THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

FALK AUDITORIUM

THE MARSHALL PLAN'S 70th ANNIVERSARY AND THE FUTURE OF DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION

Washington, D.C.

Tuesday, June 5, 2018

ANTHONY F. PIPA, Moderator
Senior Fellow, Global Economy and Development
The Brookings Institution

JOHN R. ALLEN
President
The Brookings Institution

MARK GREEN
Administrator
U.S. Agency for International Development

MICHELLE NUNN
President and Chief Executive Officer
CARE USA

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. PIPA: So good afternoon and welcome. Welcome. So on behalf of the Brookings Institution and our co-host USAID, I am pleased to welcome you here today for this commemoration of the 70th anniversary of the passage of the Marshall Plan and the lessons for the future of development cooperation and U.S. leadership.

So I'm Tony Pipa. I'm a senior fellow here in Global Economy and Development at the Brookings Institution. And personally, I'm very excited to be involved in the program today, and I'll tell you why.

As a boy growing up in rural Pennsylvania, I have to say that foreign policy didn't get much play at the dinner table nor in our local newspapers. But I'll tell you, we all knew about the Marshall Plan and the importance to the recovery from World War II and also how it showed America at its best. So I'm really excited to be here today.

I'm excited to work for an organization, the Brookings Institution that played a role in developing the plan and having just worked at another institution, USAID, which carries on part of that legacy for the U.S. government. And we're really privileged to have the leaders of both here, John Allen and Administrator Mark Green; joined by Michelle Nunn, whose own organization also traces its origins back to that time around post World War II.

Also a special thank you to some special guests who have joined us from Tidewater, which is the annual retreat of the development ministers of the OECD, which was just hosted by the U.S. and Administrator Green. And interestingly, the OECD evolved from the institutions that were built during the Marshall Plan. And so you can see a thread and it's actually the 50th anniversary of that annual retreat. So we have a lot of convergence here of anniversaries and we're looking to the discussion today.

Just a reminder that this event is being webcast. And if you want to join

the conversation online you can use the hashtag #MarshallPlan70 to join the conversation. I wanted to get that right.

So we're going to start with a short video that will provide us with some historical context around the plan and then we'll take the stage and get into the discussion and have some time for Q&A afterwards. Thanks very much. (Applause)

(Video shown; applause)

MR. PIPA: While we're getting mic'd up, we'll begin. But as I mentioned before, each of today's panelists are from institutions with a historical connection to the post World War II context and the Marshall Plan. So I'll introduce each and they'll some opening reflections about the legacy of the Plan and the implications for their institutions and for U.S. leadership, and then we'll get into a discussion.

First I will turn to John Allen. You have full bios in the handout, so I'm not going to cover the entire ground. But John became president of the Brookings Institution in November 2017. Before that was a distinguished fellow and chair of the Security and Strategy in the Foreign Policy program here. He's a retired U.S. Marine Corps four-star general, former commander of the NATO International Security Assistance Force, and U.S. forces in Afghanistan. And after his service in the Marine Corps, also held two senior diplomat posts as a senior advisor to the Secretary of the Defense on Middle East security and as special presidential envoy to the Global Coalition to Counter ISIL.

So, John, I'll turn to you for some reflections on the history that we just heard about of the Plan and Brookings' role and some of your perspective on the implications for today.

GENERAL ALLEN: Well, Tony, thank you very much for putting this together. It's hard to overstate the importance of the Marshall Plan, both to that moment

in history, but also in the aftermath.

But let me start by saying it's a real honor for me to be on the stage with Michelle and with Tom. I have tremendous memories and respect for CARE. I think as a child the sort of ubiquitous appearance of CARE in every crisis in terms of feeding and caring for the downtrodden and the underprivileged was something that has stuck with me my whole life.

And USAID is, I think, one of the great unsung agencies and entities of the U.S. government in the post-World War II era during the Cold War. My own experience with them was first intimately in the post-tsunami period, 2004/2005. And USAID, I think, personally was responsible as an institution for the saving of tens of thousands of people by virtue of how quickly it could move.

Later in Afghanistan, I had the opportunity to see it again. They did a magnificent job there. And in the Helmand Province where USAID had been at work since the '50s, it was not uncommon for some villages to call themselves "Little America" because of the impact that USAID had made on those individuals, and there were a couple of folks named Fred Ahmadzai and Phil. It was amazing and wonderful.

We talked about some anniversaries. This is an important anniversary for the Marshall Plan. But this week, 100 years ago, was the Battle of Belleau Wood, and this is the 100th anniversary of the end of the First World War. And this week, 74 years ago was the landing of D-Day.

Both of those conflicts in many ways defined the future for the United States and its views on development. And President Moulton, who was the president of Brookings at the time, after World War I had written extensively about the incredible debt burden of reparations that had been imposed on the Germans and their allies. And how in many respects the collapse of the German economy and economies in Europe, by

virtue of having lost the peace, created the environment which directly contributed to the Second World War; where lessons learned from that experience would inform the efforts by then President of Moulton of Brookings to help Arthur Vandenberg, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to give them a helping hand with a perspective on how post World War II development could occur.

It's also not a surprise that it was General George Marshall, who would then go on to be Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State, would have a particular view on it's much more important to win the peace than just to win the war. And he would become a great champion of the idea of post-conflict development and post-conflict rescue. In which case then the United States, with the assistance of the Brookings Institution and the Department of State and the Congress very actively involved in this, would create an environment where the rescue of the European states, the European population, in conjunction with ultimately the containment strategy, would turn the tide in the aftermath of World War II.

So here at Brookings we're very proud of the legacy of President Moulton and the legacy of this institution and having contributed directly to the thinking and to the development of a plan which would define so much of what would come in the aftermath of the Second World War. I hope those lessons can inform the work today. I hope those lessons can help us to bridge the aisle from time to time, to have the clear strategic thinking that's necessary for us to have a clear approach ultimately to development over the long term.

So thank you again for this. It's an honor to be on the stage with you today and I'm grateful for this opportunity.

