THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

VOICES OF AMERICA: U.S. PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

Washington, D.C.

Tuesday, November 25, 2008

PARTICIPANTS:

Introduction:

MARTIN INDYK, Senior Fellow and Director,
Saban Center for Middle East Policy
The Brookings Institution

Moderator:

CARLOS PASCUAL, Vice President and Director,
Foreign Policy, The Brookings Institution

Panelists:

KRISTIN LORD, Fellow
The Brookings Institution

THOMAS A. MILLER, Vice President
Business for Diplomatic Action

STROBE TALBOTT, President
The Brookings Institution

CHARLES M. VEST, President
National Academy of Engineering

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. INDYK: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the Foreign Policy program at the Brookings Institution. I'm Martin Indyk, the Director of the Saban Center for Middle East Policy, which is in the Foreign Policy Studies Program at the Brookings Institution.

We are very glad to day to be participating in the launching of a new study which I hope you've all picked up. It looks like you have -- "Voices of America: U.S. Public Diplomacy for the 21st Century" by our own Fellow in the Foreign Policy Studies program, Kristin Lord.

I'm very proud to be associated with this study which is coming out at, I think, at a particularly opportune moment. It will be no surprise to any of you that at a time when our hard power has been strained, seriously strained, by two wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, our soft power has also been seriously strained. The American brand I think has been badly tarnished and, as Kristin points out in this study, that makes it much harder for us to pursue and promote our national interests because the publics out there in the world have come to view us with a mixture of distrust and suspicion about our intentions and motivations.

But we have a new president, to state the obvious, whose own personal narrative speaks very loudly to the world about American values, and therefore with a new president a new administration, a new opportunity

for change, not just in this country but in the way that we relate to the world. And President Obama's communication skills combined with his narrative, his own personal narrative, I think, give him and his administration a great opportunity.

And that's the context in which Kristin Lord studies becomes so important, because Kristin, as she will explain in more detail, has done a very intensive review of the challenge of public diplomacy combined with extensive interviews with people involved to come up with some very concrete proposals and recommendations that I think have direct relevance to this opportunity.

Joining us on the panel with Kristin today we have a very distinguished group who were involved in advising on this study and will engage in discussion on it.

Next to Kristin is Charles N. Vest, who is President of the National Academy of Engineering and Vice Chair of the National Research Council, which is the principal operating arm of the National Academies of Sciences and Engineering. He's also President Emeritus of the Massachusetts Institution of Technology where he served as the 15th, and he is a past and present member of many government task forces and advisory committees that have helped shape national and international policies on research, science, education, and national security.

Next to him is our own, very own president, Strobe Talbott, who

has had a very distinguished career in journalism as well as government. His last post in government was as Deputy Secretary of State in the Clinton administration. He has written many books, the most recent of which a great book called The Great Experiment: The Story of Ancient Empires, Modern States, and the Quest for a Global Nation. It's just about to come out in paperback. It was published this year by Simon & Schuster. His previous books include Engaging India: The Russia Hand.

And if you will allow me to say my favorite, Deadly Gambits -- that's an inside joke -- which was about the Reagan administration and the stalemate in nuclear arms control.

Next to Strobe is Brookings Vice President and Director of the Foreign Policy Studies Program at the Brookings Institution, Carlos Pascual. He joined Brookings in 2006 after a 23-year career in the United States Department of State, National Security Council, and the United States Agency for International Development. He has served as the U.S. Ambassador to the Ukraine, the Senior Director at the NSC for Russia, Ukraine, and Eurasia, and, most recently, just before he left government he served in the important role as Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization at the State Department where he lived and organized U.S. government planning to help stabilize and reconstruct societies in transition from conflict and civil strife.

He has just led a major new initiative called Managing Global

Insecurity, which the report on that is being published now, as well.

And finally, next to Carlos is Tom Miller, who is a noted market researcher, marketing strategist, and public opinion pollster, who has worked for Fortune 500 clients on major global assignments for 30 years. He is a founding board member for Diplomatic Action, and since 2006 serves as its vice president.

Well, as you can see, we have a very distinguished panel, but first we will need to hear some more about the report from our very own Kristin Lord.

(Applause)

MS. LORD: Good morning. Thanks to all of you so much for coming today. Thanks to all of those of you who are sitting in the satellite room as well. I really appreciate you all taking the time to be here today.

In the spirit of defusing, please allow me to engage in just a bit of thanksgiving before we get started with going over the report. This report was very much a collaborative effort, more than 300 people helped to make this report possible, and I wish to thank them all collectively. I couldn't possibly single them all out here today, but let me identify just a few people who are just really essential to making this report happen.

First of all, let me thank emphatically the Board of Advisors for this study. Now, this study was not written by the commission -- I'm the sole author. I'm responsible for all the errors in here and anything that's in here

may or may not be the views of the Board of Advisors. But they were just incredibly helpful. I benefitted enormously from their wisdom and from their experience, and they are Craig Farrett, Nick Burns, Jim Jones, Gary Mehl, Andrew Natzios, Cokie Roberts, Wendy Sherman, Strobe Talbott, Chuck Vest, and Bill Walton. That's just an extraordinary group of Americans, and thank you to them.

I'd also like to thank a few organizations who are very helpful: Business for Diplomatic Action, and the president, Keith Reinhardt is with us today as well as Tom; the Public Diplomacy Council and Ambassador Pamela Smith and Bob Coonrod, it's president, are here today. I'd like to thank Meridian International Center, and I saw Ambassador Holliday step in, in the back -- there you are Stuart. There's a seat up here for you, I think. And then also The Center for the Study of the Presidency. These are groups that have been extremely helpful, and I thank them.

I'd like to thank Megan Dolan who gave research assistance for this program, and very much I'd like to thank Brookings, which has been an enormously hospitable home for this study and for me, especially Strobe Talbott, Martin Indyk, Carlos Pascual, and Steve Grand, all of whom are with us.

So let me give you just a brief overview of what this report has to say: "Voices of America, U.S. Public Diplomacy for the 21st Century." This report presents a vision of U.S. public diplomacy for the 21st century flexible

enough to address a broad spectrum of opportunities and challenges, not just for today but I hope for tomorrow as well. It presents an agenda that is both ambitious but also feasible, bold enough to meet the current challenges we face, but politically and financially realistic enough to actually happen.

It offers a vision that I think can be backed by a broad coalition of Americans from across a political spectrum, generational divides, geographic regions and sectors of our economy, and this backing will be essential to success. It seeks to offer a roadmap for public diplomacy that is at once aspirational, grounded in our most cherished principles, but also pragmatic favoring tangible progress over more intellectually-appealing but ultimately, perhaps, unworkable models.

And this is a pretty big aspiration, I think, for a 40-page report, and you can do a better job than I can in assessing whether or not it succeeds. But regardless, I hope it will provoke a greater and more focused discussions about our nation's public diplomacy, what it should be, what we should aspire it to be, and also set the tone for a constructive dialogue free of ideology and sound bites.

So why does the United States need more effective public diplomacy? I'm an academic at heart, so we always start with first principles, and the answer is that the world is changing in ways that made public diplomacy -- which I define as efforts to inform, engage, and persuade

foreign publics -- more important than every before. It's approximately 60 percent of the world's countries are now democracies, and even more are so-called hybrid regimes that are blending both authoritarian and democratic components.

The information and communications evolution decentralizes power, and that gives individuals the ability to spread information that supports their own world view and mobilizes global support for their causes.

Official engagement with foreign societies is now dwarfed by private engagement, especially the movement of people, capital goods, services, culture, and images. Power is diffusing to a larger and more diverse group of nations, nongovernmental organizations, and multinational corporations than ever before.

Today's most pressing challenges cannot be addressed alone: climate change, infectious disease, international terrorist networks, reforming international institutions, and the trafficking of goods and people. These are all issues that require the active cooperation of others.

Al Qaida and like-minded groups around the world are bolstered by ideology, and at least partially they need to be confronted on those grounds as well.

And then, finally, many of the currently security threats that imperil our nation cannot be confronted with force alone. When threats are diffused and asymmetric, when force actually mobilizes support for enemies and

thereby strengthens them, states have to find what the military folks here would call nonkinetic means to address security challenges.

These conditions are reshaping the global landscape requiring America to communicate both more and more effectively within an incredible diversity of audiences. In new ways and in the midst of what I think is an information tempest, more than ever before America has to compete for attention and credibility. That's not something we've become accustomed to, and it must do so in a world where winning public support is increasingly important to achieving national interest.

