

Media Coverage of “Development in the 21st Century”

The Washington Post

The New York Times

 **REUTERS**

 **canada.com**

 **CNN** 

 **FP**
Foreign Policy®

 **ClimateWire**
THE POLITICS AND BUSINESS OF CLIMATE CHANGE

 The **TAKEAWAY**
with Nicholas Kristof
and
PRI 

G-SPAN.ORG

Created by Cable. Offered as a Public Service.

On the Ground

Nicholas D. Kristof

THE US



DAILY

 **n p r**

The **CHRISTIAN SCIENCE**
MONITOR



RADIO
NEDERLAND
WERELDOMROEP

THE TIMES OF INDIA

C-SPAN.ORG

Created by Cable. Offered as a Public Service.

Secretary of State Hillary Clinton on Foreign Policy

1/6/2006



Clinton Ties U.S. Security to Better Aid Delivery

Andrew Quinn, 1/6/10

This article also appeared in the [Washington Post](#), [The New York Times](#), [The U.S. Daily](#), and [Canwest](#).

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - U.S. security depends on a new approach to international aid, so Washington must consult more and dictate less as it dispenses billions of dollars in assistance, U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said on Wednesday.

"In the past we have sometimes dictated solutions from afar, often missing our mark on the ground," Clinton said in a speech. "Our new approach is to work in partnership with developing countries."

Clinton's speech at a Washington think-tank marked the Obama administration's latest effort to persuade the U.S. public that development aid is a foreign policy tool as important as defense and diplomacy.

But while the U.S. remains the world's largest individual aid donor -- with almost \$27 billion disbursed in 2008 -- critics worry the administration may be slow to follow through on promises to boost funding and improve work at the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), the main U.S. government aid organization.

Security moved back to the top Washington's agenda this week as President Barack Obama came under political fire after a failed Christmas Day bomb attack on a U.S.-bound airliner and new al Qaeda threats against U.S. interests in Yemen.

Clinton said aid efforts in places such as Afghanistan and Yemen -- where she conceded the odds of success were long -- were critical components of security strategy.

"We cannot stop terrorism or defeat the ideologies of violent extremism when hundreds of millions of young people see a future with no jobs, no hope, and no way ever to catch up to the developed world," she said.

MORAL IMPERATIVE

Both Clinton and Obama have in recent months sketched out new priorities for U.S. foreign policy, including a pragmatic approach to human rights in countries such as China and Obama's defense of "just wars" in his acceptance speech for the Nobel Peace Prize in December.

But Clinton left no doubt on Wednesday that international assistance -- and a new, higher profile for USAID under newly appointed administrator Rajiv Shah -- would be central to Washington's new approach.

"Development was once the province of humanitarians, charities, and governments looking to gain allies in global struggles. Today it is a strategic, economic, and moral imperative," she said.

Clinton said the United States would put new emphasis on partnership, coordination with other aid donors and focus on key areas such as health, agriculture, security, education and governance in hopes of maximizing returns.

U.S. aid programs will also focus on programs to assist women and girls -- a key area of interest for Clinton, who lost her bid in 2008 to become the first woman elected president of the United States.

"Women and girls are one of the world's greatest untapped resources and a terrific return on investment," Clinton said, noting that in many communities women take the lead in growing food, caring for the sick and raising the next generation.



[Clinton: Aid Agency Central To U.S. Foreign Policy](#)

Michele Kelemen, 1/7/2010

Secretary of State Hillary Clinton swears in a new administrator for the U.S. Agency for International Development Thursday. However, Rajiv Shah's job description is still up in the air. The Obama administration and members of Congress are reviewing U.S. aid programs, and some complain that USAID has been weakened by cut backs, and is now incapable of doing the kind of work that is needed in places like Pakistan and Afghanistan.

