

RELEASE IN FULL

DRAFT 22 lm ams

FOREIGN AFFAIRS MAGAZINE**LEADING THROUGH CIVILIAN POWER**

Today's world is a crucible of challenges testing American leadership. When I became Secretary of State, I immediately confronted the need for an increasingly civilian-led role in Iraq and an expanded development and diplomatic presence in Afghanistan. Stopping the proliferation of nuclear weapons loomed large in Iran and North Korea; the global economy was still flat on its back; the Copenhagen negotiations for a new climate change treaty and the need for a new START treaty with Russia were only a year away. And all these problems are interconnected. In just 18 months we have seen how the effects of a global health pandemic, an earthquake on a small Caribbean island, and floods of the Indus River can ripple across oceans and continents. And how a financial crisis in Greece, a torpedoed ship in the Yellow Sea, and a drought in Russia can cause jitters on Wall Street and worries about our future well-being.

As I look 5, 10, or 20 years down the road, I see the following trends. Power will continue to diffuse among states and non-state actors, even as global problems increasingly require collective solutions. Crises and conflicts between governments, the staple fare of traditional diplomacy, continue, but problems once confined to domestic politics such as economic and environmental regulation, health care, organized crime, and terrorist cells will evermore dominate the global agenda. The lawlessness and human suffering endemic in fragile and failing states will occupy more and more of our time. The importance of public opinion, even in authoritarian states, will grow. The link between the everyday lives of citizens and the decisions of their governments will steadily strengthen.

Facing this present and this future, I began my tenure by calling for an elevation of diplomacy and development alongside defense – a “smart power” approach to global problems that goes beyond the scope of the traditional diplomacy associated with the State Department. To make that approach work, we must build our civilian power and strengthen the synergies between diplomacy and development. Most of the problems we must address are not susceptible to military solutions, which is why Defense Secretary Robert Gates has argued in these pages that civilian and military power – both essential to our nation's security – must be brought into balance by strengthening our civilian institutions.

To build civilian power, we must modernize our diplomacy and not only elevate development but also take a much bolder approach aimed at high-impact results. We must train our diplomats and development professionals to work much more closely together. We must develop a new set of capabilities that allow us to deploy civilian teams rapidly in conflicts and crises, in insecure environments and often alongside our military. And we need *all* our assets on the civilian side.

We must overcome the stovepipes not only at State and USAID, but across the federal government. The good news is that we have a wealth of talent and capabilities in other civilian agencies, many of whom are already active abroad. But we must harness that power in an integrated and effective way.

The Obama Administration has already begun to build civilian power. Congress appropriated funds for 1,108 new foreign and civil service offers to bolster the State Department. At USAID, we are in the process of doubling development officers, hiring 1,200 new experts with the specific skills and experience now required. With this staff, and with more local hires at our overseas missions who have deep knowledge of their countries, we intend to rebuild 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 wise.

But we need to do more. We need not only to build, but also to rethink, reform, and recalibrate. This will not happen by itself. During my years on the Senate Armed Services Committee, I saw how the Department of Defense used the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) to look down the road and prepare today for what it saw coming tomorrow. 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 that we think we will need a decade from now.

A defining feature of the QDDR, in addition to the fact of the review itself, is its focus on the elevation of development and the ways in which diplomacy and development can and must reinforce each other. In some cases, our short-term goals are best served by diplomacy working in tandem with a longer-term vision which coordinates development policies and political engagement to gain senior-level foreign support. The global financial crisis, for instance, required an immediate diplomatic and economic response coordinated through the G-20. But the longer-term health of the global economy requires coordinated development and economic policies that create a better global balance between consumers and producers. Or when the H1N1 became an epidemic, our immediate response was to work with other nations and the World Health Organization to share information, inform publics, and coordinate the development and distribution of vaccines. But to prevent future pandemics we must strengthen local health systems around the globe.

In other cases, like Iraq, Afghanistan, and many other states around the world, the need for mutually reinforcing diplomatic and development strategies stems from the combined causes and effects of violent conflict, instability, and state fragility. Even at the heart of traditional diplomacy, the Middle East peace process, we have to think more broadly about how our diplomatic and development efforts intersect. The resumption of direct talks between the Israelis and the Palestinians this 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.