I believe firmly that America can adapt to these challenges and, in fact, I think the world is changing in ways that should play to our country's strength, very much so, in fact, and however our country needs to reform in ways that strengthen the voice of government, empower our own people, and engage the like-minded around the world, and use new median technologies in agile and innovative ways.

Well, how do we do this? The report tries to lay out a very comprehensive strategy, but let me lay out a few key points for you. First, as part of a comprehensive strategy to strengthen and also reimagine U.S. public diplomacy, the report proposes a nimble and entrepreneurial new organization call the USA World Trust, and this Trust would compliment and support U.S. government efforts in public diplomacy and strategic communication.

In the world we now face, America needs the ability to engage foreign publics using a diverse range of methods, a diverse range of voices, and more speed and agility than ever before. Our country needs to understand foreign concerns deeply and appeal to foreign public in ways that resonate both locally and also globally.

The good news is that our government really doesn't need to do this alone, and I can testify to this personally after the incredible outpouring of support I received on this report. Americans and like-minded individuals around the world are ready and are also quite eager to help. The challenge is to stimulate and harness the vast potential of the American public and also foreign partners, engage partners perceived as trusted messengers among targeted audiences, fill critical gaps that government is just never going to be well suited to fill, despite the talents of our civil servants, innovate and experiment, and strengthen our government by providing targeted and useful research analysis, technologies and strategies drawn from a wide range of experts in a wide range of fields.

And the USA World Trust, as I envision it at least, would engage in five main sets of activities: the trust to conduct and commission research and analysis; asking tough questions where necessary, but in a constructive way; drawing on the expertise of a wide range of experts and conveyed in a form useful to public diplomacy practitioners, news you can use or information you can use, in other words. The trust would have the

vast potential of the private sector, something called for in so many of the other previous reports that have come out about public diplomacy, and engage companies, nongovernmental organizations, university's think tanks and others to work on innovative, new initiatives.

The Trust would provide grants in venture capital to endeavors that advance the nation's public diplomacy objective. The Trust would identify, cultivate, and experiment with media products and technologies, something that it can be hard to do from inside government agencies.

The Trust would bring together practitioners from t he U.S. government and bring them together with talented visitors from academia, the private and nonprofit sectors all together on mutual ground to work on common challenges together.

And the goal in all these instances would be to attract new talent and new voices to the challenge of improving U.S. public diplomacy to serve as a hub of innovation and creativity and a resource the government and private groups that wish to improve America's relations with foreign societies.

These functions are meant to serve a wide range of strategic ends, and I really want to emphasize this. In my vision, public diplomacy is not something that's used just to counter radical ideologies of terrorists, or to advance particular foreign policies. It has to meet short-term needs and long-term needs, and the use would be on a really wide variety of national

security interest. And the report lays out some methods to do this in considerable detail.

But the Trust purpose and activities must be agile enough to adapt to changing circumstances and need. The underlying philosophy should be quite enduring that America will always be most successful when it embraces its diversity and advances the whole by empowering the many. An approach that appreciates the power of networks and the innovation and efficiency derived from decentralization will not only prepare our nation; I think it will give us the power to prevent us creating a public diplomacy equivalent of General Motors when what we really need is a public diplomacy equivalent of Google.

Now, moving on, I'd like to emphasize that the USA World Trust should be undertaken as part of a comprehensive set of U.S. public diplomacy reforms. I don't think it would be a magic bullet even if it is created. And a detailed blueprint of these is in the report, which I've already pointed you to, but let me just pull out a couple key points for you:

First. President-Elect Obama should take a few, once he's actually elected and inaugurated, should take a few bold and immediate steps to symbolize that America is entering a new era in its relations with the world, and lays the ground work for his foreign policy. Regardless of what you think about President Bush's strategies, the data tells us that he is not popular overseas, that some of our foreign policy is not popular overseas.

That's not the goal of our foreign policy, to win popularity contests, but we do have a chance to start afresh.

Second. The U.S. government needs a comprehensive interagency strategy for public diplomacy and strategic communications. This strategy, which would be updated annually, should consider how to use public diplomacy proactively, and I underscore proactively, to advance a broader national security interest of the United States.

Third. President Obama should publicly authorize the Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs to develop an implement, a government-wide strategy for public diplomacy on behalf of himself and the Secretary of State. This person should be chosen to lead this mission and held accountable for leading this interagency strategy, and ensuring that public opinion in its repercussions are factored into American foreign policy from the earliest stages of policymaking.

Fourth. The State Department should create an interagency, regional hub offices for public diplomacy around the world with a special coordinator holding the rank of ambassador that reports to the under-secretary for public diplomacy and public affairs. These regional hubs will provide a home for the existing with, right now, skeletal media relations hubs and nexus for coordinating relevant interagency activities overseas, and a direct and regular point of contact for the combatant commanders.

The department should also appoint deputy assistant secretaries for public diplomacy in every regional bureau and most functional bureaus of the State Department to ensure that public diplomacy is a integral part of foreign policy and not something the at the United States has never fully accomplished.

Fifth. Our government needs more foreign service officers and public diplomacy professionals, more ways to bring outside experts into government to work together with them, and more education and training opportunities for public diplomacy professionals.

Sixth. The U.S. government should embark on reforms to make core agencies more nimble, streamlining processes for public/private partnerships, speaking with the media, convening outside experts, and sharing information. There are some obvious risks to decentralizing these approaches a little bit, but they're also mammoth if less visible cost of overcentralization and unclear guidelines.

Seventh. U.S. government agencies, and especially the State Department, needs significantly more resources for public diplomacy and strategic communication, Informing, engaging, and persuading foreign public is a vital part of accomplishing our national security objectives, yet the resources devoted to this instrument in statecraft are positively minuscule, as you can see, when compared with the Defense Department resources, and this -- you could question whether there should be some

things moved into the state department category, but even if I'm off by $20-$30-$50-or-$100 billion, I think the point still stands.

(Laughter.)

More money is not going to solve every public diplomacy challenge, and it most certainly should not be used as an excuse However, more resources are a necessary foundation for effective public diplomacy, and I think we need to recognize that even in a time of budget deficits.

Eighth. To engage the world effectively, we need to understand it. Specifically, we need to understand foreign culture since society is how people communicate, what leaders they trust, where they look to for information, how they prioritize competing values, where they get their information, and why. Our government needs to listen and then also share what it learns to people who are decision-makers and communicators across the U.S. government. America will far more benefit if citizens know far more about the world around us.

Ninth. The U.S. government needs to review its methods of public diplomacy in alignment with strategy. Specific recommendations to do this are too numerous to mention here, but again I refer you to the report.

And tenth. The United States must strike the proper balance between security and openness, recognizing that less of the latter does not necessarily mean more of the former. Openness enhances American security in many ways and thus, as a public diplomacy imperative, the

United States needs to treat visitors and visa applicants with dignity and a welcoming attitude even as we maintain or strengthen security procedures.

Of note, the report does not recommend a new government agency, as recommended with recent Heritage Foundation report, which I actually agree with on several points, or in the many calls to recreate the U.S. information agency. Creating yet another new government bureaucracy would absorb our energy and resources and divert them from the critical mission at hand.

It would also create competition in overlapping authorities between agencies and, as far as I can see, we already have quite enough of that already.

And, finally, even the most welcome seed reorganizations take years to gel. In my opinion, we don't have the luxury of time at the moment. Instead of recreating past organizations or new versions of past organizations, I'd like to argue today that we should view this moment as an opportunity, an opportunity to ask what capabilities the U.S, will need in the next 50 years and how we should be creating those opportunities.

As we Americans rethink our public diplomacy, I think we know this: The United States faces a rapidly evolving world. It's characterized by new centers of power, new ways of communicating, new opportunities, and also new perils. Achieving national interest in this environment will require legitimacy and public support both at home and also around the world. It

will require a foreign policy that's in line with our highest ideals, a domestic policy that invests in Americans and their collective future -- our collective future -- and a comprehensive and clear-minded strategy for how to engage and communicate with the world.

Thank you for your attention this morning. I look forward to the panel's discussion and also your questions. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR PASCUAL: Kristin, thank you for an outstanding presentation and for leading this project and bringing together such an extraordinary group of people to help you in the process of putting together these ideas. And, obviously, you've struck a chord in the community just by the number of people who are here in an overflowed room, the amount of attention to these kinds of questions. It's reflective that there is a real desire to in fact understand how the United States can more effectively communicate, an communicate on its policies. And let's pick up on some of these themes in the discussion with the panel and then with the audience.

