

August 30, 2010

RELEASE IN FULL

LEADING THROUGH CIVILIAN POWER

HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON

Today's world is a crucible of challenges testing American leadership. A glance at the headlines – and the trend lines – explains why.

In the 21 months since President Obama took office, we have seen the effects of the H1N1 health pandemic, an earthquake on a small Caribbean island, and floods in southern Punjab ripple across oceans and continents. And a financial crisis in Greece, a torpedoed ship in the Yellow Sea, and a spike in world food prices cause jitters on Wall Street and worries about our future well-being.

Global problems – from violent extremism to worldwide recession to climate change to poverty – demand collective solutions, even as power in the world becomes more diffuse. They require effective international cooperation, even as it becomes harder to achieve. And they call for American leadership, even as the world changes around us.

I began my tenure as Secretary of State by stressing the need to elevate diplomacy and development alongside defense – a “smart power” approach to solving global problems. To make that approach succeed, however, our civilian power must be strengthened and amplified. It must, as Defense Secretary Robert Gates has argued in these pages, be brought into better balance with our military power.

This effort is well underway. Congress already has appropriated funds for 1,108 new Foreign and Civil service officers to strengthen the State Department's capacity to pursue America's interests and advance our values. At USAID, we are doubling development officers, hiring 1,200 new foreign service officers with the specific skills and experience required for evolving development challenges, and making more effective use of the local hires at our overseas missions who have deep knowledge of their countries. We have begun rebuilding USAID into the world's premier development organization, one that seeds long-term growth, includes its own research arm, shapes policy and innovation, and uses metrics to ensure that our investments are cost-effective and sound.

But we need to do more. We need not only to rebuild – but also to rethink, reform, and recalibrate. During my years on the Senate Armed Services Committee, I saw how the Department of Defense used its Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) to align its resources, policies, and strategies for the present – and the future. No similar mechanism existed for modernizing the State Department or USAID. One of my first acts as Secretary of State was to

appoint a new Deputy Secretary in charge of managing our systems and resources. And in July 2009, I launched the first Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review (QDDR), a wholesale review of State and USAID to recommend how we can better equip, fund, and organize ourselves to meet our current diplomatic and development priorities and how we can begin building the people, structures, processes, and resources today to address the world's challenges in the years ahead.

The QDDR is not simply a review. It defines how to make diplomacy and development coordinated, complementary, and mutually reinforcing. It assesses what has worked in the past and what hasn't. And it forecasts future strategic choices and resource needs.

While the State Department and USAID have distinct roles and missions, we know that diplomacy and development often overlap – and must often work in tandem. Increasingly, global challenges call for a mix of both, requiring us to pursue a more holistic approach to civilian power.

Diplomatic objectives are often more effectively secured by development gains. The resumption of direct talks between the Israelis and the Palestinians over the summer was the handiwork of talented and persistent diplomats. But progress at the negotiating table is directly linked to progress building strong and stable institutions of a Palestinian state and providing Israel with needed security. And development objectives are often more effectively secured by diplomatic engagement. The impact of our Feed the Future program and Global Health Initiative will turn in part on the promotion of policy reforms in partner countries, and our Millennium Challenge Compacts are in part the product of sustained political engagement to create positive conditions for development. In many places, including Iraq and Afghanistan, the need for mutually reinforcing diplomatic and development strategies stems from the combined causes and effects of violent conflict, instability, and weak states.

The two “D”s in the QDDR reflect the world as we see it today – and as we envision it in the future. The review process relied on the wisdom and talent of exceptional people in both spheres – State and USAID – who worked tirelessly to produce a blueprint for reforms that will be implemented over the next four years but whose impact will stretch far beyond. This year's inaugural QDDR, to be repeated every four years, identifies new approaches and skill sets for diplomats and development experts, sets budget priorities, establishes planning procedures, revises promotion incentives, and reorganizes bureaucratic structures. It focuses on three main areas: modernizing and coordinating our diplomacy across U.S. government agencies; ensuring that our development work creates lasting and sustainable impact; and creating a stronger nexus of diplomacy and development – as well as better coordination with our defense partners – in conflict zones and fragile states.