The two “D”s in the QDDR reflect the world as we see it today – but also 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. The final report identifies new approaches and skill sets for diplomacy and development, 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 is high impact; and creating a stronger nexus of diplomacy and development in conflict zones and fragile states.

A GLOBAL CIVILIAN SERVICE

Effective civilian power requires integration and coordination of civilian experts across our government.

In our diplomatic missions overseas, our Ambassadors serve not as the representative of the State Department, but as the President's representative on the ground and chief of a multi-agency mission. Back in Washington, my role as Secretary is to ensure that within the State Department and throughout the world we are working smoothly together on a daily basis.

The complexity of our missions means that our Ambassadors must operate as CEOs of diverse enterprises, united in advancing U.S. strategic interests. Similarly, we must enlarge our concept of Foreign Service Officers as our sole civilian representatives abroad, and more effectively draw on the talented, innovative, and energetic people across the federal government already working beyond our borders. From the State Department, USAID, and MCC to the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the Export-Import Bank, the Department of Justice, the Centers for Disease Control, the Department of Agriculture, the Peace Corps, and many others, we must organize ourselves and act together as a global civilian service of the same caliber and flexibility as our military.

Our embassy in Islamabad exemplifies the diverse roles and portfolios of our civilians overseas. A large portion of our work there consists of traditional diplomacy – foreign-service officers issuing visas, taking care of Americans traveling or doing business in Pakistan who may need help, and engaging with their Pakistani civilian and military counterparts to manage a complex relationships. But of the approximately 500 U.S. personnel in the embassy, roughly are from the State Department, both diplomats and civil servants. They work with civilians from 11 federal agencies, including disaster relief and reconstruction experts from USAID helping to rebuild after August’s historic floods; USAID and other interagency specialists in health, energy, communications, finance, agriculture, and justice; and military personnel working with the Pakistani military to bolster Pakistani capacities and thwart the Taliban insurgency.

The new reality is that the men and women of today’s Foreign Service, and the many civil servants, technical experts, and political appointees who make up the State Department, are 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. They must work not only with officials from other

governments but those outside the marble halls, and do so with broader expertise. They must work alongside our military, and also side-by-side with civilian government officials from dozens of federal agencies who now have business abroad. They must reach beyond governments to engage foreign publics, and beyond public initiatives to build public-private partnerships and collaborative networks of businesses, non-governmental organizations, civic groups, foundations, universities, and others working to solve a specific regional or global problem. And they must collaborate closely with development professionals from USAID, the Millennium Challenge Corporation, and countless foreign governments and multilateral organizations to provide political incentives for successful development programs and to run complementary programs supporting civil society, helping refugees, or training police and prosecutors.

These broader relationships are not accidental or anomalous. In the Strategic Dialogue that I launched with Pakistan, we are focusing on ten issues that bring together experts from different agencies in both governments. Our dialogue with India engaged different agencies; and when Secretary Geithner and I traveled to Beijing in May for the second round of our new Strategic and Economic Dialogue with China we brought with us 200 people from over 30 agencies, all of whom committed in both Beijing and Washington to develop the relationships essential to working through differences on a wide range of issues. That is multi-agency diplomacy.

Civilian power also extends beyond government. Public engagement is now 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, such as American and Pakistani students, artists, women's groups, scientists, and entrepreneurs. When I went to Pakistan for the first time as Secretary of State I held a town hall with students at which afforded me the opportunity to hear directly from them, and them from me. This was something of a surprise to the Pakistani media, which was not accustomed to such direct exchanges between citizens and public officials. Public events like these are as much a part of my job as Secretary of State as my meetings in the Foreign Ministry.

In Washington, we are also 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 in shoring up fledgling institutions or fragile states, or preventing conflict or instability from arising. This also forces us to streamline and modernize our public diplomacy efforts across the board. When public diplomacy staff was decreased at our embassy in Berlin to make resources available for outreach in Central Europe, Berlin used the opportunity to develop a leaner and more agile operation that has strengthened public diplomacy there overall.