MR. PIPA: Thank you. And so next we'll hear from Administrator Mark Green, that unsung hero, USAID. He's the 18th administrator of USAID and been in that

role since August 2017. He's been in leadership roles at several organizations that are important in the global development community: president and CEO of the International Republican Institute, president and CEO of the Initiative for Global Development, and senior director at the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition. And that builds really on a distinguished career in public service where he was the U.S. ambassador to Tanzania and also served four terms as a congressman in the U.S. House of Representatives representing Wisconsin's 8th District, where he had a big hand in some key policy initiatives, like the Millennium Challenge Act and President Bush's emergency plan for AIDS relief.

So, Mark.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Tony. It's good to share the stage with the leaders who are here and good to be with all of you. As Tony mentioned, we're joined by my distinguished international colleagues from the annual Tidewater gathering. Yeah, 50 years, 70 years, 100 years, it seems to be the time for great moments and things for us to celebrate.

You know, the fact that we have gone, my colleagues and I, from Tidewater to the Marshall Plan is really fitting because in so many ways the work that we are doing these days and the challenges that we're taking on really do date back to some of the challenges and some of the accomplishments that were undertaken 70 years ago.

So why is the Marshall Plan relevant today? As you heard there, it was about much more than dollars. And yet, for so many Americans I think when they look back that's all they think of. They think of the large sums of money that did flow to Europe.

But if it were all about money, if it were only about money, not only would the Plan have faded into the mists of time quite some time ago, but it would have failed.

It would not have accomplished what we see today.

First, while compassion was certainly an important element in the Marshall Plan, and you see some of that playing out in the film, it was strategic compassion. It was strategic considerations that ultimately I think motivated key voices and key votes in putting all of this together.

So it's true that part of Joseph Stalin's opposition to the Marshall Plan was a blanket opposition to the extension of assistance to countries which in his mind had caused so much destruction in his country. But what really made his opposition especially fierce was the realization that the Marshall Plan would essentially constrain the westward expansion of Soviet influence and the influence of Communism.

And the second aspect of the Plan, it seems to me, which comes from that was how the dollars were tied to key reforms that did create the framework that we see today: economic reforms, institutional reforms, and political reforms. It emphasized a liberalization of trade policy. It included a fostering of responsive governance and democratic structures, which we all realize are so important today.

And I think for Americans who were paying close to the Marshall Plan, they eventually supported it so strongly because they saw it not as a hand out, but as a hand up. They saw that it essentially seeded new market-based economies. It created commercial opportunities for American businesses, but commercial partners amongst our allies in Europe. And I think those aspects of the Marshall Plan really do echo today to the challenges and the opportunities that we're talking about, that we've been talking about at Tidewater and we're talking about in many venues in the world today.

And there are a number of parallels between the challenges that they saw then and the challenges that we see know. Today it's not the spread of Communism, but I would argue it's the lure of authoritarianism. Moscow still seeks

influence, but it's really not Moscow that has the juice. It in many ways is China which has the juice and the wealth that it can throw around for murky ends at best. And so I would argue that just as the creation of the Marshall Plan offered war-torn Europe a clear choice for their path to economic growth, the emergence of China's mercantile authoritarian assistance programs I think in clear contrast to that which unifies all of us who took part at Tidewater, it also offers a clear choice for nations around the world.

We know that China has shown little interest in adhering to the norms of debt sustainability or the principles of development assistance that we believe in. It offers easy money. It offers quick projects. It offers availability and responsiveness in the sense of being able to act quickly. But it also secures conditions and indebtedness that I would argue essentially mortgage a country's future.

And so the spirit of the Marshall Plan is something that we do need to talk about today and we do need to bring forward because the Marshall Plan reminds us that we can use our tools of leadership, development, international assistance to really shape the world in very important ways. At USAID, we're trying to carry this legacy on because it resonates for us today, but really is something, again, that I think all of us need to be talking about.

At USAID, we believe that if countries are willing to make the tough choices, if they're willing to do some of the difficult things that we saw the war-torn nations of Europe do, if they're willing to do that, then we should step forward. We should walk with them on their journey to self-reliance. We should be there to help foster those institutions which experience has shown us make all the difference, not because we have all the answers, but as I often say we've probably made all the mistakes over the years. And so we can say to our friends in the developing world, look, you can leapfrog, you can learn from our mistakes, you don't have to repeat them, and you can

accelerate and you can aspire to great things and you can aspire to rising and making that journey from recipient to partner to, yes, fellow donor.

And to me that's the spirit of the Marshall Plan. And at USAID we believe it's alive and well and it really does animate the work that we do.

MR. PIPA: Great, thank you very much. We're going to have a lot to talk about.

And now I'll turn to you, Michelle. So Michelle Nunn has been president and CEO of CARE USA since July 2015. Most of you will know that CARE is leading humanitarian organization that fights global poverty, provides lifesaving assistance in emergencies, last year worked in 95 countries. Prior to that, Michelle co-founded a volunteer mobilization organization, Hands On America, growing it to a national network of more than 50 affiliates that then merged with Points of Light, the organization founded by President George H.W. Bush to promote volunteerism. And she served as CEO at Points of Light for six years.

So as you can see, her career has been grounded in civic and public service as a social entrepreneur, a nonprofit CEO, also a candidate for U.S. Senate. And so I'll turn to you, Michelle, to talk a little bit about the origins of CARE also in this post World War II context, as well as the evolution that we're starting to see in the conversation.

MS. NUNN: It goes without saying in my introductions, although they never say it, an unsuccessful Senate campaign. (Laughter)

So I am delighted to be here. And really it is a wonderful thing to be able to celebrate this and use it as a touchstone to think about where are we today and what are the lessons that we can carry forward and what are the aspirations and I think some of the bold vision that we can embrace reflecting back on the Marshall Plan.

I have the privilege of working for an organization that has an extraordinary origin story. And I feel very lucky to be a steward of that amazing generosity and spirit of generosity that was manifest in the invention of the CARE package. In 1945, a small group of American citizens decided that they would not stand on the sidelines and watch as people faced hunger and even starvation in post World War II Europe. And so what we now call a "care package" and might send to our sons or daughters at camp or at college was invented. And within actually just a short period of months a group of ordinary citizens banded together to create CARE and to ship off the first 20,000 CARE packages to Le Havre, France, which is pretty much an extraordinary story. And one of the extraordinary things about it was how responsive the American public was to it. It was a pervasive dimension, I think, of actually -- an understanding of what it meant to be involved in the world was to send a CARE package.

