

Collected Quotes on Global Development and Foreign Assistance Modernization

**Senate Foreign Relations Committee
Confirmation Hearing for Secretary of State-nominee
Hillary Clinton**

January 13, 2009

MFAN | MODERNIZING FOREIGN
ASSISTANCE NETWORK

Development-related Quotes from SFRC Ranking Member and Nominee Opening Statements



Chairman Senator John Kerry (D-MA)

"We must integrate all of the disparate elements of our national power into a single unified effort. And I agree with Secretary Gates that we need a State Department with more resources and more capacity to deal with 21st century challenges in conflict zones and in weak and failing states."



Ranking Minority Member Senator Richard Lugar (R-IN)

"Over the last six years, this committee has held more hearings than any other committee in the Senate [on issues including] Iraq...Afghanistan...the NATO Alliance...foreign assistance reform and the State Department budget. All of these challenges will continue to occupy Senator Clinton as Secretary of State."

"Eradicating global hunger must be embraced as both a humanitarian and national security imperative. Precipitous food price increases that occurred in 2007 and 2008 created havoc in many parts of the world, causing riots in some 19 countries and plunging an additional 75 million people into poverty and increased vulnerability to malnourishment. Nearly 1 billion people are currently food insecure. It is predicted the world's population will grow to such an extent that by 2050 current food production will need to double to meet demand. There is no reason why people should be hungry when we have the knowledge, the technology, and the resources to make everyone food secure. The United States is uniquely situated to help the world feed itself. And as the opportunities to recast its image by making the eradication of hunger a centerpiece of United States foreign policy."



Secretary of State-designate Hillary Rodham Clinton

"...our overriding duty is to protect and advance America's security, interests, and values. To keep our people, our nation, and our allies, secure; to promote economic growth and shared prosperity at home and abroad; and to strengthen America's position of global leadership...whether in working to preserve the health of our planet, or working to expand opportunity for people on the margins whose progress and prosperity will add to our own."

"Our security, our vitality, and our ability to lead in today's world oblige us to recognize the overwhelming fact of our interdependence. I believe that American leadership has been wanting, but is still wanted. We must use what has been called smart power-- the full range of tools at our disposal. Diplomatic, economic, military, political, legal, and cultural; picking the right tool or combination of tools for each situation."

"Secretary Gates, as the chairman said, has been particularly eloquent in articulating the importance of diplomacy. As he has stated, 'our civilian institutions of diplomacy and development have been chronically undermanned and underfunded for far too long.' That is a statement that I can only heartily say 'amen' to."

"One of my first priorities is to make sure that the State Department and USAID have the resources they need, and I will be back to make the case to Congress for full funding of the

President's budget request. At the same time, I will work just as hard to make sure that we manage those resources prudently so that we fulfill our mission efficiently and effectively."

"Today more than two billion people worldwide live on less than \$2 a day. They are facing rising food prices and widespread hunger. Calls for expanding civil and political rights in countries plagued by mass hunger and disease will fall on deaf ears unless democracy actually delivers material benefits that improve people's lives while weeding out the corruption that too often stands in the way of progress."

"Our foreign policy must reflect our deep commitment to the cause of making human rights a reality for millions of oppressed people around the world. Of particular concern to me is the plight of women and girls, who comprise the majority of the world's unhealthy, unschooled, unfed, and unpaid. If half of the world's population remains vulnerable to economic, political, legal, and social marginalization, our hope of advancing democracy and prosperity will remain in serious jeopardy. We still have a long way to go and the United States must remain an unambiguous and unequivocal voice in support of women's rights in every country, every region, on every continent."

"In my own work on microfinance around the world – from Bangladesh to Chile to Vietnam to South Africa and many other countries -- I've seen first-hand how small loans given to poor women to start small businesses can raise standards of living and transform local economies. President-elect Obama's mother had planned to attend a microfinance forum at the Beijing women's conference in 1995 that I participated in. Unfortunately, she was very ill and couldn't travel and sadly passed away a few months later. But I think it's fair to say that her work in international development, the care and concern she showed for women and for poor people around the world, mattered greatly to her son, and certainly has informed his views and his vision. We will be honored to carry on Ann Dunham's work in the months and years ahead.