And I'd like to start with Strobe Talbott in the discussion, if I could. Strobe, in the great experiment you go through a sort of history of governance in the world and the struggle people have to in fact come to terms with both national identity but yet also be able to govern a global environment much more effectively.

And one can argue, and Kristin did argue in her presentation and

work that we've done, that we are in much more of a transnational environment today than we have ever seen in the past, that no one nation can actually control the outcomes on any particular issue.

Now, this gets into an interesting topic because on the one hand in the past we've often argued that you can't have good public diplomacy without good policy. But if you in fact get good policy, then how do you operate in this transnational world to actually get the kind of buy-in and commitment that one needs from, as Kristin indicated, many governments, because power is much more dispersed from nongovernmental groups from the private sector, since they are so critical in actually bringing together the capital and the capabilities that are necessary to achieve anything, and from individuals.

And so I wonder if you can comment on that. How do you get that kind of activism from below in a diffused global environment when you need to actually be able to build that kind of participation in order to have an impact on change?

MR. TALBOTT: Thanks, Carlos, and thanks to Kristin.

I'll offer a couple of thoughts here at the outset, and I suspect that the question that Carlos has posed is sufficiently relevant to what the other panelists have to say and to the essence of the report itself that we'll be coming back to it in the discussion.

If I could, I'd just like to say one thing from a parochial Brookings

standpoint and also from a historical standpoint, and the two happily come together. Kristin is picking up on a legacy in a way that goes back 60 years to 1948 when a predecessor of hers, a Brookings scholar named Charles Thompson prepared a report for the Congress, the public, and, of course, the Truman administration on precisely this subject. And I think that is a significant point in time.

There were then some dramatic differences from where we find ourselves today. No doubt we'll be talking about the president-elect himself. Kristin's already referred to that. The president in 1948 did not come to office under quite the extraordinary circumstances that brought President-Elect Obama to the brink of the White House.

President Truman came by virtue of a presidential succession on the death of Franklin Roosevelt, of course, nor was his life's story quite as extraordinary as that of our current president-elect. Nonetheless, he -- President Truman -- stepped into the role of chief executive at a time when with that role came leadership of much of the world, and I think in that sense there is both a similarity and a difference to where we find ourselves today.

President-Elect Obama has made quite clear that he sees international leadership as very much part of his job description. He is also acutely aware of the obstacles he faces, some of them inherited from his predecessor, some of them circumstantial, some of them because of the way in which the world has changed, which is to say among other things

that when President Truman was our leader here in the United States, the power and primacy, both in hard power terms and soft power terms, were not only pretty much unchallenged, except, of course, by the Soviet Union, but they were largely welcomed around the world.

The last point is that President Truman, picking up on what he inherited, policies from the late President Roosevelt and that he passed on to President Eisenhower, had

very much to do with taking the good will towards the United States, the acceptance of the United States as an international leader, translating not into policies but into institutions.

And I might add that I think there's a very important sympathetic resonance between the work that Kristin has done and the work that Carlos is doing along with his colleagues, Bruce Jones from New York University, and Steve Stedmann from Stanford University, under the rubric of managing global insecurity, which is a set of recommendations that were released at the end of last week with regard to how with a lot of leadership and help from the United States we can reform and upgrade and strengthen international institutions in a way that will meet the challenges ahead.

Now more responsively to Carlos' question, I would basically make just two points. First, public diplomacy when you think about it is if not a oxymoron then kind of a contradiction in terms. We think of diplomacy as being a noble enterprise, or at least usually, and we hope a noble enterprise

carried out behind closed doors, not in public. That is going to have to change, and it's going to have to change for very practical reasons that I think Carlos was alluding to in the way that he posed the question.

The question, largely because of the trend which has been less than steady and less than complete but nonetheless a trend towards more and more democratization in the world, that means that there is more and more an onus on governments to build constituencies for diplomatic agreements as they negotiate those diplomatic agreement. And that means that no longer will it be possible or certainly wise to have diplomats go off behind closed doors, work with their counterparts either bilaterally or multilaterally from other nations, emerge with a treaty, presents the treaty to their parliaments or to their senate and say please ratify.

Particularly, because a lot of the agreements particularly in the areas that Carlos and his colleagues have been working on -- and here I'm thinking especially about of climate change but also the more immediate issue on everybody's mind which is new arrangements to manage and pull us out of the international financial crisis -- are going to require a special degree of buy-in and support from publics around the world because they are going to involve costs and sacrifices in the near term in order to get out of the mess that we're in and the dangers that we face.

So that I think argues for not just a beefed up public diplomacy capacity on the part of the United States government of the kind that Kristin

and the Commission are recommending, but similar efforts in other countries as well.

The last point I would make has got to do with the nature of both public and private diplomacy, and particularly American public and private diplomacy. And having spent eight years myself -- how shall I say? -- impersonating or at least trying to rise to the standards of a diplomat, which meant putting aside to some extent my chosen profession of a journalist, but that came in handy sometimes, too -- I can tell you that looking back to the '90s I do think that while there was much to be admired about the way the United States conducted diplomacy, there was an inadequate premium put on the importance of listening, whether it was behind closed doors or in public. There has been over the decades, maybe longer than that, a slight tendency on the part of the United States to be more in transmit mode than in receive mode, and that has to change.

And I have heard people that I think we can already be confident are going to be part of the Obama administration recognize this proactively, and that is a welcome thing. In fact, I think we've heard things from the president-elect himself saying that we need to be more in a listening mode. And one of the many features of the report and the recommendation that Kristin and he colleagues have put together is that they make this point very, very clearly:

It's not just a matter, if I can use this word advisedly, of

"propaganda", or spin, or putting the American side of the story out there, whether it's public diplomacy central here in Washington, or the hubs around the world, this whole concept will only work if part of the assignment of the people involved is to understand the cultures in which you're operating and understand the attitudes, the concerns, the hopes and the fears that lie behind the government policies that we're trying to effect in other countries. And that, too, is going to be part of the constituency-building, a public constituency-building which both domestically and internationally is going to be critical if our traditional diplomacy is going to succeed.

MR PASCUAL: Strobe, let me pick up from there and turn to Chuck, and, Chuck, Strobe used the term "understanding," and, of course, you've been in a field where understanding has been a central feature in the education world as president of MIT. And building an understanding of the world at the National Academy of Engineering, there's another aspect of this that I want to bring into it as well, which is in terms of others' understanding of the United States.

I mean, interestingly, one of the things that stands out consistently on surveys that have been done is the admiration of American excellence in science and technology, again another topic that you know a great deal about.

Now, Kristin has laid out in this report, with the help of the Advisory

Board, concepts that in part relate to the American government, how the U.S. government conducts public diplomacy, and she also identifies a role for an additional institution, a USA World Trust that will play a very specific role in support of government efforts.

And I'm just interested to get your perspective on how one can both leverage universities and science in this endeavor because I can see that on the one hand there are certain areas where, you know, universities want to protect their integrity, their independence, and yet at the same time you want to make this contribution to understanding.

And so if you can help us understand the way that universities and the world of science can actually be relevant to this challenge of public diplomacy, and add value in the kind of context that Kristin has laid out, I think that would be very helpful in this discussion.

MR. VEST: Well, thank you very much, Carlos, and thanks for all your good work, Kristin.

I'm pretty new to Washington, so I haven't quite yet learned to use terms like "nonkinetic means" and keep my face straight.

(Laughter)

But I'm all in favor of them, and so I was very pleased to be asked today --

MR PASCUAL: I would guess that General Jones particularly coined that one in the discussion.

MR. VEST: I'm very pleased to play a tiny part in this, and the reason I was pleased goes exactly to the heart of the question that Carlos has asked.

I want to reflect very briefly on two sets of experiences that I have had. One is that I had the honor to have served for 14 years on two major corporate boards through most of the '90s and across the term of the century. And I noticed that every night I'd go home, and I'd read the newspaper, and people were saying, you know, globalization is coming, and we've got to be prepared, and so forth.

And then I'd go to board meetings and realize that these companies have been globalized for 20 years.

MR PASCUAL: Right.