When I first joined CARE, my Aunt Betty, who's 82, told me that her mother had been the head of the Brownie troop in middle Georgia and that they had raised money for one of the first CARE packages. And she remembered the name of the little girl who they sent the CARE packages to 70+ years later, Marie François Brune. And when I think about the CARE package and when I think about the Marshall Plan, I think about that American involvement, that it wasn't just something that the government did. It was actually an invitation to the American public to participate. And I that's one of the lessons that we can carry forward as we think about building the constituency for the work that we do in development.

So I also think that one of the remarkable things is the scale at which obviously the Marshall Plan, the boldness of the ambition, but even the boldness of CARE, for instance. Within one and a half years, they were processing 15,000 CARE packages a day, requests from ordinary citizens to say I'll give $10 or $15 to send a

CARE package. The pure scale of that is pretty extraordinary.

Another thing that I think is important to think about is that CARE was operating actually for several years before the Marshall Plan. So the Marshall Plan really did understand and the broader American response that we needed to do short-term emergency humanitarian response in addition to systemic long-term development. And that sort of confluence and also that continuum, I think, is part of the importance of that story.

As I sort of think about, so where do we take all of this, you know, obviously CARE is no longer sending CARE packages. We sent over 100 million CARE packages. We now do sustainable development and we're working with small-holder farmers to ensure that they can feed their own families and their communities. But I still think that there are many lessons that we can take from those origin stories of the Marshall Plan and also of CARE that are relevant and that should inform how we think about the bold and strategic both challenges and opportunities that are before us now.

MR. PIPA: Great. Thanks very much. And so let's dive into some of those lessons. I love that boldness of ambition. That was an enormous amount happening just on a daily basis. That's phenomenal.

MS. NUNN: Yeah.

MR. PIPA: But, Mark, I want to pick up, you talked a little bit about Tidewater and about the conversation at Tidewater. And before we came over we were also talking a little bit about it in the room. And I do think, you know, part of the case for the Marshall Plan was to support democratic ideals and freedoms and in a set of countries to counter the threat of Communism, and you mentioned that in your remarks. And the Marshall Plan ended up creating institutions that evolved into the foundation for today's development cooperation. That's where it comes from, the OECD.

But there's a question as to what do we do with those institutions today? Are we building those similar institutions? You mentioned China. There's other emerging economies, as well, that are making assistance available. They practice what they would term South-South cooperation. And China is making massive investments, as you alluded to, through the Belt and Road Initiative, many of them having debt.

So those similarities between the geopolitical importance of the Marshall Plan and today's context for U.S. development aid and the development cooperation that's happening at Tidewater, are they similar? Are they different? Where should we be drawing those lessons and should we be drawing those emerging economies into the OECD/DAC? They don't seem to be too interested, but then what? What do we do with that?

MR. GREEN: A broad range of topics to cover. So first off, let me say that I think one of the lessons of the Marshall Plan was the strategic value of assistance done right. So where we help our allies, our partners to grow and become strong, that's good for us in addition to being good for them. So it is compassion, but it is sound national security policy, as well, and there's nothing wrong with that. We shouldn't be shy about talking about how this serves our national security interest, and it clearly does.

And you see it manifested today in a number of ways. Our relationship with the Department of Defense is as close as it has ever been. We have more than 20 USAID staff embedded in the combatant commands. We work together closely out in the field. We work together on stabilization assistance. We work together in disaster responsiveness.

Last year, when we saw the terrible earthquakes in Mexico City, the ability to be able to get lifesaving measures to Mexico City before breakfast the next morning wouldn't have been possible except for our close working relationship with the

Department of Defense. So today you see it as a very close-knit, seamless working relationship. And so I think it's important there.

But touching on the other topic, I think one of the things that we were focusing on at Tidewater is reflecting what is at the heart, what are the principles that animate the kind of work that we do? We recognize that it is not enough to send simply material resources. We need to do that. We need to provide immediate relief to those who are suffering. But everybody wants the chance to lift themselves up. Everybody wants the chance to lead themselves. Communities want to be self-sufficient, countries want to be self-reliant. I believe wholeheartedly in human dignity and tapping into that and fostering that. And that really animates a lot of the work that we do and that does come out of the Marshall Plan.

Taking on those reforms that block a country from rising, again, we don't say it because we in the U.S. have all the answers, it's that we've learned painfully about those things that we have not always done as quickly as we need to do. And so we reach out to our partners and we say, look, you know, you're sovereign. You must make your own choices, but this is what we've learned. And if you're willing to take on these tough reforms, if you're willing to do these big things and difficult things, transparency, if you're willing to take on corruption, if you're reinvesting in your people, we'll be there with you. We'll walk on that journey with you so that you can aspire to your own version of what we call the American dream and is clearly the universal human dream. And so that very much animates the work that we do.

And as I said in my comments, that clearly is not a model that every donor country in the world is currently using. You know, we want to help countries rise, and so we're not interested, in fact, we simply won't straddle them with the kinds of debt that we're seeing in some parts of the world. This isn't about our gain, although I do think

we benefit economically from it. This is about creating more partners, more market opportunities because we have partners who are interested in the types of products and services that we create and provide, but also are just interested in the same things that we are in terms of the future. And so that really drives a lot of the work that we do. And I do, I do think it goes back to those principles that we're all talking about with the Marshall Plan.

MR. PIPA: Michelle, those principles that Mark was just talking about, and you talk a little bit about and he just mentioned, as well, sort of that shift from short-term emergency to long-term development. How do you see those principles holding true today, but also how have they evolved? How are things different and how are we having to think about them a little differently? And what maybe from the Marshall Plan isn't relevant today?

MS. NUNN: Yeah. Well, I mean, I think that one of the things that was striking going back and reading some of the literature about the Marshall Plan was that George Marshall was committed to doing this. He didn't want to just do it over a big infusion over a year, he wanted to make sure it was a commitment over a period of time. Because part of what he was signaling was a long-term commitment of America to solidarity and the rebuilding with Europe.

And so I think one of the principles of the Marshall Plan is one of the ones that we should carry forward, which is we do have to think about the sort of long-term strategic vision. One of the Republican senators evidently wrote that he saw the Marshall Plan as part of a 25- to 50-year architecture for the future. I would like to think that our diplomats and all of our administrations was thinking about the 25- to 50-year geopolitical strategic vision. And I know that Mark's thinking about this as we look forward. What is that?