Finally, while our USAID colleagues lead the development work in our embassies, State Department employees today, from Assistant Secretaries and Ambassadors to political and economic counselors to civil service experts, must be better versed, and more engaged, in development issues. In Afghanistan and Pakistan I called for a wholesale review of our aid programs in to ensure that they were aligned with our strategic objectives. Given the complexity

of the security and development needs on the ground, I also sent two of our most experienced ambassadors to serve as overall foreign assistance coordinators in both Islamabad and Kabul.

In Pakistan, the Kerry-Lugar-Berman bill authorizes 7.5 billion over 5 years as an investment in a long-term relationship with a stable and well-governed partner. Those funds will be spent for multiple purposes, including security assistance to strengthen the Pakistani government's efforts to establish and maintain civil security and defeat the Taliban insurgency. But we are also investing in Pakistan's development -- helping the government build stable and lasting institutions and a growing middle class that contributes to democracy, vibrant and open markets, and flourishing civil society. Our Strategic Dialogue includes a commitment of \$1.5 billion for joint US-Pakistani projects, most notably for water and electricity, which the Pakistani government identified as top priorities. This "country led" approach reflects our belief that the host countries themselves are the best judges of their country's needs, and that small, discrete projects, while important, do not pack as big a punch in terms of economic progress. This is not a case of either, or -- but both. And it takes diplomats working with development experts to cover all the terrain.

When the varied elements of our civilian power are working cohesively -- such as in Pakistan and many other 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 our holistic approach will achieve every goal, especially in places like Pakistan where the challenges are entrenched and complex. But we believe that integrating diplomacy and development and using all the tools of our civilian strength is the best alternative we have, and one we must pursue.

Still, we have a long way to go. The culture, recruitment, training, organization, and resources of the State Department and USAID must evolve to ensure that we can both perform our traditional functions, strengthen the core of a broader and more integrated civilian service across the government, forge coalitions beyond government, and support a stronger nexus of diplomacy and development, especially in conflict zones and fragile states.

The QDDR offers specific reforms to advance these goals, beginning with bolstering the role of the ambassador as CEO of a multi-agency mission. It also recommends creating new public diplomacy positions, and providing training, more opportunities for Foreign Service Officers to intern with NGOs, corporations, and foundations, and pre-approved legal templates to make public-private partnerships a routine dimension of American diplomacy.

Our emphasis on reading future trends and building new capabilities to meet them does not minimize the importance of old-fashioned diplomatic elbow grease. Most of my time remains focused on diplomatic efforts to address major threats, such as Iran's nuclear ambitions, or to bring entrenched adversaries to the peace table, as with the Israelis and the Palestinians, and to help resolve longstanding disputes, such as between the Turks and the Armenians, which remain barriers to regional integration and development. After repairing many of our relations with key countries in the first 18 months of the Obama Administration, including starting or restarting [INSERT HOW MANY] strategic dialogues, I am determined to move beyond the tyranny of the in-box. We must build the longer-term architecture of global cooperation that will guide our engagement for decades to come.

Comment [AMS1]: For S from Anne-Marie. As important as these points are, they really don't belong in this article, but rather in the CFR speech. We have too much here already and this is strategy rather than capabilities, the subject of the QDDR. As Lissa notes, it is important to talk about your overall strategic dialogues, but we do that higher up in this section.

In this regard, I am focusing most on strengthening regional organizations. We will soon see a new NATO strategic concept; we are working closely with the new EU foreign policy institutions to build a strong trans-Atlantic coalition and participating in a process anticipating a possible reform of the Organization for Security and Cooperation. In Asia I have outlined a vision for a strong East Asian architecture with active U.S. participation. We are pleased at the growing strength of the African Union and the East African Community and hope to encourage further reforms. And in our own hemisphere, we are working actively for the streamlining of the OAS. However broad the spectrum of civilian power becomes, it is still exercised most effectively on a regional and global level in concert with others.

ACHIEVING HIGH IMPACT DEVELOPMENT

Over the last two decades, the world has made dramatic advances fighting poverty and disease and building more inclusive and prosperous economies. The number of children dying before their fifth birthday has fallen from 12 million a year in 1990 to less than 8 million today. In 2007, 40 million more children across the developing world were in school compared to just five years before. And despite the continuing devastation of HIV/AIDS, X million people are now receiving life saving anti-AIDS drugs compared to only 100,000 people just seven years ago.