A GLOBAL CIVILIAN SERVICE

Diplomacy has long been the backbone of U.S. foreign policy. And it remains so today. The vast majority of my work at the State Department consists of deploying diplomats and engaging in diplomacy to address major global and regional challenges, from confronting Iran's nuclear

ambitions, to facilitating negotiations between Israelis and Palestinians, to enhancing stability on the Korean Peninsula, to working with other governments to bring emergency relief to Haiti. And President Obama and I certainly relied on old-fashioned diplomatic elbow grease to hammer out a last-minute accord at the Copenhagen conference on climate change last December.

In annual strategic dialogues with a range of key partners – including Russia, India, China, South Africa, Nigeria, Indonesia, and Pakistan – we aim to move beyond the tyranny of the inbox to deepen and broaden our relationships and to establish a stronger foundation for addressing shared problems, advancing shared interests, and managing differences. We are investing in strengthening global structures like the G-20 and regional institutions from the Organization of American States to the Association of Southeast Asian Nations. This is part of our commitment to building a new global architecture of cooperation that includes not only East and West, but also North and South.

While traditional diplomacy will always be critical to advancing our agenda, it is not enough. We have to expand our engagement to reach and influence wider and more diverse groups using new skills, strategies, and tools. To that end, we are broadening the way we conceive of diplomacy as well as the roles and responsibilities of its practitioners.

The original Foreign Service, as its name implies, consisted of people trained to manage our relations with foreign states, principally through consultations with their counterparts in government. This has been the main function of our Ambassadors and our embassies, as well as the staff at the State Department. But increasing global interconnectedness now necessitates reaching beyond government to citizens, and broadening our foreign policy portfolio to include issues once confined to the domestic sphere, such as economic and environmental regulation, drugs and disease, organized crime, and worldwide hunger. As those issues spill across borders, the domestic agencies addressing them must now do more of their work overseas – operating out of our embassies and consulates. A U.S. Ambassador in 2010 is thus responsible not only for managing civilians from State and USAID, but also for operating as CEO of a multi-agency. And he or she must also be adept at connecting with audiences outside of government, such as the business community and civil society.

Consider our embassy in Islamabad. The mission includes 800 staff members; about 450 are diplomats and civil servants from State and 100 are from USAID. A large portion of our work there consists of traditional diplomacy – foreign-service officers helping Americans traveling or doing business in the region, issuing visas, and engaging with their Pakistani civilian and military counterparts. But our Ambassador also leads civilians from 11 other federal agencies, including disaster relief and reconstruction experts helping to rebuild after last summer's historic floods; specialists in health, energy, communications, finance, agriculture, and justice; and military personnel working with the Pakistani military to bolster Pakistani capacities and partner in the fight against violent extremists.

Back in Washington, my responsibility as Secretary is to ensure that the Foreign and Civil Service personnel within the State Department and USAID are working together -- and with their colleagues across the federal government. Our strategic dialogue with Pakistan involves ten separate working groups and thus brings together cabinet secretaries and experts from a range of agencies in both governments. Our dialogue with India engaged 22 different agencies; and when

Secretary Geithner and I traveled to Beijing in May for the second round of the Strategic and Economic Dialogue, our delegation included civilians from over 30 agencies.

Our Foreign Service officers, Civil Service personnel, and local engaged staff at the State Department and USAID form the backbone of our global engagement. But we need the expertise and skill of all of our civilians across government to meet today's and tomorrow's challenges. By drawing on the pool of talent that already exists in our federal agencies and at overseas posts, we can build a global civilian service of the same caliber and flexibility as our military. From the State Department, USAID, and Millennium Challenge Corporation to the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the Export-Import Bank, the Departments of Justice, Treasury, and Agriculture, the Centers for Disease Control, the Peace Corps, and many others, we must reward teamwork, collaboration and inter-agency rotations. Developing the structures and habits of cooperation and collaboration will enable us to take full advantage of our civilian assets.

Engagement must go far beyond government-to-government interactions. In this information age, public opinion takes on added importance even in authoritarian states and as non-state actors are more able to influence current events. Today, a U.S. ambassador creates ties not only with the host nation's government, but also its people. The QDDR endorses a new public diplomacy strategy that makes public engagement every diplomat's duty, through town halls and media interviews, organized outreach, events in provincial towns and smaller communities, student exchange programs, and virtual connections that bring together citizens and civic organizations. Indeed, in the 21st century, a diplomat is as likely to meet with a tribal elder in a rural village as a counterpart in a foreign ministry – as likely to wear cargo pants as pin stripe suits.