MR. VEST: And I gained a great appreciation for the fact that our U.S.-based corporations have thousands of people on the ground all over the world living in the culture. And I began to form an image of them as a very important projection of what we do in this country and how we think. And the experience of sitting on two audit committees, not that that's always terribly exciting, and observing the issues that grow around our ethical values and the way we go about things and how we project that in the world, and how we slowly change and educate each other and so forth, just made me realize that we've got a huge capacity out there that we don't use.

Now, as you pointed out, I've spent 40-some years in higher

education, first at the University of Michigan and then at MIT, and our universities and colleges probably more than any other institutions have historically enabled us to propagate our values and learn from others, especially in the days when our borders were truly open and free to scholars. I can pick off country after country, for example, in which numerous people, ministerial, cabinet levels we know were educated in our great public and private universities. So this is sort of an ongoing adventure.

But the thing I really want to point out that gets to the heart of what you've asked about is that while I was at MIT, our faculty decided to do a very radical thing: We put our entire curriculum, 2,000 subjects, onto the worldwide Web and just simply made it freely available. And this was an adventure from Day One. We didn't now where that pathway was going to be used, but the concept was: Let's put the basic teaching materials for everything we do out on the Web in an easily accessible, well organized, good touch and feel, usually get a link through and so forth manner.

And then we started watching the messages that came back, that came back from Sub-Saharan Africa, came back from the Middle East, came back from Europe, came back from China, Singapore, everywhere, and an amazing number of them referred to this as something that America was doing for them. Sometimes it would say MIT; just as frequently it would say America or Americans. And it suddenly made me realize that there's just an enormous power that our technologies have made available to us in

the form of openness now.

And I'll give you my favorite example, and we used to kind of treat it as a secret, but I think everybody knows it now, there is essentially an informal underground university in one of the Middle Eastern countries that was formed around the use of these open-source materials in order to educate kids who belonged to religious minorities who, legally, couldn't go to college in their own country. So I think that this sort of more or less politically-neutral world of education and of scientific and engineering and medical exchanges is a great tool for the United States.

So Kristin's report, of course, talks about two pillars, one rather classical definition of public diplomacy as a means of supporting the specific policy objectives, diplomatic objectives of our government, and the other is just -- these are my words, not hers -- creating the infrastructure, plowing the ground, fertilizing it for cross-cultural work.

And I think this is a new century in which we're going to compete and cooperate together, and what I look forward to U.S. Trust doing, if it comes about

-- and I certainly hope it does -- is just bringing a little bit of coherence, gathering that power. You're never going to centralize it, organize it top down, but I think we can draw on it for our own long-term national objectives in a better way. And I think that science, engineering, higher education, as well as the business world are going to be key to that.

MR PASCUAL: That's very helpful, and one of the things that comes out of that is the story that you raise about putting the entire curriculum on line, the impact that it had. In a sense it picks up on one of the themes of the Trust is the ability to invest in actors who are not part of the U.S. government. And the point you make very powerfully is that we have huge assets in this country. We have places of learning, universities; we have skill areas and part of what is real about the United States is that this is part of American life and American culture.

And the question is, can we invests in those aspects of American life in a way that actually gets the message of what America is about out much more broadly in a way which is decentralized and which is not controlled. And that that, the ability to do that, is in fact going to be an asset to our long-term objectives rather than something that we have to be worried about. So a very powerful story, I think, that you raise for us.

Tom, I want to come back to you now and maybe bring sort of a business dimension into the discussion. And already we've gotten started on the topic of what we can learn about the private sector's contribution to these issues. And Chuck has made the point that, you know, from the business community there has already been a huge move toward decentralization, and that's something to think about as well, that that's a centralization fact allows us to learn.

Certainly one of the things that strikes me from a business

perspective -- and, obviously, people at times immediately think about business and marketing, but behind marketing comes amount of research, analysis, testing which is necessary in order to be able to make it effective. So I just wonder if you could help us sort of draw on some of these kinds of lessons such as what is effective in the business community to be able to reach out and share a message and how we might be able to bring that back to the world of public diplomacy.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Carlos. First, let me say that it has really been an honor for a business for a diplomatic action to have collaborated with the Brookings Institution in preparing this thoughtful, articulate, important report on U.S. public diplomacy for the 21st century. It was a real pleasure to work closely with Kristin Lord as we listened to hundreds of public diplomacy professionals and concerned citizens, any of whom are on the board of this Mr. Diplomatic Action or Senior Advisory Council over the course of the past summer.

And I also would like to recognize our partners at the Public Diplomacy Council -- Bob Coonrod, Pamela Smith and their colleagues -- who were at our side throughout the process that made significant contributions all along the way.

In terms of your question and sort of things that can be learned from the business community, what kinds of things, you know, might inform our public diplomacy moving ahead, I really think there are three key areas,

and two of them have already been touched on by Strobe and Chuck.

The first is listening: how to listen better to the world.

The second is in global collaboration: How do you build cross-cultural consensus to achieve common objectives?

And the third one is in the area of communications and new media which, arguably, the private sector is fairly far advanced in terms of applying to business and the types of problems and challenges that the private sector faces compared to the public sector.

As Strobe, you know, said it extraordinarily well, I do think and we at BDA think that we have to learn how to listen better. It is not just a question of getting our message out; it's a question of understanding what people are actually hearing when we talk to them. I think this has really been a challenge for our government for many, many years, for a variety of reasons and across a number of different administrations. And I think the challenge of listening well now is going to be even greater as we look into the future in part because of issues such as the security at our embassies and our people on the ground around the world, how they can interact with the publics and even some of the elites of foreign nations.

So I think the whole discipline -- I, of course, as Martin mentioned, I'm a researcher by background having spent 20-plus years with the Roper organization, running their global programs, but I do think that in many respects the private sector, the business community which, as Chuck

mentioned, has been globalized for many years, has developed very sophisticated ways of listening to their many different constituent groups: the customers, their suppliers, their distributors, their own employees spread all over the world, and that the government could learn many valuable lessons from how the private sector approaches the listening process.

I know that there have been certain part of the government that have embarked on some fairly substantial listening programs I think there was some excellent work done, for instance, during the 1990s after the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the emergence of Russia in the New World Order, as it were. But that really wasn't replicated very widely across the government, to my knowledge. And I think it's time to take a look on how to apply some of those lessons and those techniques for listening to our public diplomacy practice.

The second area that Chuck really mentioned is how to build a global collaboration across cultural consensus. I mean if you think of American multinational companies, they are just that. They are multinationals, so I take Coca Cola as an example, the CEO is a Turk. The previous one was an Irishman. Seventy-five percent, not only of their sales and revenues, but also their people are located outside the United States, so companies have had to, in order to prosper in a globalized economy learn techniques both with their own people as well as with their outside

constituents on how to bring people together with carrots rather than sticks. So whether it be cross-cultural education within the organization, the way in which management decisions are made, again with the global perspective, I think there are an awful lot of lessons that can be learned, again from the experience of the private sector over decades that would be relevant, very relevant indeed to our public diplomacy challenges moving ahead.

And then, thirdly, I think -- and Kristin highlights this in her report as well -- is in the area of communications new media and technology. And I think, frankly, this is an exciting new frontier for public diplomacy, one that didn't exist just a decade ago, much less 50 or 60 years ago.

I personally think -- and this is my own view -- that this administration and the president-elect really gets it when it comes to new media and technology, and one of the most striking aspects, of course, of the campaign was just how adeptly they deployed new media and technology for the very specific objective very successfully. So in a sense, we're very hopeful that the administration will understand or at least be open to the idea of applying these new technologies to the pursuit of public diplomacy objectives in the years ahead.

MR PASCUAL: That's very helpful. I guess a couple of things from that. One is on the point of listening, that's it's a systematic process.

MR. MILLER: Correct.

MR PASCUAL: And you have to invest in it, so it's good for the

two of us to sit here and talk with one another and listen; but at a certain point you need to figure out how to systematize that and build it into a process of analysis and developing policy.

MR. MILLER: (Inaudible).

MR PASCUAL: And then the question of innovation and where innovation comes from. And in the end, all of us have to be sort of users of that innovation, but, in fact, that that innovation in many cases actually doesn't necessarily start from within government even, that it starts from other sources.

MR. MILLER: I would agree. I mean in thinking, you know, in terms of how would public/private partnerships work, moving ahead, I mean often I think there's a view, frankly, particularly here inside the beltway -- and I'm a New Yorker, so I don't know all of the, you know, workings here -- but that the role of business is to sort of write the checks for programs that have been developed here when, in fact, a lot of innovation and creative talent lies in the public -- in the private sector. So how to harness that creative energy, if you will, I think is a really important issue for public diplomacy moving ahead. It really can't be a one-way street.