"And we can generate even more goodwill through other kinds of social investment, by working effectively with international organizations and NGO partners to build schools and train teachers, and by ensuring that children are free from hunger and exploitation so that they can attend those schools and pursue their dreams for the future. This is why the President- Elect supports a Global Education Fund to bolster secular education around the world.

"I want to take a moment to emphasize the importance of a "bottom-up" approach to ensuring that America remains a positive force in the world. The President-elect and I believe in this strongly. Investing in our common humanity through social development is not marginal to our foreign policy but integral to accomplishing our goals."

Development-Related Questions and Answers from SFRC Members



Senator Bob Corker (R-TN): [PARAPHRASE] It seems to me that the Secretary of State is the chief deal maker, and has to be focused on running the department. How will you ensure the Department has what it needs to be successful?



Clinton: ... If we don't enhance our diplomatic and development efforts and move toward more equilibrium as Secretary Gates, even, has said, we will not be as successful as we need to be in promoting our foreign policy. So to that end, I decided to fill a position that had not been filled - although it had been created 10 years ago - and that was the Deputy for Resources and Management. ... So it seemed to me, that in order to really fulfill my responsibility to you and to the American people, we needed to have someone whose total job focus was to manage the department along with the career professionals, to work to manage USAID to be more effective, and to represent the interests of the department as well as the Presidential budget here on the Hill when it came to these resource matters."



Corker: We have a maze of aid efforts that are underway - every Senator that travels and sees some need authorizes another aid program - and I was wondering if you would consider, during the first 6 months you're there, rationalizing that for us, and reporting back some of things that need to be done away with. Again, all are in good intentions, but they seem to water each other down and not have the focus they might otherwise have and I was wondering if you might commit to that during some short time after you're there?



Clinton: Senator, that's going to be one of the responsibilities given to the second Deputy under my direction. To take a look at our existing authorities, to determine what works, what doesn't work, try to eliminate redundancies, and fill gaps... You know, it matters greatly to me, as it does the President-elect - these development efforts, these humanitarian commitments by the United States government, are often the way we are perceived. And frequently to our advantage if they are done correctly. But I think it's fair to say that USAID, our premier aid agency, has been decimated. It has half the staff it used to have, it's turned into more of a contracting agency than an operational agency with the ability to deliver; yet at the same time, whether I'm talking to Sec. Gates or I'm talking to people in the Non-Governmental Organizational world, very often they will say the same thing: well they've turned to USAID to determine how to implement these programs. So we're going to take a hard look at all of our aid and development efforts.

We're at a great disadvantage. I'll give you just a quick example. There's a program that I learned about, of course, on my Senate Armed Services Committee work, called CERP- Commanders Emergency Resources Program. I remember the first time I went to Iraq, in 2003, and I met young captains and majors and Lt. colonels, who were literally handed thousands of dollars in cash and told 'go get that school open,' 'go get that road built,' 'go fix that sewer problem,' and they were doing an incredible job with great flexibility and very little accountability... But when I contrast that with a development officer or a State department expert who knows the culture, knows the language, unlike this very well-meaning and well-trained

warrior, and this person can't get \$500 to fulfill a development mission that is in service of American security and our national interest, there's a big difference."



Senator Barbara Boxer (D-CA): Thousands of women have suffered...attacks...so I'm introducing some legislation. No woman or girl should ever have to live in fear or face persecution for being born female, and Senator, I know how deeply you feel about this. So I wanted you to take a little more time to talk about your commitment to this particular issue. And obviously I would be so pleased if you would commit to help us work on legislation to fight this immorality.