So I think a couple of the things that I would carry forward, the ownership, which Marshall said that Europe had to define for itself how to use this with influence from America; the boldness that we've talked about; this confluence of humanitarian and development. I think some of the -- and yet, some of the institutions that were built during that period, we pretty much are using in the same way that we used them in that period. And so the fact that we have evolved tremendously, but yet our institutions have not necessarily kept pace with that I think is the opportunity and challenge for us.

And I think that we need to think about, so, how do we all become the George Kennans or Dean Achesons or whoever the architects were that were thinking bravely, boldly, and that were willing to really reimagine what's necessary. Because, for instance, our refugee -- we have, obviously, a greater number of refugees now than we did then. But the structures that we need to support them are not the same as they were 70 years ago. And yet, I feel that we are not yet meeting the challenge for reimagining them for the next 70 years.

MR. PIPA: So as --

MS. NUNN: Can I just say one more thing? Because I thinking about from -- as I was looking at the signing and there were a lot of men, but no women, one of the things that CARE is carrying forward, and so I feel like I have to put this in there, is that one of the evolutionary dimensions I think of development that's been embraced by USAID and by partners around the world is the importance of investing in women and girls as a strategy for carrying forward. So I think that's one of the sort of pluses that I would put towards the evolution of the way that we're doing development and the lessons learned over the decades.

MR. PIPA: Yeah, thanks. And 25 to 50 years, I will admit that even

though I was in the role of chief strategy officer at USAID, we were not -- I was not getting us to try to think 25 to 50 years. We were a little shy of that, 10 to 15. And so I think maybe we needed -- I will admit to not having as bold a vision as we probably should have been having.

But I want to pick up on what you were also talking about sort of in terms of the evolving and you mentioned refugee crisis and just sort of the evolving environment. And, you know, the nature of conflict is different given violent extremism. The nature of crisis and the breadth and depth of those crises, I mean, we keep setting records for the amount of Level 4 crises that the world is experiencing. And many of the persistent development challenges that we now face are really in countries that we term in different ways as fragile, where there's either conflict or a post-conflict situation, and the institutional and governance capabilities to provide for their citizens are weak.

So what's the case now for U.S. engagement in these situations and what's our modern vision of success? And should we have the similar expectations we had in the Marshall Plan? And, John, it would be great to get your perspective on this.

GENERAL ALLEN: Sure. Well, great comments so far. My own experience, and I've had a bit in both Iraq and Afghanistan and other places, is that when we attempt to envisage the end of the conflict or we seek to envisage how a conflict society can transition to a post-conflict society to a developing society, when we try to envisage the long term to see where the ends will take us, then we're at our best. When we try to transition out of the conflict period into the development period, that's when we generally are not very good.

For example, when we did the counter ISIL conflict, we did the organization for the counter ISIL piece, very early in the process -- very early in the process -- we began to have a conversation about the post-conflict stabilization. And we

had to have that conversation. That was led by Germany and I thought it was apropos that it would be our European partners in the aftermath of the success of the Marshall Plan that they would see that in this war upon this abomination, this terrorist abomination, that we needed at the very beginning of the process to being to think about how we would rescue the liberated populations, stabilize them, and set the conditions for humanitarian relieve and post-conflict development.

Now, that's when we get it right. That's how we get it right.

The reality, of course, is that in all of these environments there are going to be three components that we have to think about. We have to think about these and the strategic leaders have to have these uppermost in their minds. And that is what the post-conflict governance will look like, power-sharing in some form or another; how we will, in fact, set the conditions with security so the population feels secure and can feasibly receive the assistance that will come in the post-conflict period; and then how that development will work.

Those three things have to exist in a relationship. They are symbiotically related to each other. And on those occasions when we have not given full and complete consideration to those three characteristics in the stabilization period, in the post-conflict period, that's when we typically fail. Afghanistan is a perfect example of that.

We went from roughly 150,000 troops to 9,500 troops on a downward slope of 2 years to be completely out of Afghanistan after being there for over 10 years, spending $100 billion a year on that process. You simply cannot have an expectation to win the peace after you've fought the war if you haven't given consideration for how the relationship of long-term governance, economic development, and security assistance will be interrelated, inextricably related, over the long period of time to achieve the development goals that we have to achieve.

We're still learning those lessons and we shouldn't have to be learning those lessons. They were taught to us well in the post-World War II period. The whole idea of NATO with the Marshall Plan integrated Europe in a way that we could never have imagined it would unfold. And it's a tribute not just to the Plan, but to the Europeans and the American support. But we're still learning that lesson and it has to be the earliest part of our thinking in the conflicts that we contemplate in the future.

MR. GREEN: If I can, Tony.

MR. PIPA: Yeah, go ahead, Mark.

MR. GREEN: So a couple of thoughts. First off, the challenges that we're taking on today, and CARE is our partner in taking many of these on, are extraordinarily complex. You know, I look at the humanitarian challenges that we're facing and they're almost all manmade and they almost all have enormous challenges of governance.

And I was just noting here, you think about South Sudan and you think about Venezuela and DRC, just to name three, and what makes it particularly challenging for the approach that we want to take is that we have governing partners who don't really care. And that's one of the big challenges and one of the major differences from what we saw in the post-war era. So we have in these countries leaders who don't really want to undertake any of the reforms that we all believe are crucial, and so it's a fundamental problem for us. It's a significant challenge.

You know, Tidewater, Chatham House Rules, but it is something that we've been talking about. Because obviously, it affects our ability as donor nations and as development agencies to be able to meet some of the objectives that our citizens want us to meet.

On the flip side, the positive side, a major difference from those days, we

have many more partners. There are many more donors. This is not the U.S. and everybody else. This is instead a close-knit group that is absolutely dedicated to mobilizing compassion and lifting lives and building communities.

So the challenges are more complicated. They're daunting and, in many cases, there's no clear end in sight. But also, the community of donors is greater than ever before, so many countries that are proud of the Marshall Plan and looking to take it and apply what they've learned and the benefits that they've received and apply them to the challenges of today.

MR. PIPA: John, you have something?