There's, you know, of course in the private sector, innovation going on everywhere. and channeling it, capturing it and then channeling it appropriate, I think is really one of the major challenges moving forward.

MR PASCUAL: Kristin, I want to turn back to you for a minute and

maybe to clarify or sharpen one issue on the USA World Trust and the role of government, because there's always going to be a responsibility for government in public diplomacy. In the end, it's going to be a front line, and you talked about the importance of being able to move quickly, and flexibly and agilely in a sense, and government is going to have to take that on.

And yet, at the same time there are other kinds of functions for the USA World Trust, maybe not necessarily being that those frontline actors. but then making kinds of investments that help facilitate the capacity of government to be flexible and agile

And if you could pick up on this point and talk a little bit more about sort of, yes, what is the appropriate role for government in public diplomacy -- let's be clear about that -- but then how, then, this additional entity can reinforce it.

MS. LORD: Great, thanks for that question, Carlos. What I am trying to advocate is not -- underscore not -- the outsourcing of public diplomacy to a private group. Someone asked me if that's what I thought, and I emphatically do not think that.

Instead, what I think we really need in our government is on one hand a group that can really help to mobilize and work with the private sector to do more of what they're doing well already, like the MIT open courseware program, and there would be perhaps a grant-giving function and a community-building function to help make projects like that happen

within the private sphere.

But what I envision as being a major role in the USA World Trust is to really work closely with government, build a community of professionals across agencies in government who consider themselves public diplomacy and strategic communications professionals; tap expertise, research, and technologies from the private sector and help to not just push them into government but work with people from government to get them into a form that is useful for government.

And so when I first talked to some people at the State Department, some of them were a little bit resistant to this idea because, you know, there's a real fear that you're taking some control away from the State Department. But then they would say: "Wait, wait, but are you saying that I, as a state department official, could go and sit in this organization for a year and work with people from the private sector and the military and marketing organizations and technology companies on a project, and then go back into government and use it?"

And I said, "Yes, and the Trust would help you do it."

And they sat back and said, "That would be great."

And then another person said to me, "You know, I have a colleague, he sits in the Near Eastern Affairs bureau, and he's so innovative, but I just worry about we're always pulled away onto these day-to-day crises, and we really never get the chance to take advantage of his ideas. Are you

saying that this is a place that could sort of incubate ideas like that and help us develop them, and then government could carry them out?"

And I said, "That's exactly what I'm saying."

And he said, "That would be fantastic."

So what I imagine is an organization that could work very closely with, but be independent of, government. You really, I think, need that to protect the government as well as the Trust to innovate and experiment and bring people together on equal footing. But the whole goal is to work closely with government in a constructive way to improve what our government does in public diplomacy.

And let me just say one quick other word. There is a part of the report that talks about the organizational culture of the USA World Trust and what kind of culture would make this organization ultimately successful. And one of the lines in there is that the USA World Trust will be successful if it wore “not invented here” as a badge of honor; that it helps other people be successful. To me, that's what I think we need very much in our society and in our government, and that's the role that I hope the USA World Trust could play.

MR PASCUAL: Okay, good. Martin, we're -- I know this isn't part of the script, but that's why my colleagues love me, all right?

We're going to test-drive this vehicle here a second, and you've had a few prominent positions in the Middle East, have been known to be

associated with things like Middle East peace process and how these issues play themselves out in the United States, in Israel and the Arab world. Obviously, the public perceptions have a huge impact on the capacity of political figures to act.

So imagine yourself in any one of the many different positions that you've held related to the Middle East peace process. You've got access to something like this USA World Trust. How do you think about it? How do you think?

MR. INDYK: Well, thank you -- for putting me on the spot.

MR PASCUAL: I like you so much and am so confident in your answers.

MR. INDYK: First of all, just a point to make because if we talk about the Middle East or the Muslim world, that's not an area where democracy thrives, at least not yet. And yet public opinion there is at least as important as it is in democratic societies precisely because these authoritarian regimes are scared of their public. They are in a sense even more sensitive to public opinion because there are now institutional ways for public opinion to express itself in these authoritarian societies. So that just underscores the importance of public diplomacy.

Second is the point about listening. I think that conveys respect and a lot of people in the Arab world and the Muslim world feel that we don't respect them.

And so listening is important, but the consequence of listening is that you have to show that you're actually are going to change something about what you do as a result of listening; otherwise, people get the sense that you're not really listening at all, even though you say you are. And that comes to the heart of the problem where, I think, Kristin's ideas become important.

In the Arab world, in particular -- I think it's true of the Muslim world as well -- there is the sense that we espouse one thing and do something else. It comes under the rubric of double standards. And that is the easiest way in which our public diplomacy is dismissed because of the sense that, you know, America stands for certain values like democracy and freedom and meritocracy, which I think a big message that Barack Obama's success would send to societies which are not meritocracies.

But on the other hand, we go about doing things to promote our interest which don't reflect those basic values. And where this public/private partnership I think can be most important is by finding ways to emphasize where our values are important. The things that they identify with about us as Americans is what we have in common. We, in a sense we have a common language, and we have to find ways to build that up, and that can be done much more effectively by the private sector than the government, which also has responsibility for pursuing our national interest, and, therefore, inevitably ends up doing things which don't quite gel with our

values.

And I say "inevitably" because we can't -- we can't do anything about that. That's just the reality of on the one hand trying to hold ourselves up as a light unto the nations and, on the other hand, having to pursue national interests. So private sector programs that can emphasize our values and speak to people in this common language of common values is, I think, critical.

And I go back and I think what Kristin said is particularly important about there are some things that work very well that we kind of gave up on. What I remember a an ambassador was our jazz diplomats, our jazz ambassadors, a hugely successful way of promoting our values around the world that we just somehow kind of gave up on when we started pushing a freedom agenda. But it's those kinds of things that the private institution can promote, and obviously in new ways that I think will be very effective.

MR PASCUAL: Good, Martin, thank you.

I'm going to turn to the audience now. I'm going to ask people to ask questions, to make them relatively short, to introduce yourself.

I'm going to warn my panelists here that at the end what I'd like to come back to is based on the discussion we've had, the questions and answers that we're going to go through. I'm going to ask you to just say a couple of words about, is there a business case for this USA World Trust? Because in the end, as Kristin pointed out, it is going to require investment,

and so if one is going to make a business case for something like this, what are some of the critical things that we have to remember?

So let me start right there.

MS. GRAFFY : Hello. My name is Colleen Graffy, and I'm Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy, the only one, so thank you very much for your recommendation that includes keeping them.

(Laughter)

I'm listening. I did want to let you know that we have a product which we call the EUR Early Alert that gets us outside of the Washington bubble and tells us first thing in the morning what the conversation and the narrative is in Europe. And we've also started media hubs -- London, Brussels, Dubai -- with Under Secretary Glassman expanding those. Our one in Brussels gives us broadcasting and radio facilities which is really revolutionizing the way we're doing business. So I think building on that is going to be a very good idea.

I don't want to miss this marketing opportunity to let you know that your embassies really are doing some great things, including jazz ambassadors, and you can find that out by going to europe.state.gov with the button that says "Public Diplomacy in Europe." And we also have a newsletter on what we're doing, and we have some hard copy samples of public diplomacy and our Muslim engagement. You can also follow my twitter on my recent trip to Moldova and Romania.

My question is one of the real difficulties for our public diplomacy offices around the world, our CRs, and does the report say anything about how we can perhaps protect public diplomacy funds from CRs -- those are "continuing resolutions" -- which means that they can't plan to have events for when universities are in session. They end up not being able to plan anything, and then at the end they have to spend a budget or lose it, so they end up buying equipment or something but are unable to do the sort of events-planning that they would like to do.

Thank you.

MR PASCUAL: I'm going to take two more questions. Why don't we come right here, and then I'll come over here.

MR. WILSON: My name is Doug Wilson. I was the Congressional Director of USIA in the first part of the Clinton administration and now head the Leaders Project with the former defense secretary, Bill Cohen. And I wanted to pursue the point that you raise, Carlos, with regards to how this new Institute relates to government.

I want to congratulate you, Kristin, on some terrific work that you have done, but my question has to do with the public diplomacy practitioners and how they relate to this Institute when they're not spending a year inside it.