Clinton: I want to pledge to you that as Secretary of State, I view these issues as central to our foreign policy. Not as adjunct or auxiliary, or in any way lesser than all of the other issues we have to confront...And it will be my hope to persuade more governments...that we cannot have a free, prosperous, peaceful, progressive world, if women are treated in such a discriminatory and violent way. I've also read closely Nick Kristof's articles, in the last months and especially the last weeks, the young women that he has both rescued from prostitution, and met, who have been enslaved and abused, tortured in every way-- physically, emotionally, morally-- and I take very seriously the function of the State department to lead our government through the Office on Human Trafficking, to do all that we can to end this modern form of slavery. We have sex slavery, we have wage slavery, and it is primarily a slavery of girls and women. So I look also forward, Senator, to reviewing your legislation and working with you as a continuing partnership on behalf of these issues we care so much about.

So we're going to have a very active office on trafficking, we're going to be speaking out consistently and strongly against discrimination and oppression of women, and slavery in particular. Because I think that is not only in keeping with American values, as we all recognize, but American national security interests as well.



Boxer: Even the most conservative historians have said that 'if women in the world would be allowed to live up to their potential, it would bring the whole world forward.' A lot of the problems we face really come from this mindset, that half of the population doesn't matter and can be abused, and they're ignored or hurt and can't contribute. So I think it's a key matter.



Senator George Voinovich (R-OH): I think from a big picture point of view, we have...an absolutely wonderful opportunity to really change the image of the United States of America. Jim Jones - I heard him wax about what we should do a few years ago in Brussels at the German Marshall Fund, and I said, 'why can't we get this guy into this Administration? He's got the right idea' And then you've got Gates, who has the right idea, and you have the right idea. And this smart power is something that we really need to focus on. I would be interested in your reaction to the recommendations of Joe Nye and Dick Armitage, in terms of smart power.



Senator Ben Cardin (D-MD): Many of us have been asking you about energy...we have a lot of mineral rich countries in which the citizens are very poor...we think that many of those revenues are going against U.S. security interests....many of these countries are receiving foreign aid from the U.S. and we don't know where that mineral wealth is going. I just want to bring that to your attention...I think this an area where we can [do better to help on poverty around the world].



Senator Jim DeMint (R-SC): With our economy and our debt and the domestic needs we have and the incredible levels of spending we're experiencing now, it's very difficult to see an expanded role for America around the world. We need to be that city on the hill, but I'm not sure we can afford to build those cities on the hill around the world. I'd like you to comment on other things we can do. We...see private charities, aid workers and missionaries around the world doing so much good. How do you see the role of the State Department in facilitating [this private sector work]?



Clinton: It's a real opportunity for us, if we can figure out how best to coordinate and facilitate the private sector and the non-profit and the religious community on behalf of humanitarian and commercial efforts. I think the State Department has been reviewed in a mixed way for a number of years. In part, it's because the work of the State Department, both in diplomacy and development, is not as well understood and sometimes appears frustrating...it does raise questions in the minds of the American people about what exactly it is we do. I think we have a bigger job, which I will assume, of trying to explain to the American people why our national security depends on defense, diplomacy, and development. Defense is primarily a government mission...diplomacy is primarily a government mission, but there are lots of ways that non-government actors like corporations, religious organizations, charities and foundations are actually building relationships with foreign governments and foreign people all the time, which if done in the right way are really value-added to who we are as a nation and what we can achieve. Right now in Rwanda, a number of foundations, churches and private sector actors are all working to try to build that country back up. I would hope that when we look at the State Department, we think of the role of foreign policy – diplomacy and development – as involving not just those who are the FSOs, the civil service professionals, and the development experts, but really, it's all hands on deck.

I don't think in this complex and dangerous world, there is any substitute for the role of the State Department and USAID professionals, so it will be my undertaking to make this department as efficient as possible so that you know you're getting your money's worth, to streamline it as much as possible. I want strategies. I want specific ideas. I want more partnerships. That's how I see the role of the State Department of the 21st-century. That's how I hope that USAID will be revitalized to perform that role as well.