Signs of progress are even evident in the poorest countries. Per capita income has doubled since 1990 in countries like Mozambique, Ethiopia, Ghana, Rwanda, and Tanzania. In Rwanda and Zambia, the numbers of recorded cases and deaths due to malaria have been cut in half. Mozambique and Tanzania have doubled primary school attendance rates to reach near-universal levels.

American development has contributed to many of the successes in health, wealth, and education, thanks in good measure to our nation's development agency. USAID pioneered oral rehydration therapy, a low cost and easy method of administering solution that has saved tens of millions of lives around the globe. It was USAID agriculture research that sparked the "Green Revolution" and generated the largest increases in agriculture yields and production in the history of mankind. Today, we are poised to build on this legacy and make progress toward our ultimate goal of creating the conditions where our work is no longer needed.

President Obama's National Security Strategy highlights development as "a strategic, economic, and moral imperative." Development dollars are dollars invested in our long-term security and prosperity even as they are a direct reflection of our values. To make the most of those dollars, we are committed to a new strategy of high impact development.

The Presidential Decision Directive on Development issued by President Obama in September emphasizes the importance of coordinating assistance with trade, finance, investment credits and other economic policies to spur widespread economic growth. Ultimately, our ability to promote economic development that helps build and strengthen the middle class around the world will influence our success in bolstering our security and advancing our interests and values globally. The State Department and USAID, under the transformative leadership of Dr. Rajiv Shah, are focusing on how to increase the impact of the assistance we provide.

We start by thinking about development as a process of assisted self-help. 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 fully self-sustaining.

We are putting a partnership model into practice in two signature initiatives the Obama Administration has announced over the past year: the Global Health Initiative and the Feed The Future Program. The Global Health Initiative starts from the recognition that the landscape for health in many developing countries has improved over the years, in part due to President George W. Bush's Presidential Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) and his malaria initiative and in part due to the contributions of many other countries and organizations. But this more crowded landscape does not necessarily improve health outcomes efficiently or sustainably.

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 the antiretroviral drugs that keep her healthy. If she makes a longer journey by bicycle or bus, there is another clinic offering prenatal care and immunizations for her children. Sometimes health services come right 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. □□

There is too little coordination among countries and organizations, including our own government, that deliver health services. 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 turned into a long-term solution. As a result, the African woman's current access to care is erratic, and her future access to 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, the Government of Bangladesh developed its own food security investment plan, which was reviewed and discussed in a public forum with more than 500 representatives. The resulting strategy was reviewed for technical quality by independent experts from top universities and international institutions. We are now developing our own U.S. government investment plan in support of Bangladesh's strategy, in full collaboration with other government and international donors.

This is what partnership looks like in practice. The governments involved will almost certainly choose to do things differently than we might, or to outline different priorities. Vetting and investing in the government's plan may take longer than delivering services ourselves. But the result is a sustainable strategy that will move ahead 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. It is worth examining how our diplomatic outreach moved the needle on a stalled humanitarian effort in Nigeria. Although billions of dollars in US and international aid had flowed to Nigeria to address AIDS, polio, and malaria, a patchwork of health programs had not yet been stitched together into a comprehensive health system, and vaccination rates remained low.

In 2008, Northern Nigeria suffered a major polio outbreak, the result of years of suspicions in the Muslim community about the vaccine that led many to forgo getting immunized. But steady engagement by representatives of the State Department, USAID, the CDC, and PEPFAR, along with the World Health Organization and international organizations, culminated in a decision by the influential Emir of Kano to vaccinate his grandson in 2009. By July 2010, Nigeria reported only three cases of polio, down from 798 in 2008. Last summer, the head of GHI, Deputy Secretary Jack Lew, and our Global AIDS Coordinator, Eric Goosby, visited the Emir to thank him for his role in suppressing the polio scourge and discuss building a stronger health system. They were also able to seek his support for Nigeria backing U.N. sanctions against Iran, a significant benefit to our diplomacy given Nigeria's position on the U.N. Security Council.

To partner effectively with others, we need to get our own house in order. We start by coordinating ourselves to use the full talents of our government. The Global Health Initiative is being 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 is a unique leadership structure that embeds our commitment to coordination at every level, from the White House down.