There are a lot of distinguished, prudent, former public diplomacy practitioners in this audience, and I wonder if you or the panel could explain

how this Institute would help them to become more credible listeners. You point out, I think very correctly in your report, that it's the credibility of the messenger as well as the message. And given the current structure of public diplomacy and given, I think, the difficulties in recruiting and retaining a new generation of public diplomacy practitioners who seem to be doing this job outside of government because they're frustrated going into it, how would you see, in a relationship between this Institute and helping to solve those challenges?

MR PASCUAL: Good. And we'll come right here.

AMBASSADOR ROSS: Ambassador Chris Ross, former Special Coordinator for Public Diplomacy and Arabic language spokesman on Al Jazeera and Alhurra and the other Middle Eastern outlets.

My comment has to do with the role of international broadcasting, and its relationship to the other structures of public diplomacy. I look at the Middle East, the budget for international broadcasting of -- (audio/microphone distortion inaudibility) -- SAWA radio (inaudible) center is about the same as all the other public diplomacy activities in that region.

And let's face it, in today's media world, these outlets are the most, potentially the most, potent ways of reaching the Middle Eastern audience. What's lacking here is an organized and sustained mechanism for providing public diplomacy guidance to the world of international broadcasting.

I'm not talking about the news function; the news function has been and should continue to be protected by the firewall against political and other interference. But there are hours and hours of programming that are available for which there is no sustained organized input from the world of public diplomacy, and this leads to interesting errors.

I follow as much as I can -- I will give you two examples of what's appeared in the last few months. We had a wonderful docu-drama on the conflict between Islam and Christianity as dramatized in the battles between Richard the Lion Hearted and Saladin.

The other example was how a small power can confront a large power in the dramatization of the Wars of Hannibal against Rome. These two things don't strike me as being particularly responsive to public diplomacy objectives as I know them. In the enabling legislation, the Secretary of State is assigned a function of providing this guidance, but there's never been a development and formalization of that role, and I think this is something that, given the huge budget that goes to international broadcasting, it's place should be looked at.

MR PASCUAL: Okay. Kristin, I'm going to start with you in responding to some of these points because some of them directly relate to issues such as funding and congressional resolutions and the role of public diplomacy practitioners.

I'd like to bring some of the ideas back to the panelists, in

particular for them to comment on how government and the policy parts, policy function, should relate to this question of international broadcasting because, I mean now there's obviously a huge international broadcasting capacity out there, and there are questions that can be raised about how much should be replicated or shouldn't be replicated by governments, but certainly governments have to understand how to relate to it.

And so let's come back to that question and, Strobe, I'll probably begin with you on that.

Kristin?

MS. LORD: Do you want to --

MR PASCUAL: If you can start on the wider question of funding and public diplomacy.

MS. LORD: Right, absolutely. So to answer to Colleen's question, I do talk and report about the problems of funding and how it hurts public diplomacy. There's a very shocking, to me at least, chart in the report that Megan Dolan developed that shows a budget, the real budget for public diplomacy over time. And it goes like this -- and that actually masks huge swings in tactics, not just huge swings in funding.

This is really a problem. If your goal is to have a long-term impact, you need to be able to sustain programs. I mean, obviously, this isn't something that any report can change, but certainly advocate it for a more longer-term approach to public diplomacy.

When Representative Thornberry was speaking at the Heritage Foundation, I asked him this very question, actually, and I said, "Would you be open to giving a longer-term -- say, two, three-year budget cycle -- to a new organization like this?" And he said that he very much would. I'd love to see that happen. It's very hard to plan it. It's even worse than you say, Colleen, of course, because sometimes you don't even know what your budget is until you're three-quarters of the way through the year, and then if you've worked in the department, you know that there is a search around to pull out all those papers you wrote six months ago to try and get them through in the budget cycle.

That's not a good way to use the taxpayer money, so, yes, I would definitely advocate for a new approach to budgeting.

With respect to Doug's question about how to engage public diplomacy practitioners, in the USA World Trust beyond bringing them into the organization, I think one of the things that Facebook has taught us is the power of communities, and communities of people who opt in. I have heard from numerous people that public diplomacy professionals, even though they don't report to the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs, they're really eager for leadership. They're professionals. They want tools to do their job better.

I mean all of us belong to lots of different professional societies. We spend a lot of time reading about the jobs we care about beyond what

we have to do as, you know, an absolute checklist for our job. I think there's a possibility to create a community of people, share information with them that is useful and that this will help to solve their problems, especially if this organization really tries to go out and listen to what these people need.

And just as an example of what is possible, I mean some colleagues of mine -- John Brown and Marc Lynch and Matt Armstrong and others -- have blogs that they've developed, as individuals, and don't have much money to do this with. But they have thousands of readers every day, a lot of whom are public diplomacy practitioners. And I think that goes to show that public diplomacy professionals are professionals. They want to do their job better. They want the tools to do their job better, and we can help them and help them help each other.

And then to address Ambassador Ross's question about broadcasting, this deserves an entire report in and of itself. I mean it really, really does I want to be fair to the broadcasting Board of Governors. They do have a new strategy. It talks about trying to work more closely with public diplomacy officials – it hopes to do some more of what you're talking about. It hasn't started yet. But it would be a big difference from how public diplomacy has ever -- broadcasting has ever been run in the past. But I think it will be incumbent upon the Obama administration to try and find ways to protect the news function, but also bring the rest of broadcasting a little bit closer to public diplomacy without compromising its quality.

And one of the things I do advocate in the report is -- especially in the Middle East and in markets that are information-saturated as opposed to where there is a scarcity of information, like in Burma -- it's not very many people's job to think strategically about how to get Americans' message onto Middle Eastern broadcasting entities as opposed to putting our own public officials forward or putting information onto Al-Hurra or our other broadcasting services.

I mean that's actually a big gap. I mean I'd sign -- I've be trying to get Chuck Vest on Al Jazeera or Alhurra, and to have him talk about MIT Open Courseware. I think that would do enormous good for American public diplomacy. But it's not anybody's job to do that, and I'd like to see that change.

MR PASCUAL: Strobe, you know, this brings together two parts of your career between public diplomacy and media reactions on the broadcasting question.

MR. TALBOTT: It sure does, and Chris's question and comments cast my own mind backwards to the not-so-good old days of the Cold War when Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty in particular, I think, were performing a very real function that is in some ways but not all ways, and to some degree but not all degrees antiquated now. And that was to fill a gap in the very large part of the world where there simply was not anything like objective information about the outside world coming in.

And I think that the government-sponsored-and- funded broadcasting agencies are doing an admirable job of trying to figure out their new niche. And I wouldn't want anything I say to constitute a criticism of either the evolution that's taken place so far or the efforts that are being made. I do think it's an area of opportunity and indeed obligation for the administration and the Congress to pay some attention to, because the terrain is shifting in a number of ways. And I would just make a couple of observations in that regard:

One is that, unfortunately, particularly in the Russian Federation, there has been in this respect very real backsliding towards the bad old days. That doesn't mean that there aren't still some oases of more or less free medias. But you don't find them clicking on a television set in Russia; you can find them on the radio dial, although not all that easily. I'm thinking of Ekho Moskvy, for example, which is hanging on.

And that goes really beyond the question of public diplomacy to the way in which the United States and other countries that want to see Russia move back in a direction of being a normal modern country, and how Russians and Russian authorities govern themselves, which is an issue, of course, on which they are both very resistant to outside pressures and outside pressures can be counterproductive -- which is how we say "stupid" here in Washington.

But I think one of the lessons of the Ekho Moskvy -- this is the

radio station that is really very bravely and quite successfully and with a degree of tolerance proving an exception to the rule -- is for Americans as much as possible and others to go on that show and talk rather than relying on broadcast stations coming in from, in my day -- the old days -- it used to be Munich and places like that, but beaming in from the outside, but actually going to those outlets within these parts of the world where the media is still closed or closing.

I wish I knew Arabic for all kinds of reasons, not the least because I could have watched you appear on Al Jazeera. But I'm sure you would have some advice to convey to those who will be working on the further evolution and the way we think about that, and you might contribute to another commission that Kristin has just called for.

The last point I would make has to do with our own media, that is to say American media. And let's just stipulate that any representative to the American media who is here covering a Brookings Event in the Falk Auditorium are part of the solution and not part of the problem -- Gary and others.