But the disparity of resources is such that when you've got more than 10 times the resources going to the Defense Department than you have going to the State Department and foreign aid, DoD has in effect been recreating mini-State Departments. They're out doing development assistance and rule of law and other things. Why? Because they have a presumption of being able to move much more quickly, the money we give them is more flexible. I think we have to see how we get what we want and what we pay for our of our State Department and USAID. I don't think there is any substitute for having seasoned professionals and experts leading our

efforts on diplomacy and development, and working where possible in partnership and coordination with the private sector and the non-profit sector.



Senator Bob Menendez (D-NJ): You and I have had a conversation about something I care about a great -- foreign assistance... interesting to note that President Kennedy sent a letter to Congress nearly half a century ago that talks about issues, in some respects, that is something we largely face today. How do we ensure that we elevate foreign assistance and ensure that we elevate a high performance manager to run that facility, a strong independent voice for foreign assistance, building up the staff of USAID making sure that a lot of what has gone to the Defense Department by lack of appropriate structure comes back to state in coordination with the defense department. Give me a sense that under your leadership this is something that we will pursue vigorously.



Clinton: Well, you have my commitment that it will be pursued vigorously. It is an area that I care deeply about... I am hopeful, Senator, that we are going to put in place a system that will rationalize what we have there now. And not only in the State Department and USAID, but as you know there are pockets of foreign aid across the government that are technically under the Department and are not working together as they should. We have got to have a handle on contracting out... it leaves us without the capacity to function in many areas that we know are there... what we ought to be doing is making the existing programs in the state department function...

So again, we've got to get our arms around what you can think of as traditional foreign aid-- health, education, economic empowerment and the like-- plus what is now becoming increasingly important. That is the reconstruction, stability, conflict resolution, peace keeping challenges that we face. And Senator I am determined that we are going to present to you a plan and a system that will try to maximize coordination, minimize redundancy and make the case for the increased resources that are so desperately needed if we intend to meet the missions that we've been given....

We've got to make the case, I think Secretary Gates is open to the case, I know the President-elect is very committed-- he actually wants an increase in foreign aid because he believes so strongly in its efficacy as part of our foreign policy. They are committed to transferring assets and functions back to the State department, but we have to prove that we're ready to take them on, that we're going to handle them, that we can instill confidence in you, and Senator Cardin and others, about these core functions, and answer Senator DeMint's concerns about, 'are we really doing what we need to do here?' so that is my pledge to you, and I'm going to work as hard as I know how to make it happen.



Senator Johnny Isakson (R-GA): Twice in your opening remarks, which were extensive and really appreciated because you really covered some very important topics, you referred to what I call the 3 D's: diplomacy, development and defense, on two different occasions. One vis a vis al Qaeda, the other based on overall policy and I believe the better your diplomacy, the better able you are to defend yourself, and a strong military is a great foundation for good diplomacy, and then if you add development, which I think is soft power or smart power, you have a great trilogy. Do you agree with that?



Clinton: Senator Isakson, I couldn't say it any better. I certainly do agree. In order to protect and defend the United States of America, to advance our interests, and to further our values, we have to have all three of those elements of our power working in concert.

I think that the State department has a very big responsibility to improve its capacity with respect to both diplomacy and development, because without those two elements of our power projection and our policy being as effective as they can be, we're not going to have the agile, comprehensive foreign policy we should look forward to.



Isakson: You quoted George Marshall at the end of your remarks in saying that sometimes our enemies are not the nations or doctrines, but in fact hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos. I'm ranking member on the Africa Subcommittee and certainly if you talk about desperation, chaos, hunger, and poverty, certainly you can talk about the continent of Africa, and in particular, north Africa and the horn of Africa, where al Qaeda is attempting to do what it did in Afghanistan effectively a decade and a half ago. And you talked about smart power - I think Africom was a smart move on behalf of our country, though a lot of people don't realize what Africom is doing. They are military personnel doing a lot of soft power: they're drilling well, they're building bridges, they're doing the things - I hate to say this - but Hamas and Hezbollah figured it out, they got political strength by giving people housing and clothing, a lot of times that use of soft power can win over people's attitudes toward you. So I hope as the next four years go by, we can work together on the continent of Africa and on those issues because I think it's the next place we are vulnerable if we are not proactive in dealing with the governments, the people, the poverty, and also obviously continuing the Bush PEPFAR program which has been so successful, that and malaria eradication.