Public diplomacy must start at the top. In Indonesia and Turkey, I conducted bilateral meetings with government officials, but I also met with civil society leaders and appeared as a guest on popular television talk shows. I have held town halls with diverse groups of citizens on every continent I've visited. Public events like these are as much a part of my job as Secretary of State as my meetings in the Foreign Ministry because the durability of our partnerships will depend on the attitudes of the people as well as the policies of their governments.

In Washington, too, we are re-shaping the way we conceive of and conduct public diplomacy. We are shifting away from traditional platforms and building connections to foreign publics in regions once considered beyond our reach. It makes no sense to allocate our greatest resources to parts of the world where our ties are already strong and secure, and to minimize our efforts in places where engaging the public is critical to our success. This also forces us to streamline and modernize our public diplomacy efforts across the board. When the public diplomacy staff was decreased at our embassy in Berlin to make resources available for outreach in Central and Eastern Europe, the staff used the opportunity to develop a leaner, more agile, and more effective operation.

We can also leverage civilian power by connecting businesses, philanthropists and citizens' groups with partner governments to perform tasks that governments cannot. Technology in particular gives us new tools of engagement. One great success this year was a partnership forged almost overnight with U.S. and Haitian mobile phone companies, the Red Cross, social entrepreneurs, the Coast Guard and eventually the U.S. Marines. Together, we created a platform that directed text messages locating earthquake victims so workers could rescue them. We

launched a program called Text to Haiti that drew contributions from 31 million Americans who donated \$10 each. At the State Department, we continue to develop new ways to use the world's 4.6 billion mobile phones to improve the lives of people living in remote and arduous circumstances.

Visits by American technology delegations have also produced promising avenues for innovative partnerships in fields from agriculture to health. One such visit to Russia, for example, helped pave the way for a public-private partnership called text4baby that will provide a mobile application for pregnant women and new mothers to get health tips through their cell phones and monitor their own pregnancies to determine when they should seek professional medical attention.

As we look down the road to the forces that will shape global politics, we see more acutely how the material conditions of people's lives can affect our national security objectives. While our USAID colleagues lead our development work overseas, State Department employees today from Ambassadors to civil service experts must be better versed, and more engaged, in development issues. For this reason, I called for a broad review of our aid programs in Afghanistan and Pakistan to ensure that they were aligned with our strategic objectives, and sent two of our most experienced ambassadors to serve as overall foreign assistance coordinators in Islamabad and Kabul.

This comprehensive approach is essential to our engagement in many regions. In Mexico, for example, we continue to support law enforcement efforts to arrest and prosecute members of drug cartels but have also begun the next phase of our Merida Initiative working with our Mexican partners – in government, business, and civil society – to strengthen justice systems and promote a “culture of legality” in communities. This includes supporting community watch initiatives, expanding educational opportunities for young people so they have alternatives to the drug trade, and strengthening citizen participation councils in every state in Mexico to ensure that they can safely engage in real dialogue to hold authorities accountable.

When the diverse elements of our civilian power work cohesively – as in many of our embassies around the world, and on our best days in Washington – we can see the potential impact of a global civilian service. There is no guarantee that this comprehensive approach will achieve every goal, especially in places where the challenges are as entrenched and complex as they are in places like Mexico and Yemen and Pakistan. But it is the best alternative we have, and one we must pursue.

ACHIEVING HIGH IMPACT DEVELOPMENT

I am sometimes asked why development matters to our foreign policy and why we should spend money on people overseas when we have economic challenges at home. As counterintuitive as it may seem, the answer is that development, when done effectively, is one of the best tools we have to enhance our own stability and prosperity. It can help strengthen fragile or failing states; support the rise of capable partners who can help us solve regional and global problems; and

advance democracy and human rights. And it is a direct expression of our values and compassion as a people.