But there is a problem, and the problem is both domestic and international. And I say this with a heavy heart as a, not just a lapsed and former journalist, but an incurable journalist. I really think that the American media is, broadly speaking with lots of admirable exceptions, falling down on the job both in terms of the way it is providing the public trust and public

education function that it should be providing to our own citizenry, and also in the way that it is carrying out its global function. And I think that is beyond the parameters, probably, of both the panel discussion today and the report except in the following sense:

Kristin, in the way she has written the report, has made clear that she's not proposing either a panacea or a stand-alone solution to the problem of public diplomacy; quite the contrary, she's trying to suggest with backing from the Commission, and we hope with receptivity from the incoming Congress and administration, that this will be a new government function that will more easily partner with and plug into the private sector, including the fourth estate. Because in order to get the job done, it is going to take a lot more than anything that can be either funded or sponsored or run by the United States government; it is going to require a sort of buy-in at least in terms of the mission, in this case on the part of the American media.

MR PASCUAL: That's great. What I'm going to do is take five other comments from the floor, and I'm then going to come back to our panel and given them an opportunity to comment on one or any of those points that are made as well as the question which I asked earlier about a business case.

I'm going to start from the back of the room this time, right over there.

MS. MUELLER: Sherry Mueller with the National Council for International Visitors. I just wanted to ask Kristin, in 1961 there was a Brookings report on the foreign leader program and, of course, now that's the International Visitor Leadership Program. Is there anything in the report that says that the flagship exchanges that really have worked so well over the years, like the IVLP and Fulbright and others, need more attention? So I just wanted to ask that question.

MR PASCUAL: And we'll go right all the way in the back.

MS. TREVAL: Hi, May name is Christina Treval, I'm a foreign service officer and an instructor for public diplomacy at the Foreign Service Institute, but comments are entirely my own.

As Kristin Lord was saying that there's nobody who would bring a speaker over to talk about MIT open course software, there actually is. We have a speaker program. The problem is that the ACAOs, the Assistant Cultural Affairs Officers, no long exist to perform it the way that we need it done. And so part of it is this staffing problem of having people on the ground for that gold standard of still person-to-person contact even if it's a person who organizes a digital social network, but they have to be there to start it.

But the question I have about the corporation is, what would the ratio of kind of domestic to foreign staff be? Because myself, even having to spin back in Washington for three years and seeing some of my

colleagues fresh from the field, I know that there's a big gap in the way that you think when you're in the Washington bubble as opposed to when you're overseas doing the work directly. And if there's not -- if that's imbalanced, I think you'll have a fractious relationship that won't work, and the people back here will feel accountable to domestic constraints, and the people overseas won't consider these folks real partners.

MR PASCUAL: Okay, and right over there in the back, this gentleman right here, the greenish shirt, yes.

MR. GRIER: I am David Grier, also foreign service officer, and I work in the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, and I do public outreach there.

One point is I wanted to second what the Deputy Assistant Secretary said about the jazz ambassadors. They are alive and well It's under a new name, so if you look for jazz ambassadors you won't find it; it's called the Rhythm Road, and it's a public/private partnership between the State Department and Jazz at Lincoln Center, and we send out 10 music ensembles a year all around the world, and our next group is going to be starting in January where we're going to be sending them out and they represent all kinds of genres of music from jazz to blues to hip-hop.

And you can also go to our website at www. -- no, I'm sorry, not www. -- exchangesatstate.gov, and you can learn about all the exchange programs, cultural, educational, sports, professional, they're there.

And my question is having to do with the outreach. I think -- you're preaching to the choir here when you talk about we need more resources, we need more funding, we need more ability to get the public diplomacy message out. What I think the people really need to hear about how effective public diplomacy, cultural diplomacy is for the American public, number one; and our friends on the Hill, number two, who do the funding.

Because in situations when times get tough economically, the first thing that gets cut are things like cultural programs, and they need to be instructed -- maybe too strong a word -- they need to know that the money that goes into this type of diplomacy is an investment in the U.S. and our future, and really our national security and not an expense.

So how would you suggest that we get the general public and the congressional people more aware of the importance of that public diplomacy?

MR PASCUAL: All right, I'm going to come over here.

MR. APPLE: My name's Martin Apple, and I'm the head of a Council of Science Leaders that represents over a million scientists. My perspective is quite different. If I went way up in the sky and I looked down on this planet, and I saw as I got closer and closer that it was divided into nations and I tried to understand how they were functioning, and they were conversing with each other and so forth, and then I looked at the question of what's really going on in terms of human activity and I saw instead huge

networks of people doing all sorts of things based on common interest -- they could be business interest, they could be scientific interest, they can be criminal interest, they can be all sorts of things all across the globe -- and those common interest networks are running completely independently of those little borders that create countries.

And those common interest networks are making most of the things happen across the world right now. And, in fact, just to take one example, the IPCC group of 2,000-plus scientists changed the action and direction of almost every government on the planet without firing a shot and without diplomacy and without all the ordinary things that we think governments should be doing with each other.

So I think the question -- and I want to commend Kristin for this report because I like that idea of planting imaginative seeds that should be flowering to do what we're doing in the way that we can do it better -- but I want to understand how you can incorporate the real activities of networks across the world that are really making things happen.

MR PASCUAL: Okay. The IPCC is the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, which is a network of hundreds of scientists throughout the world who contributed to a change perspective on global warming and climate change.

Gary, your name was mentioned, so I'll give you an opportunity to defend the rights of journalists and their integrity.

MR. MITCHELL: Well, actually I -- Gary Mitchell from The Mitchell Report. My question really, and observation, deals directly with what Strobe was talking about, which I think is terribly important.

Whenever the discussions about public diplomacy come up, as I think Kristin knows, I always think about that observation that George Ball made 45 years ago, which was people will see us as no better than we are. In a perfect world that would be true, so all we need to do is change policy. It's not a perfect world, so we agree -- and I use the term more figuratively than literally -- that we need to engage in the promotion of ideas and programs that further make the case and build cooperation.

What I've been thinking about in this conversation is sort of a third piece which is that on the longer-range aspect of this, it seems to me that one of the most important things that we have to do in this country is to become better global citizens, and that, to use an easy term, that I'm interested in whether in your conversations you talked about civic education for global citizenship, if that term makes any sense.

But it really is saying that over the long haul, you know, we need to get smarter, more attuned, and more sensitive.

MR PASCUAL: Okay. So I'm at last trying to equate questions we have: effectiveness of the exchanges; staffing, particularly staff on the ground versus in Washington; the effectiveness of public diplomacy relationship to international work -- networks: and impact on global

citizenship. And then my request which is on if one is to make a business case on this USA World Trust, what are some of the core elements that one needs to make in order to make that business case?

If, Kristin, I can start with you, and then Martin, and then I'll come back to our other three panelists, if we could go in that order, please.

MS. LORD: To get to Sherry's question about exchanges and the visitors program, of course, we know that these are some of our most powerful tools of public diplomacy, but they take a long time to pay off, and some of them won't pay off at all. And, by the way, they're expensive. But I think we've learned that they're worth it. I suggest in the report that the new president -- or President Obama -- should take a few bold steps to symbolize what the United States hopes for the world and, specifically, recommend a tripling of the Fulbright program.

Actually, that wouldn't take as much as you think, and I think it would do us a world of good. It may be difficult in the financial situation we find ourselves in now, but it's something that I think could pay off over the long term.

On Christina's question, Christina, were you in Los Angeles at our listening session?

(Inaudible response)

I thought I recognized you. On the speakers program, I just want to clarify that I was talking about broadcasting. The speakers programs are

great but they do not reach the millions that broadcasting does.

With respect to bringing people into the Trust and the ratio of domestic and foreign, I actually did not touch that issue, but one thing that I did touch upon is using DARPA as a model, that is the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, which actually stipulates that their staff can only stay for a maximum of six years so that you're constantly circulating brainpower in and out, new ideas, fresh approaches, and I think that would be very useful, and you could think about that as the cycling in and out of broad- range perspectives and talents, whether they're people who have spent time overseas, people who have spent time as market research executives or whatever.

With respect to David Grier's point about preaching to the choir here, but needing to talk to the public and the Hill, I'm actually not so worried about the Hill -- and I know that gasps just went across the room when I said that. I see a tremendous interest in these issues on Capitol Hill from congressional staff, but also from members themselves. I was at a dinner recently, and two senators stood up and talked about the importance of public diplomacy, spontaneously, when the issues on the table were Iran, Russia, Iraq, Afghanistan. They both volunteered that public diplomacy was absolutely critical.