On the Ground

Nicholas D. Kristof

[Hillary Clinton on Development Issues](#)

By NICHOLAS KRISTOF, 1/6/10

*Sec. Clinton gave **an excellent speech** on development today. She has a longtime interest in poverty issues, and President Obama's mother was a pioneer in microfinance, yet so far the Obama administration hasn't been particularly engaged in global poverty issues. It took forever, after all, to get an administrator for USAID, the aid agency. In contrast, President Bush never seemed very interested in global poverty, but he left a quite impressive legacy there — with PEPFAR, the AIDS effort; the President's Malaria Initiative; and his Millennium Challenge Corporation directing aid to countries with good governance.*

So I hope Clinton's speech, which hit all the right notes but didn't unveil any specific new initiatives, marks an increased focus on these issues. One crucial point: Clinton emphasized, rightly, that development is a security issue. We fight terrorism not only by dropping bombs, but also by building schools. A couple of other points caught my eye:

—She emphasized measuring results, an approach that has gained ground recently in part because of the work of the Poverty Action Lab at MIT. Some people complain that results are difficult and expensive to measure, but I think this approach is yielding important new insights into what kind of interventions are most cost-effective.

—She talked about partnerships with local countries, and consulting them rather than dictating to them. It's generally agreed that one of the big mistakes we make in foreign aid is to march in and tell everybody what we're going to do, so a new emphasis on listening would be a good step forward.

—She focused on investments in women and girls, saying that women will be central to her development efforts. Not surprisingly, I think that's just right. You just get more bang for the buck when you focus on girls, as Clinton noted. And, more broadly, she talked about investments rather than just aid, which is also the right way to think about some initiatives.

Frankly, USAID is something of a mess, and has been for decades. It's bureaucratic, lacks focus and doesn't get respect at home or abroad. Let's hope that the Obama administration will turn that around. A lot of you readers work in the development field, so what do you think of the speech?



Development Aid Central to U.S. Interests: Clinton

WASHINGTON, Jan. 6 (Xinhua) -- U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said on Wednesday the United States achieves "best results" when development, diplomacy and defense are approached as a whole, signaling a change of tactics in U.S. diplomacy.

"The United States achieves the best results when we approach our foreign policy as an integrated whole, greater than the sum of its parts," Clinton said in a prepared speech in Washington, noting development is central to advancing U.S. interests and solving global problems.

She also said the administration is adopting a development model based on partnership, not patronage, pledging to work with developing countries and invest in evidence-based strategies with clear goals.

Clinton's message of bundling development and defense together came at a time when the country is grappled by a sudden surge of security concerns, after a failed terror attack on a U.S. airliner on Christmas Day, and threats against the U.S. embassy in Yemen, a country long neglected by U.S. development aid.

According to the Organization of Economic Cooperation, U.S. development aid to Yemen declined from 56.5 million U.S. dollars in 2000 to 25.5 million in 2008, during which period the terror network of al-Qaeda regrouped in the poverty-stricken country.

Prior to Clinton's speech, a senior U.S. official who declined to be named said the administration has to focus on areas where development results are needed "as part of our broader security strategy."

In places such as Yemen, the official said, the administration has to pursue security goals and development goals simultaneously, because "without development, you're never going to have security."

The White House announced on Monday that President Barack Obama has asked for a significant increase in foreign assistance to Yemen in fiscal year 2010. Development and security

aid to that country could be as much as 63 million dollars, representing a 56-percent increase over fiscal year 2009 and a 225-percent increase over fiscal year 2008 levels.



Yemeni official: Other Conflicts Diverted Focus from Al Qaeda

1/6/10

Sanaa, Yemen (CNN) -- Yemen's foreign minister says his government has not sufficiently focused on al Qaeda because it has turned its attention to insurgencies rocking the northern and southern regions there.

Yemeni Foreign Minister Abu Bakr Al-Qirbi told CNN's Christiane Amanpour in an interview Wednesday that "our fault was that we spared al Qaeda" because of other conflicts -- fighting Houthi rebels in the north and secessionists in the south.

He spoke to Amanpour from Yemen's capital, Sanaa.

Al-Qirbi also said **Yemen** isn't accepting direct U.S. intervention, despite reports that the United States made military strikes against Yemeni targets late last year, and he said his country's forces can conduct military action against al Qaeda.