At the same time, we must acknowledge that, while the world's problems are vast, our resources are not. As stewards of American taxpayer dollars, we must be strategic in pursuing the most critical needs and making decisions based on hard evidence to ensure that our investments deliver results. And we must also stay focused on the long-term – not simply addressing the urgent needs of people today but building the foundation for a more prosperous future. With this in mind, the Presidential Policy Directive on Development issued by President Obama in September – the first by an American President -- emphasizes the importance of targeting countries with responsible governments and favorable conditions, and coordinating assistance with trade, finance, investment credits and other economic policies to help seed emerging markets and foster widespread and sustainable economic growth. Economic growth is the most lasting route out of poverty, and expanding and strengthening middle classes around the world will be key to creating the just and sustainable international order that lies at the heart of our National Security Strategy.

The QDDR embraces development as a process of assisted self-help in furtherance of American interests and values. A developing country must be in charge and set its own goals for meeting the needs of its people. Americans come to the table as partners, not patrons, lending our resources and expertise and, eventually, putting ourselves out of business when a host country is self-sustaining.

Today, we are putting that partnership model into practice in two signature initiatives the Obama Administration announced over the past year: the Global Health Initiative and Feed The Future, part of the Obama Administration's broader global food security initiative.

The Global Health Initiative recognizes that the landscape for health in many developing countries has improved over the years, due in part to President George W. Bush's Presidential Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), his malaria initiative, and the contributions of many other countries and organizations. But this more crowded landscape does not necessarily improve health outcomes efficiently or for the long-term.

Consider the life of a woman in a remote African village. Within walking distance is a clinic supported by PEPFAR, where she finds out that she has HIV and then receives antiretroviral drugs that keep her healthy. She can make a longer journey by bicycle or bus to another clinic offering prenatal care and immunizations. Sometimes health services come to her door, in the form of health volunteers bringing bed nets to protect her family from malaria. Yet if she has trouble giving birth, the nearest facility equipped to perform emergency surgery is hundreds of miles away. And while her home has been sprayed for mosquitoes, she has no access to clean water, so her children may escape malaria only to die from diarrheal disease.

The delivery of health services is marred by a lack of coordination among countries and organizations, including our own government. And when governments cannot afford or don't have the expertise to ensure that health care gets to local populations, donor countries and outside NGOs have stepped in. That is the right response to an emergency, but in too many places, it has become the *de facto* solution. As a result, the African woman's access to care is

piecemeal, and her future care is uncertain. She is vulnerable to the vicissitudes of funding cycles and development trends in places far from where she lives. The fundamental purpose of the Global Health Initiative is to address these problems by tying individual health programs -- PEPFAR, the President's Malaria Initiative, maternal and child health, family planning, neglected tropical diseases, and other critical health areas -- together in an integrated, coordinated, sustainable system of care, with the countries themselves in the lead.

Our Feed The Future initiative is based on the same principles. To give one example from a partner country, Bangladesh is developing its own food security investment plan based in part on consultations in a public forum with more than 500 representatives. The strategy has been reviewed for technical quality by independent experts and is being further refined by national leaders and technical experts. We are now developing our own U.S. government investment plan in support of Bangladesh's strategy, in full collaboration with other governments and international donors.

This is what partnership looks like in practice. Partner governments will almost certainly choose to do things differently than we might, or outline different priorities. Vetting and investing in the government's plan may take longer than delivering services ourselves. But the result promises a sustainable strategy that will continue even after our assistance has ended. This approach reflects the consensus of the international community on principles for effective foreign assistance. The QDDR embraces these principles and recommends a detailed set of mechanisms for implementing them in the field.

The QDDR also focuses on the diplomatic side of effective development policy, building much stronger and more systematic links between State and USAID both in Washington and in the field.

Diplomacy can support development policy in different ways. Our most important diplomatic effort with China in recent years -- the Strategic and Economic Dialogue -- includes high-level discussions about development, and what it means to our countries' respective and collective efforts in Africa and elsewhere. Before the 2009 meeting of the G-8 in L'Acquila, Italy, high-level engagement with partner governments enabled us to secure a \$20 billion international commitment to food security, building a coalition of countries willing to contribute. And at the 2009 Summit of the Americas, President Obama launched the Energy and Climate Partnership of the Americas, bringing together all the democratically-elected governments of our hemisphere to work toward a shared goal of clean, renewable and inexpensive energy sources. As part of that effort, the United States and Brazil are helping seven energy-poor Central American and Caribbean countries develop their own biofuels. This promotes sustainable economic development and regional integration, and also helps reduce dependence on imported Venezuelan oil.