So I think the Hill is with you on this issue. In terms of the American public, I think this is actually much harder because it's very, very

difficult to build support among Americans for these issues by using taxpayer dollars in public affairs strategies. And it's a very touchy thing for governments to do.

But I think this is where private groups like Business for Diplomatic Action, Meridian International, the Center for Citizen Diplomacy, and so many other private groups come in. They are the ones that ought to be out there advocating to their members and their constituencies, and their communities for broader international engagement. In my opinion, that would help a lot. And journalists, too, by the way.

With respect to Marty's question about networks, I completely agree with you, so the question that I saw was, how does government even begin to tap into the power of these networks? And what I decided was that, you know, after speaking with so many people and really listening, it's very hard to do that from government for a host of reasons. So the question is, how do you have people whose job it is to work with these networks to connect government officials with these networks? And that, actually, in a nutshell is what the USA World Trust would be set up to do.

There is a little story at the beginning of the report about the invention of the Internet, which I left in, despite having two people who I respect very much telling me that it was a horrible idea to put that there, and I absolutely had to take it out, but I -- I left it in, and here's why: Several people who read drafts of the report said: Thinking about networks put me

in a completely different frame of mind in terms of thinking about what makes our country safe. It just -- it's a completely different paradigm, and you need to allow yourself to shift to that paradigm to begin to think about how you organize to live in a network world as opposed to looking at the kind of institutions that we set up in the 1940s and 1950s to do public diplomacy. It's just a different kind of model.

MR PASCUAL: I'm going to jump in there.

MS. LORD: Oh, sorry.

MR PASCUAL: And that was actually too good a point to -- I mean it's crystal clear, and I'm just concerned we're going to run out of time on the panel. So what I'm going to do is keep going through, and if anybody would like to continue the discussion afterwards, they can come and I think talk with any of our panelists. But, Martin, do you -- any points that you --

MR. INDYK: I'll see if you have time. I'd rather listen to our panelists.

MR PASCUAL: All right. Chuck, do you want to pick up?

MR. VEST: Well, I'll make just a few very quick points. First of all, I still believe deeply in person-to-person contact, and you'll be glad to know, Martin, that the National Academies took Bob Taylor, a Nobel prize-winning physicist, to a couple of campuses in Iran last year, and it was probably second only to Louie Armstrong going to Moscow that we all remember in terms of its impact. I mean that seriously.

Secondly, we all kind of are moving in a similar direction here, and to make a point, I'm going to be publicly undiplomatic, which is the days of broadcasting may be over. I am an old-fashioned guy, I love my newspaper, I listen to NPR while I'm shaving. If I have some time I watch a little television around the edges.

But we're interested in the future, and I have to tell you, whether you're in the former Soviet Union or China or the Middle East or anyplace else, the young folks are out there on the Web. That is their world, that's how they get their information, and we need to really recognize that and even in its greater manifestations, as Marty has pointed out.

I think this is an age of some leveling of the world in a lot of dimensions, and we're only going to be able to lead by participation, by our actions, and by our decisions. I think that's the tone of the times in how we bring government and the private sector together.

And, finally, just to end your question about what the business case is, we've talked a lot about listening, and I think the business case here for this new entity is now only listening across the oceans and so forth but listening to the enormous knowledge and experience base we've got in our educators, in our business folks and so forth, and trying to create a positive feedback from that.

And so it's: What are you hearing out there in the world? What are your problems? What's really effective? And anybody who's led an

organization knows that when you listen, if you just feed back and just literally state back to people a little bit of what you heard from them, whether it's a speech by the president, or something the secretary of state does, or something a business leader does, you can create positive feedback that will, I think, move us more effectively in the direction that we all want and desire.

MR PASCUAL: Very good. Tom.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Carlos. So very briefly first, I couldn't agree with Chuck more on the role of listening again, making the business case for this new organization.

But I want to mention three other points that were raised by the members of the audience:

First, in terms of global citizenship, we at Business for Diplomatic Action couldn't agree more. Our message is "Proud to be American but also an informed citizen of the world." And I've put together a number of world citizens' programs to try to promote that concept here in the United States.

Secondly, on exchanges, to Sherry's point, again we are huge believers in the importance of those last three feats. I believe Kristin's report calls for a tripling of the Fulbrights. We, ourselves, have launched a small exchange program, the Arab and American Business Fellowship program that we'd love to turn into the Fulbright or the private sector, but we

think that is a very effective way to enhance cross-cultural understanding and respect.

But, finally -- and I think where the real case, the business case, lies for this organization -- is in the networking area. And in terms of how do you really empower networks through the Web, through social networking to really get on your side and help, you know, both develop as well as move the message out to their membership?

And the thing about networks, I think, is anyone who's got a Facebook page, or teenage kids with Facebook pages, is that you have to cede control. You just cannot call all the shots the way the government is used to. So I think that in itself argues for a kind of buffer organization, if you will, between the many networks out there that could be empowered and the government who is ultimately responsible, of course, for our public diplomacy.

MR PASCUAL: Amen. That's true.

MR. TALBOTT: I'll start with what I think is not a totally proven empirical point, but I believe that Barack Obama may be the first president of the United States who has called himself a citizen of the world before he took office. Jack Kennedy had the good sense to wait to do it until his inaugural address, and Ronald Reagan did it when he gave a speech to the UN in 1982, but make of that what you will.

I'll go straight to Carlos' question about the business argument of

the business case. I think it's very well made in the report, and I think it's come up in this conversation, but just to try to crystallize it, the essence of American foreign policy is to advance American interest and values around the world and, to the extent possible, that is when hard power is not required, to do so in a rule-based and consensual international system. And then I would zero in on the word "consensual."

That means that others have to consent. They have to willingly kind of go along with our interests and values being consonant with theirs. And that argues for exactly the kind of effort, which as a number of you have pointed out -- notably including those of you who are involved in the U.S. government in public diplomacy that, hey, it's already going on, but I take it as implicit in your comments that it could be done -- it could be done even better.

It does largely come down, as it so often does in Washington, to money. And I craned my neck around to see that one slide that Kristin put up which made pretty dramatic what a paltry amount of money we're talking about, and a significant increase would be a paltry amount of money, and getting rid of the CRs is also a very good idea.

CR is a four-letter word for the vocabulary of those of us who worked in a lot of areas of policy. When Colin Powell came in as Secretary of State in 2001, he had some successes which we must remember. And it may seem mundane, but it sure didn't seem mundane to the professionals

who are well represented here today, and that is he was able to take his prestige, and his unique prestige with regard to national security, and make the case that the150, the foreign affairs account of the U.S. budget was way underfunded, and needed to be beefed up, and he got that done.

Now, assuming -- and, of course, one has to be careful here that Senator Clinton is going in due course to be Secretary Clinton -- I think she will be able to do something similar in several regards, notably including with a body that she knows very well, which is the United States Congress, in getting more funding for a variety of effort on behalf of advancing our foreign affairs and thereby our national security, but notably including the one that we're talking about today.

MR PASCUAL: Strobe, thanks. Just maybe four points, then to sum up. I think the point has been powerfully made about the importance of systematic listening; that this is not just something that happens by chance but it has to be done in a way in which you invest and you systematically learn; and that this is absolutely critical to being effective in the kind of more dispersed and diverse environment in which we live today.

Second is the point that's been made about networks as being the impetus for change in the kind of world that we live today, and if that is the case, then how do we understand them, how do we relate to them, how do we have a capacity to work with them more effectively?

The third is the importance of innovation that we always have to be

at a cutting edge that drives us further, and innovation is not just this question or a tool for the private sector but it's in fact, in this kind of transnational world that we live in today, if we are going to be effective, we have to bring that innovation to bear.

And the fourth is that we have huge assets in the United States, and those huge assets are spread out all over in our universities, in NGOs, and the private sector, and if we want to put the best face of America forward, we have to understand how to invest in them and give them the capacity to get their messages out to the rest of the world, because that is very much what draws people to the United States of America.

Kristin, we thank you for your leadership in helping us pull together this report and bringing together the Advisory Board.

We thank the audience for your very engaged participation, and we thank our panelists for their outstanding presentations and exchanges.

(Applause)

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

/s/Carleton J. Anderson, III

Notary Public # 351998
in and for the
Commonwealth of Virginia
My Commission Expires:
November 30, 2008