We'll be dealing with repelling Obama care. Tim did you want to?

Tim Roemer: Yeah I want jump in and I think Madeleine is being kind by saying governor Romney is coming from ***. Let's talk about a couple of the differences. This is where I see elections. It's a very good thing here and in the world because some people look at elections and they say. Well it freezes action and you can't talk about foreign policy, it's all about domestic policy and the economy and jobs. As president Clinton said last night. It is about jobs it is about what the president inherited and let's looks at what he inherited on foreign policy and what he's done. The president honorably and respectfully brought all our troops out of Iraq. Governor Romney would have left them there. The president has said we are on a time table to bring our troops home out of Afghanistan and honor our commitment there and then try to help solve through smart power the reasons why we went. Governor Romney said each day something different about whether or not he supports the time table. We don't know how long our troops would be there. Governor Romney took a foreign policy trip to our closes ally to talk about a subject matter that he should be really comfortable with, the national Olympics. Yet he fumble that and David Cameron had to come back and *** him. So if you can't handle the easy issues with our closes allays in Great Britain at the Olympics games. How are you going to handle war, how are you going to handle peace, how you going to handle bring troops home. I think there are very big differences between what the president has achieved and accomplished. How he's use smart power. When he came to see us in India when I severed as ambassador. He telling me over and over and over again make

sure you are working on American jobs in India. Make sure you are using the export power of the United States to make things in America and that India will buy those products creating jobs back home. And that's trip resulted in I think twenty four thousand American jobs being sustain and created at home because of the presidents hard work to solve things overseas.

Richard Wolffe: I got my political fix and that's great. The organizers will be mad at me and I apologize for that but let's try and look forward here. Say your desired outcome comes to pass and president Obama gets another four years. Michele you worked on the president's development and global development. Whoever is president there are going to be budget constraints and budget pressure very real budget pressure and while it's a small part of the budget and maybe some of the smallest parts are the one that come in to the pressure because it's not entitlement it's not military. So how does a commitment to development survive budget pressures any next president is going to face?

Michele Flournoy: Well I think if you think about the budget prefers. I would look to the experience we had when we have budget control and the pentagon has had to try and find 487 billion budget cuts over the next ten years. As required part as a majority in congress. What did the president do? He didn't just sharpen knives and start cutting and slicing. He said wait a minute we have to step back and have to do a strategy driven review. We have to rethink our priorities of our resources constrains. That laid to a review process that very clearly articulated the defense priorities got all of the chiefs all of the commanders and the whole military on board signing off and supporting a new way forward. I expect we will have to the same thing on a much bigger level. Looking across diplomacy and development and the military going forward and I think this president understands the importance on doing that on a strategy level perspective. I also think he understands as Jack Lew said not only the moral code but the strategic economic imperative of development and our support for development and it's such a small portion of what we spend with such disproportion strategy effects. But I think there'll be strong supportive administration to protecting that. The challenge will be in congress. Here in harden by the fact that there are some new constituencies coming on board to support development but that is going to be the challenge. We have to better educate the American people about the strategic value of development of going forward.

Richard Wolffe: Jim four years' time we can talk about development more but interested in the phrase pivoting to Asia. What does four years of pivoting to Asia look like at the end of the Obama term?

Jim Steinberg: I think this is an enormously important prize when you talk about this being a consequential election because I think that the stage is being set that's going to shape up politics in the economics of Asia for generation to come. China is clearly merging on to the stage. It's having not only to deal with its relationship with the United States but with all its neighbors. But how we both the United States and our partners engage with China over the coming year. I think is going to set a context in which it make either possible for China to either take its place as an important contributor of a member of Asia Pacific region. Which is a stable and prosperous drive global growth helps deal with the big challenges like climate change, energy security or creates a new era of stability. I think the willingness to see how big the stakes are to recognize that our presents is indispensable for shaping the environment that allows China to take its rightful place but in a constructive way that reassures our allies that they can live in a world that China is important and powerful and not going to be left alone not going to feel insecure not going to have to do thing that increase stability. That we have to build trade, that we make China can live up to its international obligation to be fair and free in its trade but also welcome it as an engine for growth and to build the kinds of relationship like through the transpacific partnership that the president has been pushing new set of links between countries. Links on energy, links on trade, links on environment that creates a very stable region. This could be the region of peace and stability that drives the world. But it will take the foresight we need to do it. Sustain our engagement to recognize that engagement not just military but political and economic. To be there with our traditional partners and realize we don't have to trade that off to new countries and bring in India. That would be a tremendous exciting opportunity but also a period of risks if we don't take advantage of it we could see a very dangerous future.

Richard Wolffe: Senator we have not yet touched on Iran. I remember the second Bush term was supposed to be the term when Iran had to be dealt with and the timeline keeps moving further and further back. First of all have we reached a tipping point with Iran in the next four years in your view and secondly is there more room for a collaborative smart power approach or have we reaching the end of that road as well?

Dianne Feinstein: My answer would be yes and yes. I think we do reach a critical point within the next four years as Iran is preceding today I think most people would agree today that Iran will be a military nuclear power within four years unless there is a change and I think very strongly and was delighted to see the European instituted negotiation with the P5 plus one however it may well be there isn't sufficient flexibility with in that negotiating mechanism to work something out and this is a deep concern to me and I think. I've said this to the administration. I think there has to be a way ascertaining whether the supreme leader is really interested in doing an agreement and that America may step up in a bilateral negotiation where all things are on the table. What could happen if Iran becomes a military nuclear power? I think potentially catastrophic and that we really have to take the steps to prevent it. And it would be my hope China and Russia would be more active or members of the P5 plus one but as I look at this it's a much more rigid negotiation process and just setting down bilaterally. I just think that everything has to be done to push diplomacy to see if there is anything we can do to prevent Iran from being a military nuclear power.