But diplomacy and development can only be mutually reinforcing if we also get our own house in order. The first step is to move beyond agency stove-piping and to use all the talent and expertise within the federal government. The Global Health Initiative, for example, is jointly led by the USAID Administrator, the U.S. Global AIDS Coordinator, and the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Their agencies, along with the Departments of Health and Human Services, the National Institutes of Health, and the Peace Corps, work together under the

overall guidance and direction of the Deputy Secretary of State. This unique leadership structure solidifies our commitment to coordination at every level, from the White House down.

The QDDR also reinforces and reflects specific internal reforms within USAID. Administrator Rajiv Shah has laid out an aggressive set of operational priorities called “USAID Forward” that are designed to make the Agency more effective, accountable and transparent. Guided by the QDDR and in coordination with the State Department, USAID Forward concentrates on procurement, people, and policy.

Procurement reform may sound like an arcane subject removed from the realities of helping people on the ground. Done poorly, procurement can become a bureaucratic burden. But it can also be an opportunity for progress when it’s done well. Our goal is to build local capacities in the countries where we work by drawing on the talent and expertise of small businesses and NGOs. Senegal, for instance, has more than 1,400 health huts, where trained by USAID provide basic – and often lifesaving – treatments, lowering costs and moving us closer to the day when our aid will no longer be necessary.

To reform personnel, our goal is to attract and retain development professionals who represent the diversity of America and are skilled, energetic, and know how to solve problems. Administrator Shah and I have observed firsthand how our best USAID staff members work as development entrepreneurs—identifying opportunities and finding solutions that meet people’s needs. To capitalize on this kind of talent, the QDDR is focusing on how to recruit and retain locally hired staff, the backbone of our USAID missions worldwide.

To reform policy, USAID has already created a new Bureau of Policy, Planning and Learning. Evidence-based development must be more than a notion—it must become our reality. We will measure our investments not by the number of programs run, but the number of children nourished or vaccinated, and the volume of people benefiting from clean water, electricity, teachers, medicine or jobs. We will also make sure our taxpayer dollars are well spent – by gathering baseline data, surveying development indicators *before* we launch projects, and then measuring those same indicators over the life of the project. Where our approaches are successful, we will replicate them and scale them up. Where they are not, we will admit it, learn from our failures, and come up with a better idea.

We will also rely on the innovations of science and technology to help us work better, cheaper, and faster in the pursuit of high impact development. Mobile phones have already transformed the lives of countless people in sub-Saharan Africa. Imagine what the world would look like if off-grid renewable energy provided illumination to billions of people now living in the dark, or if more kinds of drought-resistant seeds existed for farmers in the developing world. The QDDR endorses USAID’s creation of the Development Innovation Ventures Fund where creative solutions will be funded, piloted and brought to scale.

In July, USAID brought together scientists and technology experts to develop “Grand Challenges for Development.” These government-sponsored competitions will challenge scientists and engineers to develop game-changing solutions to specific development problems. Just recently, USAID funded the trial of a vaginal microbicide that reduces the transmission of HIV/AIDS by 30 percent, a major breakthrough in HIV transmission that will give women more control over their reproductive health. USAID and the Gates Foundation recently have joined forces to create

mobile banking in Haiti, building on effective programs in Asia, Latin America, and Africa. We are also inviting top scientists and entrepreneurs to help us find cost-effective, simple ways to provide clean water, vaccines, inexpensive but durable computers, micro-generators, medical kits, and applications for cell phones.

As we undertake these efforts, we will broaden our partnerships. Twenty years ago, the “development community” didn’t exist far beyond the walls of USAID. Today, it includes corporate leaders, philanthropists, foundations and advocates, all of whom add new skills and perspectives. Equally important are the grassroots leaders in our communities: the religious groups, students, and other activists who lend their passion and energy to humanitarian efforts. These advocates and entrepreneurs are willing to challenge old orthodoxies and bring a new mindset to their work. We will partner with them to get results.