GENERAL ALLEN: Yeah, I just want to add what Mark said so well. He said it earlier, that there was a strategic value to the Marshall Plan. One of the reasons -- or one of the imperatives of the U.S. role in this world in this area is not just about the strategic value of the legacy of the Marshall Plan, but that the United States must lead with strategic values. We must lead with strategic values.

And I've looked a president in the face and said we're not going to do that because that's not consistent with American values. This is an overseas president. (Laughter) But those values that we stand for when we seek to influence the development of a country or to have it crawl out of the darkness of a conflict or to address a disaster or humanitarian crisis, those values that we stand for, which is non-corrupt governance, respect for human rights, the rule of law, we're not imposing that necessarily, but we've got to stand for those as we go about doing it.

And in particular, with regard to Michelle's point, increasingly this government, the United States government, has got to put emphasis on the rights of women. And I've had this conversation overseas with leaders that say you will never, ever crawl out of the darkness of a conflict environment or a post-conflict environment if

you don't bring in one-half of your population into the mainstream of development. They are going to be the strength of your economy in the future and the strength of your governance. The development and assistance to women for education purposes and economic development is absolutely essential.

So it's strategic value, but it is strategic values that makes the United States uniquely capable of influencing the world in this regard.

MR. PIPA: That's great. And, Michelle, your organization's really founded on those strategic values and that compassion, as well.

So before we turn to the audience, I want to ask each of you to comment on sort of the public support for U.S. aid and our leadership. Because as I mentioned in my opening, I feel like the Marshall Plan is one of the most widely recognized U.S. foreign policy successes by the U.S. public. I mean, it's just sort of part of our DNA. We all think about it growing up. And the American people, especially through the scale of their donations to organizations like CARE, are some of the most generous in the world.

Yet, over the past 20 years, when we ask the American public they've consistently shown low awareness for what amount we're actually really spending on these issues in developing countries overseas. And then when they're corrected they say, well, we might want to even moderate that some more. At the same time, they also really support issues like addressing issues of health and hunger, humanitarian response, education. It obviously animates and is a part of who we are as a people.

So how do we reconcile that and how do we take the lessons from the Marshall Plan to think about how we strengthen that support? And it was even mentioned, I think, in some of the opening remarks, at the very beginning there wasn't much public support for the Plan itself. And yet, that came around. And now I think we think in very positive terms about the Plan. So it would be great to ruminate on this a bit

and hear your perspectives.

MS. NUNN: So I think this is so essential for us at this juncture and I think there's a variety of dimensions to this. One is if you think about who the champions for the Marshall Plan were, it was pretty extraordinary. Right? You had bipartisan support from Congress, an extraordinary Republican paired with a Democratic administration, paired with military leaders, paired with diplomacy, paired with the business community who stepped in to actually help administer this.

And then I do think one of the things that's important is you've laid the groundwork. You invited the American public in to participation. You didn't say this is something for your government to do only. There had been a call to action to millions of Americans to participate in CARE packages. And so I think people have to be brought in and invited in to participate.

I also think that one of the things that was extraordinary about the Marshall Plan, obviously, is it was successful. There was no doubt that over a few years you could start to see the success of it. For a CARE package, when you made your $15 contribution you got within 4 months the delivery receipt that said this is -- I mean, this is post-World War II Europe. Like how did they do this? This is without Amazon. (Laughter) This is without technology of the kind that we have. And so they had a sense of, again, efficacy and agency.

If you ask people today has poverty been decreased in the last 25 years, the majority of the people would say no. And so people don't necessarily even know the good stories that we have.

And I think people also think, well, what is our modern day -- what is the Marshall Plan? Is it Afghanistan and Iraq where we've spent literally hundreds of billions of dollars and people don't necessarily see the story of change? So I think this invitation

into participation, the champions that we pull in holistically, and then also telling a story of why it matters and the difference that it can and will make and is making.

MR. PIPA: Thanks. Administrator, what would you add to that?

MR. GREEN: So I served, as Tony mentioned, eight years in the House of Representatives from a district that's a conservative district, not always known for -- Joe McCarthy is from Appleton, Wisconsin, my old district -- not always known for internationalism. (Laughter) And when I would go around the district, people would come up to me and say, oh, I hate foreign assistance. I'd say, okay, well, how do you feel about delivering lifesaving ARVs to people who are HIV positive? Well, I support that, I just hate foreign assistance. (Laughter)

When you start actually laying out what it is that we do and they support every piece of it, they just don't like foreign assistance. And so the failure is our responsibility. We do a terrible job in describing what it is that we actually do.

I think, secondly, when you look at trusted voices, it's the military and it's our men and women in uniform. And when they come forward and say, hey, look, this is actually in our national security interest, this is about solidifying victory, this is about stabilizing fragile areas, the numbers go way up. When they realize that this isn't simply -- as important as compassion is, it isn't simply about compassion. This is also, again, about our strategic interests. This is about solidifying the gains that have been won the hard way by countless men and women in uniform in far-off lands. And I think we don't talk about that enough.

Then finally, just to build on what Michelle was saying, the other thing that we need to do that CARE does so well is make this person-to-person. So people don't like broad terms. They don't like foreign assistance. They don't like these sort of amorphous concepts. But when you realize or when you talk about the individual lives

that we're lifting -- girls who are going to school who were not; girls who are having access their dreams in many ways, entrepreneurial opportunities -- everybody says, yeah, I'm in for that. So I really look at it as our failure. We just don't do a very good job.

And the final point, I do think that there is a fatigue these days with the number of conflicts that we have around the world, the humanitarian challenges which seem to only grow by the day. And so that's why you hear us at USAID talking about this sense of helping countries rise to eventually lead themselves. Because I think when the American people realize that this is what we all believe in, a hand up and not a hand out, that this is meant to be not forever, but instead lifting people who have fallen on hard times, who have been victimized, I think that also changes the dynamic of it. And I don't think we talk about that enough.

MR. PIPA: Okay, great. John, do you have anything to add do this?

GENERAL ALLEN: Yeah, just I'm worried about this time in American history. You know, we have an administration that made it clear from the day of the inauguration that we were not going to impose our standards on other -- or our values on other countries. And I really believe in the strategic values of the United States as being perhaps for many of the people of the world and many of the fragile states in the world the last best hope for their rescue. And we have to stand up for those.