Richard Wolffe: Before we go to some question. Tim secretary Clinton has talked about economic state craft. You've been in a country where that would've seen to loom large in India. How do you see that kind of economic state craft playing out in country that to be frank is a competitor economically on the job side of things for America but is also a developing country a trading partner? What's your experience of trying to perform economic state craft with a country that is clearly a rising economic power?

Tim Roemer: That's a great how the president has visualized and practice this policy with India is to full Richard. One and it goes back to your question to Jim. I didn't like the phrase of the question about the pivoting to Asia. It's really a balance of our foreign policy to recognize the number of people in China and India the growth potential in exporting market. We're not going to turn our back on Europe and the Middle East and our commitment in Latin America this just a refocus and a rebalance pivot away from something. There's competition with China, there is potential conflict with China, and there is cooperation with China. The united states want to see a peaceful raise there. With respect to India and your question I think the president has seen a great potential to almost work on concert of democracy with Asia and India that India strengthen its neighbors. This very well sees a blossoming of more democracy in Asia so we work more closely not only with India but other partners in Asia. I remember when I went to go meet with the president at the white house before I went to go

sever as ambassador in India and we went through the strategy and how he saw the relationship of the next five or ten years and then he said in terms of your question of state craft. He said Tim and he called me to the door and he put his arm around me and said I want you to shake hands with all 1.2 billion people (laughter) in India. Don't just get to know the prime minister and the Member of Parliament get to know the farmers. Go in to the poorest areas. I want you to show the moral imperatives to all the religions and all the people there and see where we can put this partnership with N.G.O. and businesses and work together with this country.

Richard Wolffe: And how many hands did you shake? (laughter)

Tim Roemer: I had a young man come up to me on a train, a 12 year old ask If I was the American ambassador and said I want to be one of the one billion people to shake your hand. (laughter)

Madeleine Albright: I want to add to that because it brings it back to the first question that you asked me which is that economic state craft requires many more players with in it. And we in the last panel in a discussion about private public partnership and Tim just mention it. And I think so we have to figure out a system we're comfortable with having Major Corporation and sit at the table at the time negotiation are taking place. They have to play a very important role in this not just in job creation but also in value system and looking in how issues come up. So the system has to adjust now to a whole new set of stake holders. And in order to deal with all the issues that are all out there whether they are health environmental or jobs it does require a larger table and that are what the structure looks at.

Richard Wolffe: So we have some question from Twitter, which we'll throw up in to the whole panel. So let me start doing that. This is from Plopez92. What do you think is the best way to engage youth in these global issues and stake a claim in the world's future? Anyone want to take that one?

Jim Steinberg: I'll be happy to take that one. As the president with youth today. I'm very encouraged by the tremendous change that's taking place with young

people today in America. This is first globalized generation. They think about the world differently and understand how people know about everything that is going on but borders are not meaningful to them. They understand the connection in their relationship. So I think the challenge for all of us is to give them outlet in a sense that they can take the instinct that they have and put it to use in a meaningful way. I like to see some of them engage in government serves. That kind of public serves is still dispensable to get the best and brightest. We have to get away from a sense of people feeling that there's no future and that it's a dead end that it's not a respected profession. We have to reestablish public serves value in other profession. We also have to train them to be able to work in N.G.O. and in Multinational Corporation. To give them the sense that they can make a difference in their life's which ever avenue they make but that they have to do it by understanding how others think being able to sit and put themselves in other people shoes to give the experience of languishes and cultures.

Richard Wolffe: We'll do one more from Twitter and then open it up to the floor. I think we have microphone on either side. But this for Soyepoe. While America dealt with Iraq and Afghans South America became more assertive by pulling the rag underneath the OAS how does the U.S. deal with this? Who wants to deal with South America?

Madeleine Albright: I do think our relationship with South America has always been complicated if I may say so. We're damn if we do; we're damn if we don't. If we don't pay enough attention then they say you're not paying enough attention if you do you're interfering with our domestic affairs. It is not a simple issue. The most revolutionary as secretary of state was to move Canada in to the western hemisphere. It actually was in Europe. The bottom line was to increase the numbers of democracy. And I do think there is a huge partnership here that we can and should have with Latin America. In any number of different ways both in terms of value and in terms of how they can be part of a partnership aspect. Brazil is a major player but so are other countries. We have more complicated and interesting relationship with Mexico than any other country in the world. And I do think there are many opportunities to do thing together but it does require a sense of respect from both sides and an understanding of democracy and development. One of the things I have been pushing is in fact the importance of development and democracy because democracy has to deliver and people want to vote and eat. So the bottom line here is how to make that happen in our own hemisphere.

Dianne Feinstein: May I say one thing about young people. I think it's really important to spend some time on history of an area of the world you're in and really become proficient in it. Sort of develop a portfolio of expertise in one area and then you know there are all kinds of opportunities with N.G.O. to come in an intern for young people for a period of time. And I really think it gives you a leg up but I also think understanding a country is very important!

End of Conference

Transcribed by Bilingual Connections

09/07/12