BUILDING PEACE AND STRENGTHENING FRAGILE STATES

American civilians have long operated in conflict zones and fragile states. But today, our diplomats and development experts are being asked to undertake missions of a scale and scope never seen before. Our task in Iraq is to lead a broad U.S. peace-building mission. At the same time, we are responsible in Afghanistan for helping to reduce the strength of the insurgency, improve governance, and promote stability that will last after our troops return home. In Pakistan, we are assisting a government and society buffeted by the global economic recession, natural disasters, and regional instability, while supporting a counter-terrorism and counter-insurgency campaign. Today, twenty percent of our diplomatic corps is now stationed in these three countries -- where democracy is young, institutions are struggling to serve local populations, society is ethnically or religiously divided, and security is an ongoing challenge. Beyond those countries, we are working to stabilize fragile states from Somalia and Sudan to Haiti and Kyrgyzstan.

Given this unprecedented situation, we have to ask unprecedented questions: As we plan for the transition in Iraq, how will we protect our embassy in Baghdad or our consulate in Basra? How will we ensure the security of reconstruction experts who must work alongside Iraqi colleagues in villages and towns across the country? How will we generate the sustained manpower to fulfill our many ongoing and diverse commitments in Iraq?

In Iraq, we had 170,000 troops during the surge: Today our troops stand at 50,000 assigned to supporting Iraqi government forces. On the ground are about 1,600 civilians – diplomats, stabilization and reconstruction experts and development professionals in charge of helping Iraq transition to a stable and prosperous democracy. Similarly in Afghanistan, the American contribution to reconstruction and redevelopment is now led by about 1,100 diplomats and civilian experts who will remain there after our troops are gone. These numbers say something important about civilian power and leadership. Properly trained and equipped, civilians are force-multipliers. One effective diplomat or development expert can leverage as many as ten local partners, and we have learned that when local partners build their own capacities and networks, communities become stronger and more resilient.

Civilian leadership in addressing conflict and instability also depends on marshaling and leveraging the varied assets of our government as a whole. Under the leadership of strong Ambassadors and agency representatives, collaboration among American civilians from across the government has reached a new level in Pakistan, Iraq, Afghanistan, Haiti and elsewhere. We are pooling the expertise of civilians at State and USAID, as well as DoJ, Commerce, Treasury, DHS, HHS, CDC, and other agencies. The United States cannot succeed in these fragile states if these agencies aren't working together. That means organizing ourselves internally with a focus on integration, cohesion, and solving problems. For example, the creation of the office of the Special Representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan – with 16 agencies represented – was an innovation to overcome agency compartmentalization and to achieve a comprehensive strategy.

The QDDR also draws on the talents of the Civilian Response Corps, which has identified hundreds of civilian experts across the government who can be quickly deployed to conflict zones or fragile states. The Secretary sent the CRC's expeditionary conflict and security experts to Southern Sudan, deploying them quickly enough to support our Sudanese partners as they prepare for potential independence after decades of conflict.

The QDDR recommends building rapid response diplomatic teams and specially trained experts who can operate effectively over the longer term amidst conflict and instability. The State Department will focus on complex political crises, and USAID on disaster response, building on its abilities to get relief and recovery workers into the field within 24 hours after a disaster strikes. We will also create a joint operating framework and response plan that will allow State and USAID to work more effectively together and with other agencies.

Although Afghanistan and Iraq have occupied much of the world's attention for the past eight years, they are not the only places where diplomats and development experts are responsible for helping to shore up fragile and failing states, deal with the consequences of political, economic, and social instability, or join in common cause to prevent conflicts in the first place. Indeed, since the end of the Cold War, the State Department and USAID have steadily taken on more missions in difficult and dangerous places, from Lebanon to Bosnia to East Timor.

In Sudan we are mounting a civilian surge around the southern capital of Juba to prepare for the January 2011 referendum that will determine whether South Sudan secedes from the North.

In Yemen, our embassy is working to address economic conditions and the ravages of poverty in a country that has recently faced a secessionist movement in the south, a rebellion in the north, and a persistent threat from al Qaeda on the Arabian Peninsula. Through the diplomatic Friends of Yemen and concentrated efforts to stabilize fragile local communities and create opportunities for economic growth, we are trying to help the Yemeni government provide better services for its citizens and to prevent conflict. The QDDR anticipates more situations requiring rapidly deployable civilian teams of diplomats, stabilization and reconstruction experts, and development professionals that can meet our needs in circumstances like Sudan or Yemen while also mounting larger efforts in other countries at the same time.