Within USAID, Dr. 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. While procurement done badly can become a bureaucratic burden, it can 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 1,427 health huts, where volunteers selected by their communities are trained by USAID to provide basic – and often lifesaving -- treatments. By training local health workers and hiring local staff for project management, the program lowers costs while saving more lives. And it moves us closer to the day when our aid will no longer be necessary.

To reform personnel, our goal is to attract and retain the best development professionals we can find. They should reflect the diversity of our country and share a common trait: the ability to

solve problems. Dr. 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. We want to capitalize on this wealth of talent and build on its strong base. The QDDR is focusing particularly 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. That is the way that we can make smart, informed decisions and promulgate cutting-edge development policies. We are seeding a culture of research and knowledge-sharing, with a particular focus on monitoring and evaluation. We will measure our investments in ways that matter – not the number of programs run, but the number of children nourished or vaccines delivered, and the number of people who benefit 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.

The evolution of development is one of the most exciting changes enhancing our foreign policy agenda. Twenty years ago, the “development community” didn’t exist far beyond the walls of USAID. Today, that community has expanded to include corporate leaders, philanthropists, foundations and advocates, all of whom bring new skills and perspectives from different disciplines. But perhaps most important are the grassroots leaders in our communities: the church groups who advocate for humanitarian relief, the Baby Boomers who forego a comfortable retirement to join the Peace Corps, and the college students who oversubscribe to courses on development.

We must tap into the energy and engagement of this 21st century development community to make real change. It is time to be bolder, to reach beyond our comfort zone, and to be imaginative about how we can work better, cheaper, and faster in the pursuit of high impact development. That means encouraging, celebrating, and disseminating innovation. The QDDR endorses USAID’s creation of the Development Innovation Ventures Fund where creative solutions will be funded, piloted and brought to scale.

Thinking big in development also means embracing science and technology in ways that accelerate problem-solving and broaden the impact of effective solutions. In July, USAID hosted “the Grand Challenges for Development” to create an overarching strategy for development based on transformational, scalable, and sustainable change. This strategy includes prizes, challenges, as well as building capacity and institutions to carry out those challenges, investing in research, and leveraging our federal science dollars. In this way, science and technology can serve as powerful way to leapfrog development, moving away from the idea that we must recreate the last 200 years of development. We want to transfer scientific knowledge and use new technologies to connect people in remote villages to the world outside, improve agricultural production, strengthen democratic institutions, and support citizen efforts to hold governments accountable.

It makes sense for an American development agency to invest in game-changing solutions. We should not be content with the tools we have. 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. The State Department recently hosted a conference on mobile money, looking at all the ways that mobile phone technology can be used to help people receive, keep, spend and invest their money. Now we are 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.

High impact development will have a high impact on our security, diplomatic, and economic environment. It is one of the best investments we can make for a more stable, prosperous, and healthier future.

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 simultaneous missions of a scale and scope never seen before. Our task in Iraq is to lead a large-scale U.S. peace-building mission. In Afghanistan we are responsible for helping win a war and sustaining and strengthening a peace well after our troops return home. In Pakistan, we are supporting a counter-terrorism and counter-insurgency campaign, while assisting a government and society buffeted by the global economic recession, natural disasters, and regional instability. Beyond the sheer magnitude of these roles, we are being asked to undertake them in countries where institutions are still struggling to serve local populations, populations are ethnically and religiously divided, and security is an ongoing challenge. Twenty percent of our diplomatic corps is now stationed in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. Beyond those countries, we are actively stabilizing, building capacity, and trying to prevent conflict in zones of instability from Somalia and Sudan to Haiti and Kyrgystan.

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 1000 civilians – diplomats, stabilization and reconstruction experts and development professionals in charge of helping Iraq develop into a stable and prosperous democracy. Similarly in Afghanistan, the US contribution to reconstruction and redevelopment is now led by 1000 CHECK diplomats and civilian experts who will remain there long 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 these local partners build their own capacities and networks, communities stronger and more resilient.