Clinton: Well, Senator, I appreciated when I spoke with you, your commitment to Africa and your making it priority of the service you have performed here on the committee, and I look forward to working with you. It is a serious concern that we could see safe havens created again. The chaos that flows from failed states, like Somalia at this moment. The aftermath of autocratic regimes that have so mistreated their people, like Zimbabwe, the anarchy and terrible violence in Eastern Congo. Those are breeding grounds, not only for the worst abuses of human beings, from mass murders to rapes to indifference toward disease to other terrible calamities, but they are invitations to terrorists to find refuge amidst the chaos. Anyone who thinks that our interest in Africa is only humanitarian, I think misses the strategic import of the comments you made, and I do look forward to working with you.



Isakson: My last question. If you ask the average Georgian what's the one thing they have the most consternation about, it's how much money we spend in foreign aid. And, although as a percentage of the budget it's a small number, a lot of the stories that get published raise questions about it. Talking about preconditions for a second - I am one that feels like foreign aid invested - especially with preconditions for results - is beneficial to the United States of America. And I shared with you the issue on women's education in Muslim countries in Africa, where prior to 2001, we weren't really

aware that we had money going to NGOs then going to education that was only teaching Muslim men not Muslim women. Then we put a precondition post 9/11 and built schools for women in Egypt and Ethiopia and other places and the payback has been a renaissance in those countries, at least in raising the education levels of all. I would appreciate your comments on the extent to which preconditions can be used in foreign aid. Not preconditions to agree with us, but preconditions to see that the result brings about a benefit, like in this case the education of women.



Clinton: I think that has been an important contribution of the foreign aid debate by this Administration, most manifest with the Millennium Challenge Corporation. I think we're still finding our way, trying to figure out the best practices to use to encourage governments to act in certain ways, conditioning our aid. But I really believe this holds tremendous promise. And again, it's an area that I'd like to work with this Committee on because there's a lot of expertise here. When you look at foreign aid, we want to be able to justify the investment to the American people. And we want to get measurable results. Those are two goals that really go hand in hand. And so I believe strongly that as we try to shore up foreign aid, as we try to make the case for more development assistance, that we try to get back some of the authority and resources that have drifted to the Defense department, we have to be ready to make that case. I think that the conditional aid approach, in certain situations and countries, is one we have to look at more closely.



Senator Jim Webb (D-VA): I want to spend what little time I have here to get your thoughts on this because it's been talked about in many different ways here, the need for us to rebalance the tasks being performed by the department of Defense and the department of State as they relate to our involvement around the world. And I would like to emphasize here, that the implications for this are beyond the notion of turf wars, they're beyond simply discussing who can do it better, they really go to how our country is being perceived around the world. It's one of the most graphic things I have been seeing over the past couple years since I came to the Senate versus the time when I was in the Pentagon years ago or even when I was traveling as a journalist, very heavily in Asia, before 9/11 and that is that we are increasingly being seen as a military guarantor- and in many cases a desirable military guarantor- in these other countries as opposed to being an economic partner, or a cultural partner, or growing our interdependence with other countries in regard to educational programs and reciprocal trade and these sorts of things and I think it's vitally important that the State department invigorate these policies, put a civilian face on them, and push these cultural, economic, and issues of interdependence.



Clinton: [sounds cuts out] to get that balance more in the direction of putting a civilian face on our power and sending the message that, yes, we have this huge military that we spend nearly 600 billion dollars on, but we are much more than that. We are a country with all kinds of political, cultural, economic, and other assets that we can offer the rest of the world. It is not going to be easy, because you serve on the two committees--having served with you on Armed Services--where on one committee you can get practically anything you want and on the other committee, you can't keep up with the demands that are being put on diplomacy and development. There are more members in military bands than there are foreign service officers serving overseas. So when you think about that, it puts it in perspective. We have so underresourced our diplomacy and our development, it sort of becomes a self fulfilling prophecy. The less resourced we are,

when we're given a task, the harder it is to perform, so the military understandably says get out of the way we'll take care of this, but you guys come along, you know the languages, you've got some expertise, be our advisors. So that just further enhances the military face.