Training a new generation of diplomats, development professionals, and peace-building experts will help us strengthen weak, fragile or violent states and offer opportunities and hope to their citizens. Poverty and repression do not automatically engender terrorism but countries that are impoverished, corrupt, lawless or mired in a recurring cycle of conflict are more prone to

becoming havens for terrorists and other criminals. Al Qaeda first operated out of Sudan and bombed U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania before migrating to Afghanistan, then a country notable for its poverty, high infant mortality and repressive Taliban government. It is no coincidence that al Qaeda is most active today in underdeveloped nations such as Pakistan, Somalia, Yemen, Mali, Mauritania and Niger.

Beyond terrorism and violent extremism, the world already has witnessed too many tragic examples of what happens when good governance is absent. We have seen drug cartels exploit the absence of strong governing institutions and push countries on several continents to the brink of becoming narco-states. Elsewhere, countries rich in minerals and diamonds have become epicenters of violence – including gender-based sexual violence -- because the central government is unwilling or unable to combat corruption, regulate legitimate business, or invest natural resources wealth in the country's infrastructure and people. And too often, conflicts in fragile and weak states spill over borders, creating humanitarian crises and spawning grounds for terrorists and global criminal networks elsewhere.

On the positive side, however, we have also seen the effectiveness of civilian power working with our military to impede conflict and contribute to stability. In Liberia, as fighting between rebel groups and government forces under the leadership of Charles Taylor intensified and the humanitarian situation deteriorated, the United States undertook intense diplomatic efforts, including public calls for Taylor's resignation, as well as military deployments to the region to help shore up peacekeeping efforts of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). Taylor's resignation paved the way for a comprehensive peace agreement that led to the end of Liberia's conflict and set the stage for Liberia's stabilization and reconstruction efforts. Both the United Nations and the United States continue to partner with Liberia as it rebuilds social and economic infrastructure destroyed by years of conflict. Our future depends on the success of all these types of missions – from Iraq and Afghanistan to West Africa -- and our ability to mount more of them.

The American people must understand that spending taxpayer dollars on diplomacy and development is in their interests, especially when those investments support missions in conflict zones, fragile states, and states that can play a responsible role in their regions and in the world. And Congress, which has a long tradition of bipartisan support for traditional diplomacy and development, must appreciate the scale and scope of the reconstruction and stabilization missions that our civilians are being asked to undertake. Congress must provide the necessary funding now.

The House and Senate have appropriated hundreds of billions of dollars for the military missions in Iraq and Afghanistan. The diplomatic and development activities represent a fraction of that cost, yet the funding often gets bogged down in the old debates over foreign aid. We have to move beyond the past and treat diplomacy and development as national security priorities and smart investments in our future stability and security. We can succeed, but only with the necessary Congressional leadership and support.

Perhaps no one understands the urgency of this as much as Secretary Gates. As he said last August: "Congress is part of the problem. When I sent my budget to the Hill for roughly \$550 billion, the Senate voted me \$550 billion as the budget allocation. . . . Hillary Clinton sent up a budget of about \$50 billion, and they whacked four or five billion dollars out of it. So there has

to be a change in attitude in the recognition of the critical role that agencies like State and AID play for them to play the leading role that I think they need to play in most of these situations.”

* * * * *

Our emphasis on civilian power is in keeping with America’s history and traditions. The Marshall Plan was a civilian development initiative undertaken in partnership with European governments. President Kennedy founded the Peace Corps to show the world a different face of America decades before the term “soft power” was coined. American diplomats helped negotiate the reunification of Europe in 1991 without a shot fired. Meanwhile, American civilians have enjoyed the world’s admiration because of their spirit of innovation, abundant goodwill, and the audacious belief that technological, social and political advances can and must be used to improve the lives of human beings around the world.

The men and women who volunteer for our armed forces exemplify this spirit. So do the growing number of civilians who find ways to engage in public service. With the right balance of civilian and military power, we can advance America’s interests and values, lead and support other nations in solving global problems, and forge strong diplomatic and development partnerships with traditional allies and newly emerging powers. And we can rise to the challenges of the world in the 21st century and meet the tests of America’s global leadership.

###