And when we cut back the budget of the State Department and we cut the budget of the USAID, when we vilify publicly that foreign assistance is, in fact, a giveaway program, all of those things in confluence or in the accumulation work to our detriment. As Mark said, as Michelle said, this is about communications. We have to communicate that this is not just good for America, it's good for humankind.

The strength of the United States is not 10 carrier strike groups. The strength of the United States is in the values that we can project. It's in our diplomats

every single day that are in our embassies that represent the United States of America. It's in our aid and development workers, who are risking their lives every single day out in those developing countries trying to make a difference in their lives.

We've got to tell that story and we've got to stand up for the values of the United States. And there can be no ambiguity in the minds of the people around the world about what we stand for and what we are prepared to do to help humankind. And as long as we're able to tell that story, I think that we have a prospect of being successful in these areas.

MR. PIPA: Okay, thank you. (Applause) So I'd like to turn to the audience now for some questions. So a few requests. Please introduce yourself. Wait for the microphone because we're being webcast. And so that we can maximize the time, please be short. And one question per speaker and remember that a question ends with a question mark. (Laughter)

So we've got right here.

MR. VON SCHIRACH: Thank you very much. Great presentation, great summary of a great historic moment. My name is Paolo von Schirach. I'm the president of the Global Policy Institute here in Washington, D.C., and a practitioner in development for about 20 years in sub-Saharan Africa mostly, including Tanzania.

You, Administrator Green, you talked in your introductory remarks about our own strategic vision to try to marry values, implementation of good governance, and foreign aid packages, which is a great idea. But also you mentioned China and the alternative vision that the Chinese have or maybe no vision perhaps, which is sort of transactional and easy money and whatever.

I'm sure you know very well that the sheer size and the magnitude of this type of investments that China undertakes mostly in Africa, but in other countries, as well,

and the United States is sort of retreating, it seems to me, closing missions and doing less rather than more. And therefore, China is providing its own, unfortunately, as President Allen just said, its own strategic vision. Be with us, do what we do, and you'll be fine, no conditionalities, no questions asked, take the money, including whatever we give under the table to the minister and his cousin and his friends. And this is becoming sort of the new coin of the realm in terms of this new model of development assistance.

So my question to you is what can we do about it? I know it's also a question of resources. China is pouring hundreds of billions of dollars, including sending its own population. China is colonizing Africa in a certain sense. I'm not sure what the game plan is there, but this combination of efforts, Confucius Institutes, you know, language training, political influence, and indeed investments so that one recognizes all the Chinese-built ministries in Africa because they're all kind of made by the same people.

So what is your strategic alternative to all this? Thank you.

MR. GREEN: Well, for one thing, as you were posing the question I couldn't help but reflect upon our offices at USAID. So the administrator's conference room -- I don't know why they call it the administrator's conference room, it's everybody's conference room, I'm actually rarely in there -- however, it's called the Point 4 Room. Point 4 because of the fourth point in Harry Truman's inaugural address, which comes from the Marshall Plan. And Marshall's point was that the great strength that the U.S. had and the assistance it was providing wasn't actually the money, as important as it was. It was the sharing of technical know-how, the expertise that we had, the entrepreneurial capacity that we had, and applying that to the challenges that we saw around the world.

Marshall said basically, you know, look, dollars are limited by definition.

Knowledge is not. Knowledge, values, principles in action, they're unlimited. And I think that's what we need to make clear, that we export, that we bring to these challenges.

My experience in Africa, in the places where I have lived and the countries that I visited, good leaders understand the bargain. They understand the deal. And they understand the consequences that they get with the easy money that comes from the Chinese model. In most cases they take it. I would say, first off, undemocratic leaders take it for immediate benefit and gain. But others take it because, quite frankly, we, the U.S. in this case, both public sector and private sector, we're not there.

And so I think a big -- because we hear it over and over again, a big part of this is also mobilizing the entrepreneurship, the strength of the American private sector, and applying that to the challenges that we see because that really is what countries are looking for. Again, you'll get some leaders who are most interested in that rather odd-looking building that gets plopped in the middle of the country because they can do it immediately and point to it. But good leaders are looking for something more, and I think it's up to us to help provide it because we can help shape it and that's really what I think we bring to it.

And that is the fourth point of Marshall. And, again, I would argue that's the lasting legacy of the Marshall Plan is this sense of mobilizing what we believe in America has made America a special place, applying that and allowing other countries to aspire to greatness and aspire to rising.

MR. PIPA: Great. Alexia?

MS. LATORTUE: Good afternoon. My name is Alexia Latortue. I'm with the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development whose genesis is another fine example of cross-Atlantic collaboration, this time 1991 Europe post the fall of the Berlin Wall.

So my question is for Michelle and it's a "how" question. How, with regards to your three lessons learned, how do we better bring in the American public? How do we build the coalitions, the partnerships that are needed? And how do we communicate about the successes we are having?

Important panel at an important time in our history. Thank you.

MS. NUNN: Oh, I wish I had the answer for all for that. (Laughter)

GENERAL ALLEN: Ouch.

MR. PIPA: Go, Michelle.

MS. NUNN: I do think -- so on how do we invite the American public in, I think it is up to a combination of civil society, but also our political leadership to invite the American public into greatness in the manifestation of our nation as a humanitarian leader and as a generous nation.

But specifically, I actually do think, and we're spending a lot of time on this, so if anybody has any great ideas, for instance, that we need to think about what's the next generation of a CARE package? Right now already there are community health workers in Zambia that can deliver extraordinary services to hundreds of families and we know that they're doing it. We can look at that digitally. Why can't we connect people so that they are able to specifically focus on and give money to that community health worker, to sponsor them for a year? Or an educational voucher in Jordan for a Syrian girl or a Syrian boy, how can we invite the American public in? It's not going to be the economic answer to all of the needs that we have in the world, but it is a dimension of solidarity and connection that invites us in.

In terms of the coalitions and collaborations, I do think that building -- the USGLC does a great job of this. I do think that Mark's right and we can see it here in evidence when General Allen talks about this and its importance, it has a different weight

when it comes from not just practitioners, but the military. I think, also, the private sector, a lot of corporate partners that care, we're starting to bring our corporate partners and CEOs to the Hill to have this conversation about how important this is for America's long-term economic security.