With the new Africom--which I support-- we have to be very careful that it doesn't appear that our only real government engagement throughout Africa is our military presence.



Senator Bob Casey (D-PA): I wanted to read you a statement.....The person who made this statement first made reference to our institutions of development and diplomacy being undermanned and underfunded. And now I'll pick up with the quotation: "When it comes to America's engagement with the rest of the world, it's important that the military is in a supporting role to civilian agencies. Our diplomatic leaders must have the resources and political support needed to fully exercise their statutory responsibilities in leading American foreign policy. To truly harness the full strength of America requires having civilian institutions of development that are adequately staffed and properly funded."

The person who made this statement was Secretary Gates this past July. And I wanted, in light of the discussion here today— and I'm grateful for the time in your statement you spent on this, but also in light of what you and I have talked about, in our meeting and in other conversations, tell us how you are going to be working with Secretary Gates to make sure that we can give meaning and integrity to that observation he made in his speech in July.



Clinton: I've had several conversations with him already. And what you read is exactly what he believes – we are going to be stronger if we are better able to promote diplomacy and development, not just rely on our military power. There's a lot of work to be done between that belief, which he and I and the President–elect share, and actually realizing its promise.

We have work to do at the State Department. Part of the reason functions and resources have migrated is because there's just a presumption that the military can move much quicker and with greater effort, impose development or negotiate agreements, better than the State department. And it's going to be our job to prove that the State department is not only substantively strong, which indeed it is, not only experienced in diplomacy and development which indeed it is, but can, in this 21st century move with dispatch, be results oriented, create an atmosphere of collegiality and cooperation across the State department and USAID and across the United States government. So I'm taking this very seriously. I'm working with Sec. Gates, he's very open to cooperative efforts. But we have to prove that we can shoulder this new responsibility, like stabilization, reconstruction, and the new civilian corps, like really outcomes oriented development aid that can be done quickly without enormous bureaucracy....so we're going to take that challenge on. Because I don't think we have a choice. I think that our foreign policy has gotten way out of balance, Sec. Gates knows it, the President–elect certainly knows it, so it's going to be up to us to get back into more equilibrium which will be good for our government and for our image around the world.



Senator John Barrasso (R-WY): The people of Wyoming want to make sure that foreign aid, especially in light of the economy today, is being used so that people are getting value for their dollars and that we're safeguarding American taxpayer dollars.



Clinton: Senator, I appreciate very much your interest in these issues... I want to be able to go anywhere in America and explain why the relatively small but important amount of money that we do spend on foreign aid is in the best interest of American people, so that we do promote national security and advance our interest and reflect our values. I have to make sure that the State Department has to be able to tell the story of what we do and why. You and other members of this committee often travel and see the work, but it's very difficult to convey that to the rest of our country and I will look for different ways through public diplomacy in telling our story overseas and better ways at home through my own efforts to explain what we do to our fellow Americans. This all has to be part of an overall review of how we conduct foreign aid, how we fund it, who is responsible for it, which is why I decided to have a second deputy, Jack Lu, who will be responsible for resources and management because I want somebody to be able to come up and talk about specific ideas we have had on how to make foreign aid more effective. We have divided and degraded the capacity of USAID to be our premier aid development organization and a lot of what has been drifting towards the defense department is foreign aid in a traditional way. When a young army captain gets asked to go build a school, that's foreign aid, that's not war fighting. We have just got to do a better job of trying to explain and justify and rationalize and make efficient what we do so that if I'm fortunate enough to come to Wyoming in a year or two... I will be able to explain what we are doing, why we are doing it and why that makes a difference to the people that are there.