Civilian leadership in conflict and instability also depends on our ability and commitment to marshaling and leveraging the diverse assets of the interagency and ensuring those with the capabilities are key players. Under the leadership of strong Ambassadors and agency representatives, unprecedented USG collaboration is occurring in Pakistan, Iraq, Afghanistan, Haiti and elsewhere that combines not only State and USAID expertise, but also the knowledge and skills of DoJ, Commerce, Treasury, DHS, HHS, CDC, and other agencies. The United States cannot succeed in countering insurgencies, responding to natural disasters, building peaceful

societies or mitigating conflict without these and other agencies working together under a common vision and more unified effort. Even the way we are organizing ourselves internally indicates our focus on integration, cohesion, and solving problems. The appointment of a Special Representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan was an innovation that we made to overcome stove-piping and to achieve a comprehensive strategy. At his weekly “shura” at the State Department, Ambassador Holbrooke counts representatives from over INSERT agencies.

The QDDR recognizes both the scale and the scope of the problem of conflict and state fragility. It builds upon the lessons learned and capabilities built over the past decade, but goes further to identify new requirements that will make us more effective. We will build upon and expand the skills of the Civilian Response Corps, which has identified hundreds of civilian experts across the federal government who can be quickly deployed to conflict zones or fragile states. The CRC is a great asset; its members were the first Americans on the ground in southern Sudan. But it could be deployed much more frequently and effectively.

We will also provide more effective operational solutions across more missions, so that when we encounter an acute or persistent crisis, including those in East and West Africa, Iraq and Afghanistan, we show up in adequate numbers with the right strategies, tools, skill sets and partners for that situation. Among other things, the QDDR recommends expanding the number of State and USAID personnel capable of operating effectively amidst conflict and instability, consolidating relevant capabilities and building new ones in a new bureau for complex peace operations in the State Department, and developing a joint council and operating framework for the relevant personnel and offices from State, USAID, and other parts of the federal government.

Although Afghanistan and Iraq have taken 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 asking us to difficult things in dangerous places, from Lebanon to Bosnia to East Timor. Two current examples include Sudan and Yemen. 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 build capacity and pursue development in a country that is facing 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 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 once.

Strengthening the capabilities of a new generation of diplomats, development professionals, and peace-building experts is an investment in our future security and stability by strengthening weak, fragile or violent states and offering 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 government is toothless, corrupt, brutal or absent. We have seen the tyranny of drug cartels that have exploited the absence of strong governing institutions to 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 incapable of regulating legitimate business or investing 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, when fighting between rebel groups and government forces under the leadership of Charles Taylor intensified and the humanitarian situation had 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 which 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 the Government of Liberia as it rebuilds social and economic infrastructure destroyed by years of conflict.

Put bluntly, 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. That success, in turn, depends on whether we are genuinely serious about investing in civilian power. If we care about what happens in Iraq, if we want to prevent another Afghanistan and avoid further expenditures of American blood and treasure, we must provide the resources, training, and support for the diplomats and development experts working in these dangerous and complicated arenas to keep our country and our people safe. This cannot be done by small, incremental changes. Rather, we need to begin now to institute the QDDR's vision for a civilian capacity to prevent and respond to conflict and crises. This is a vision that requires collaboration and support from many USG agencies and from Congress.

Getting serious requires more than words. The American people must understand the necessity and the cost-effectiveness of spending taxpayer dollars on diplomacy and development. Congress, too must come to the table with the resources required to complete the mission. The House and Senate have appropriated hundreds of billions of dollars for the military missions in Iraq and Afghanistan. The diplomatic and development missions can be funded for a fraction of that cost, yet securing such funding is difficult and often gets bogged down in the old debates over foreign aid. We have to move beyond the past. It is time for Congress to 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. That's not what I got out of the appropriators, but that's what the allocation was. 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. But so too do the growing number of Americans who find ways to engage in civilian public service, from the State Department and USAID to the Peace Corps to CARE, the Ford Foundation, or the Acumen Fund. They are the face of American civilian power. We need more of them in government and we need civilian government institutions that can put them to work in the most innovative and productive ways.

With strong civilian power and continued strong military power we can advance America's interests and values in the world. We can lead and support other nations in solving global problems. We can forge strong diplomatic and development partnerships with traditional allies and newly emerging powers. And we can build a global architecture of cooperation that will bridge North and South as well as East and West. Diplomacy, development, and defense are the foundation of a world order for the 21st century in which all the world's people can flourish.