And I do think we also need to think about what are the ways -- if we have a vacuum in political leadership, who's going to fill it? Michael Bloomberg and a group of mayors have stood up around climate change. Who's going to stand up around women and girls, for instance, if we're not hearing that emanate from the top of the pyramid in terms of America's leadership? And so I think it's incumbent upon all of us to help answer the "how."

MR. GREEN: One thing that I think is important to point. So, you know, we have to be careful when we talk about American leadership not to restrict ourselves here. America is a country that is known for the energy and vibrancy in its private sector.

I was struck a couple of weeks ago, an old friend of mine who leads a major faith-based organization came to me. It was on the calendar and I thought, okay, he's going to come and he's going to ask for money, USAID. Right? That's going to be the request. And he said, look, 80 percent of my funding comes from congregations all around this country. We want to see how we can help you achieve your goals.

And so when we talk about the contributions that are made, it's a lot more than simply what the line items are, as important as they are. We do see congregations, we do see parishes, we do see synagogues all around this nation that are engaged, that have adopted counterparts around the world, extraordinarily generous. The American taxpayer, the American family are wonderfully generous and they do care.

So we need to be careful when we think about America's role in the world or what Americans do. I think there's remarkable compassion and I think it's

mobilized all the time in ways that are large, but, more significantly, in ways that we don't really see necessarily or focus on.

MR. PIPA: Yeah, but picking up on some of those themes, to Michelle's point, we're not using necessarily the platforms that we have today to be able to reach those and make those connections. And it may even challenge our existing institutions like USAID and government institutions to be able to engage in those types of partnerships more easily and build and sort of harness that entrepreneurialism and that leadership, as well.

MR. GREEN: Yeah, PEPFAR was a wonderful example of doing just that. One of the reasons that the AIDS Initiative, President Bush's AIDS Initiative, which had enormous bipartisan support and really was a wonderful expression of mobilized compassion, one of the reasons it was so successful is because the framers realized, President Bush realized the only way that you could get there, the only way that you could touch those communities around the world is if you didn't wait around for USAID to establish offices everywhere. But if you tapped into the work already being done and some of the voices and some of the leaders in communities all around the world.

And so, you know, really shame on us. I think we really do need to tap into that, harness it, partner with it better than we have, and that's something that we do talk about in the Trump administration. We really are trying to mobilize those voices and leaders. And at USAID, obviously, like many other parts of the U.S. Government, we have a faith-based office and we're trying to work closely to see how we can align and we can tap into the networks that they already have in play.

So it's important. We will never have enough money to satisfy all of the needs and crises that are out there. We all know that. That's always been the case and that's particularly true these days with the humanitarian crises. The world is on fire in so

many parts of the world. But we can optimize the resources that we do have, and that's something that, again, once of the reasons that we partner so closely with CARE is to make those dollars go further than they can without CARE.

CARE has a network. CARE is a trusted voice, a trusted brand in so many parts of the world. So in some cases the answer for us is to mobilize resources to CARE and utilize those networks. So that's something that we are doing, perhaps not as much as we should or as well as we need to, but it is, I think, the American spirit at work.

MR. PIPA: Let's go right here. Yeah.

MS. SAJAIA: Hi, I'm Nana Sajaia from the Voice of America Georgian Service. My question would be to President Allen.

Seventy years ago when the Marshall Plan was introduced it played a huge role in shaping Europe as we know it or as we've known it till very recently. But 10 years ago, in August 2008, when Russian tanks rolled through Georgia and later on, in 2014, when Russia occupied -- annexed Crimea, 2008 was the first time when borders in Europe changed violently by using military force. Does that bring us to a need of a Marshall Plan 2.0 or some new sort of a plan regarding Europe? Thank you.

GENERAL ALLEN: Well, I think I was Central Command when the Russians rolled on Georgia, and I don't remember where I was when Ukraine was violated. Yes, it does, and the wake-up call for Europe was enormous. And the wake-up call for NATO was enormous to see that in the 21st century a despot and an aggressive revanchist political entity would be willing to change the borders of two sovereign countries by force.

I think what's important to understand is that we still have not -- I think we'll see this reinforced again at the NATO Summit coming up shortly -- we have not closed the door ultimately to NATO membership for Georgia or Ukraine. That open door

is going to continue. The conditions within both of those countries have yet to be achieved ultimately to become NATO members. But we should continue to extend our assistance to Georgia. We should continue to extend our assistance to the Ukraine.

And we should make it very clear that with regard to NATO, the 29 partner nations of NATO, that we will not tolerate any aggression against the NATO states. Whether we'd be willing ultimately to take military action vis-à-vis Russian incursions either into Georgia or Ukraine is a different subject. But we have, in fact, reached out to help the Georgians and we have, in fact, reached out to help the Ukrainians to defend themselves. And I think that's the right thing to do both as a nation, but it's the right thing to do as a coalition under the NATO flag and we should continue to do that.

MR. GREEN: I'll just add a quick point. Under President Trump's leadership we have a major countering Kremlin initiative that we have at USAID and are mobilizing to push back against some of the propaganda that we're seeing. But most significantly, I think the best way to push back is to have success in the region and free nations. So that's one of the reasons that we all partner so closely in Ukraine because success, vibrancy, growth in Ukraine -- and I'm talking not about the military side, the civilian side -- is the best way to check the aggressions coming from Moscow.

And again, that's very much in the spirit of what we saw on the opening video. It's building vibrancy in free nations, helping them to rise, helping them to take care of their people, that's the way it seems to me that you check aggression.

GENERAL ALLEN: Let me make a quick point is we need another panel on this. (Laughter) And that's about the Russian interference in European governance, and Mark could not be more correct. But the whole issue of the Russian strategic influence operation being conducted in Europe and against the United States is

something we have to push back in a very, very strong way. It has created nativist politics. It has created a drift to the right in the number of our NATO partners and EU members. And we have to watch this very, very carefully because the strength of Western Europe, the strength of the transatlantic alliance comes from our shared values and the coherence that we all have by sharing those values. And when we see those values eroding, when we see autocrats begin to emerge in those states that are members of the EU or members of NATO, we all have to be worried about that.

MR. PIPA: I think we have time for one last question right question right here in the front.

MR. BERG: Thank you. Bob Berg, Stimson Center. Administrator Green, every think tank in town is holding meetings about legacy countries and what's going on. We had one just this morning. Excellent work going on, nuanced, careful. But one issue that we weren't able to get much headway on, which I think you probably get a better sense from Tidewater, is whether in the transit from partnership to donor we are going alone or whether there's going to be a community of countries that make assessments about when is the time to transit from aid.

MR. GREEN: So thanks for the question. In our framework and the way that we look at the work that we do, it's not transiting in the sense of exiting. It's instead moving to a new relationship, the kind of relationship most often these countries themselves are looking for.

Classic case is India. So not so very long ago we provided food aid, handouts in India. And today we're helping them to catalyze private investment. We're helping them to test technologies and scale them up, so it's a different relationship. It is not the traditional relationship from 20 or 30 years ago. I would argue it's a much more exciting relationship. And so what we look to do is to help countries build their own

institutions, build their capacities, walk on that journey with them. And at the point in the relationship where they have reached a certain level of self-reliance is to talk about them, about what the future could look like. You know, how can we help them rise and aspire and reach those aspirations?

And so it's not leaving, it's not turning off the lights. It's instead building further donors, building that community that can help to lift lives and take on some of the strategic challenges that we're talking about.

MR. PIPA: Well, we're almost out of time and I want to give everyone a chance to sort of offer a few final reflections. We have covered a lot of ground and, Michelle, I'll start with you. You had some key points of taking us back to the principles from the Marshall Plan. But what would you say after -- especially where we are right here when we're talking about transition and we're also talking about a world that's very different, even a reconstruction, even the way in which we think about reconstruction and development, and that's very different, your final thoughts.

MS. NUNN: I think we can use the Marshall Plan as an inflexion point to both take forward what are the lessons learned that worked and also as a point of inspiration for reimagining a set of institutions that need to be prepared to deal with the challenges of today, which are different and which we have not yet re-architected in many instances for the future.

And so we talked about the fact that, you know, within a decade-plus we will see that 80 percent of extreme poverty is in fragile states and yet we don't necessarily know how to be effective in alleviating that poverty in fragile states and in places of manmade conflict. And so I think we need to use this as a challenge.

And then I would just close by maybe I started with a little bit of the story of CARE, of one of the privileges of my job is that I get to meet people who were

recipients of CARE packages around the world over time. And one of my favorites was a young German woman who was at that age at the end of World War II was eight years old. And described living in a mound of hay and having literally straw shoes that she was wearing, with nothing to eat and no heat. And what appeared to her as almost like a gift from heaven in her words was a CARE package, and it had nutrients and it had chocolate bars. And she as a German, who had been told that America when they occupied would kill her family, believed that America was the greatest nation on Earth. And she made it her mission to come to America and she's now an American citizen who's been supporting CARE for 50+ years.

And so, you know, Henry Kissinger wrote an article about the Marshall Plan in which he said despite the focus on the economics, perhaps the most extraordinary thing was the political transformation that it enabled and almost, and this is Henry Kissinger saying, the spiritual legacy of the Marshall Plan. And so as we think about the Marshall Plan that's a touchstone that I think that we need to think about as practitioners and that we need to think about as, hopefully, leaders and architects for the future and the long-term future.

MR. PIPA: Well, thank you. That's inspirational.

General Allen, we talked a lot about the intersection with conflict as well as the high degree of trust that the American people have in the military, and some final reflections from you on these lessons.

GENERAL ALLEN: Well, first, it's been great to share this panel with an intersection of great leaders and great organizations, and I want to thank them both for being here today.

You know, we sometimes hear the term Marshall Plan almost used as a verb. You've got a problem, let's Marshall Plan it. (Laughter) And what we're saying is

that the effect of the Marshall Plan, to Michelle's point, has been so profound that it means several things. For us it means that it's ends, ways, and means. The ends of the Marshall Plan was what you see in Europe today and a transatlantic relationship that is second to known. And it's precious to us. We must preserve it at all costs because we are, in fact, the last great confluence of values that will keep us on the straight and narrow, number one.

Number two, there was a political consensus in the United States around the Marshall Plan. It was difficult to build, but eventually it created a political consensus around the Marshall Plan. That has sustained us now for the better part of a century. Multiple administrations, multiple political environments, yet the strategic vision and the components of the Marshall Plan were so compelling and so strategically logical that we were able to achieve this by virtue of the value and the importance of the planning.

So when we talk about Marshall Planning this problem, I think what we're looking for is an outcome where humankind is lifted up, but a process that delivers us to that point which creates political coherence, which creates sustainable outcomes, and, as I said in my earliest remarks today, it's not possible to overstate how important the Marshall Plan was not just to the United States, not just to Europe, but the legacy of the Marshall Plan to humankind at a moment right now when so much is in doubt. It remains the shining example of what can be done when we all decide to do it right.

MR. PIPA: That's wonderful and inspiration. And again, paying dividends from thinking 25 to 50 years ahead.

GENERAL ALLEN: That's right. That's very hard to do in a democratic system, but the Marshall Plan did it.

MR. PIPA: Administrator Green, I'll let you have the last word.

MR. GREEN: So I agree with what you've just heard. The only thing I'll

add, when I was leading the International Republican Institute one of our board members was General Scowcroft. And we were talking about some of the great anniversaries that we were celebrating at that time, the Year of Poland Free Speech. And he came in to see me at IRI and his message was simple. He said, you know, everybody thinks I was easy. It wasn't easy. It was in doubt.

And I always reflect upon that because we look here and we gather and we think this was all easy, and it wasn't. And naturally, what gives me faith with the wide range of challenges that we face, we've faced tough challenges before. So if we just mobilize that spirit, it's not going to be easy and we shouldn't think it will be, but we've had tough challenges before and we'll be just fine.

MR. PIPA: So that's an invitation for all of us to participate, in Michelle's words. And I want to thank all of you for taking us on a journey both to reflect on what was uncertain in that time and became more certain as time went by, and then what that means for us in the future. And I know I will take away from this thinking to challenge myself to be thinking 25, 50, and 100 years ahead.

But it's been a rich discussion. You've been very generous in your thoughts and reflections and remarks. Thank you for going on this journey with me.

And thank you for welcoming this conversation. (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.

Carleton J. Anderson, III

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2020