He said that the United States has learned from its experiences in Afghanistan and Iraq that direct intervention can be self-defeating. But he emphasized that his country has welcomed help from the United States and other nations to bolster its equipment, intelligence, firepower and overall development.

Al-Qirbi said there are 200 to 300 al Qaeda members in Yemen, but he says events have proved that the country hasn't become the next Afghanistan, a reference to that country being a haven for al Qaeda when it was under Taliban control.

But he said that their activities are "obviously of concern to us" and that unless there is a concerted effort to exchange intelligence, "lapses" will occur like those that led to a failed Christmas Day terrorist attack on a U.S. passenger jet.

Meanwhile, Daniel Benjamin, the U.S. State Department's ambassador-at-large for counterterrorism, told Amanpour on Wednesday that the United States has not taken its attention off of Yemen. He said Washington has been focusing on the terrorist threat there since President Obama came into office.

Benjamin said that Yemen is not a failed state, though parts of it clearly are "undergoverned." But "the **al Qaeda** threat from Yemen is at a peak now," Benjamin said, and the United States is working "more effectively" with Yemeni authorities to curb it.

In a speech Wednesday, U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said there needs to be a "new mindset" in the "long-term endeavor" to help develop countries, including places like Yemen. Such work requires patience and "the courage to rethink our strategies if we're falling short," she said.

"We must also be honest that, in some situations, we will invest in places that are strategically critical but where we are not guaranteed success. In countries that are incubators of extremism, like Yemen, or are ravaged by poverty and natural disasters, like Haiti, the odds are long. But the cost of doing nothing is potentially far greater," she said, speaking at the Peterson Institute for International Economics in Washington.

Yemen fertile ground for terror groups

They made their remarks as Yemen's Interior Ministry kept up the heat on al Qaeda militants. Yemeni security forces arrested three al Qaeda suspects Wednesday along with four others believed to be sheltering them, the ministry said.

It was the latest action in what the ministry says is Yemen's fight against terrorism and al Qaeda -- a series of operations officials say resulted in the deaths and arrests of dozens of militants. The action comes after the failed plot to bomb the Northwest Airlines plane December 25 as it approached Detroit, Michigan -- a plot that has been linked to Yemeni extremists.

The arrests occurred in Amran province northwest of the capital, Sanaa, according to a statement published on the ministry's Web site.

The al Qaeda suspects were wounded and on the run after clashes with government troops Monday, when they were thought to be accompanying Mohammed Ahmed al-Haunq, an al Qaeda leader for the area, the ministry said.

Four others accused of helping the suspects were apprehended at a hospital, according to the ministry Web site, which described them as "al-Haunq security and relatives."

Yemen's state-run news agency, SABA, reported Monday that two al Qaeda suspects were killed and two others were injured in clashes with a Yemeni anti-terrorism unit.

The Yemeni government has referred to al-Haunq as the mastermind and leader of the group threatening to attack Western embassies in Yemen.

The United States closed its **embassy** in Sanaa on Sunday after intelligence suggested that four al Qaeda operatives might have been planning an attack on the compound, a senior Obama administration official said Monday.

The embassy reopened Tuesday, saying Monday's operation had addressed the threatened attack.

The British Embassy in Yemen also cited security concerns when it closed Sunday. It reopened Tuesday, but public services -- including consular and visa services -- remained suspended indefinitely.

Al-Qirbi and British Ambassador to Yemen Tim Torlo held discussions Wednesday, according to SABA. They talked about the arrangements for a conference on the Yemen situation. On December 25, Nigerian-born Umar Farouk AbdulMutallab allegedly tried to detonate explosives hidden in his underwear as the Northwest Airlines flight from Amsterdam, Netherlands, made its final approach to Detroit. The device failed to fully detonate, instead setting off a fire at the man's seat, and he was restrained by passengers and crew until the plane landed.

The Yemen-based al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula claimed responsibility for the Christmas Day plot, and Obama has linked the suspect to that group, which is a combination of al Qaeda networks in Saudi Arabia and Yemen.

AbdulMutallab, who faces federal charges of attempting to destroy an aircraft, is scheduled to make his first court appearance Friday.

Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula has said that the attempted attack on the airliner was in retaliation for airstrikes against it December 17 and 24. However, Yemen has said that AbdulMutallab purchased his ticket December 16.

The U.S. Embassy in Yemen has come under attack numerous times in recent years. In September 2008, 10 people were killed -- among them police and civilians, but no embassy employees -- when insurgents opened fire and set off explosions outside the compound.



[Hillary Clinton: Yemen Needs more Than Air Strikes and Diplomacy](#)

By Howard LaFranchi, 1/6/10

As it deals with the challenges presented by poor countries like Yemen, the United States aims to elevate development assistance to equal footing with the traditional foreign-policy tools of diplomacy and defense.

That is the message that Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton offered in a speech Wednesday, in which the nation's top diplomat explained a vision of strengthening American development work to further such national interests as spreading American values and enhancing US national security.

“We cannot stop terrorism or defeat ideologies of violence and extremism when hundreds of millions of young people see no hope” for improving their lives, Secretary Clinton said. Not just by more development work, she added, but by doing it better, relying more on partnerships with

benefiting countries, and leveraging government work with private-sector assistance, can progress be made in reducing the ranks of the world's poor.

Defense Secretary Gates agrees

Clinton's vision of a foreign policy where development "is as essential to solving global problems as diplomacy and defense" reflects Obama administration priorities. As Clinton noted in her speech, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates – a holdover from the Bush administration – is one of the administration's most forceful advocates of a robust civilian development effort to relieve some of the burdens that have gradually fallen on the Defense Department.

The speech, delivered at the Center for Global Development in Washington, came a day after the US embassy in Yemen reopened following a closure Sunday connected to Al Qaeda threats.

Clinton referred to Yemen as "an incubator of extremism" and said that even though "the odds are long" for achieving rapid progress with development assistance in such countries, "the costs of doing nothing are potentially far greater."

Clinton on Monday praised the Yemeni government's recent efforts to disrupt Al Qaeda-linked activities, but those words were met by calls from the Yemeni government for more international assistance to address the roots of extremism.

A spokesman for Yemen's ruling party said the government was up to the task of confronting extremists, but that it is up to the international community to promote "complete economic development to treat the sources of terrorism."

Transparency and efficiency essential

On the other hand, Clinton said a new focus on development must include demands for transparency and efficiency – two qualities that are likely to be hard to come by in countries like Yemen or Afghanistan, another development-stunted priority Clinton highlighted in her speech. Yemen is listed as the second-most corrupt Arab country (after Iraq) in a report last year by the monitoring group Transparency International.

Clinton cited success stories such as Ghana, Rwanda, and Tanzania, where she said smart development assistance is making a measurable impact. And she called on her own diplomats and private international development advocates to do more to explain to an American public that is hurting economically why America's international development assistance is in their interest.

Clinton's speech was mostly serious policy talk, including when she riffed on her personal commitment to promoting the role of women and girls in advancing development. But she elicited chuckles and applause when she reminded her audience of the old adage about teaching a man to fish so he can eat for the rest of his life, only to add, "If you teach a woman to fish, she'll feed the whole village."

POLITICO

[Previewing Clinton's Development Speech: Results Oriented, Transformational, Focused](#)

Laura Rozen, 1/5/09

State Department policy planning chief Anne-Marie Slaughter and new USAID administrator Raj Shah previewed Hillary Clinton's development speech today at the Center for Global Development.

Clinton will say "development was once the province of humanitarians, charities, and governments looking to gain allies in global struggles," Slaughter said on a conference call this morning. "Today, it is a strategic, economic, and moral imperative as central to advancing American interests and solving global problems as diplomacy or defense."

She "is going to emphasize the need to ensure that all of our development activities are accountable, transparent and results-oriented," Slaughter said. "The measure for success is not how many dollars we spend or how many programs we fund, but results in terms of actual evidence of development, progress and health and education, economic growth more broadly and the advancement of women."

Slaughter said the speech is being given in the context of two ongoing reviews of development policy: the Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review being conducted at AID and the State Department, co-chaired by Shah, Slaughter and Deputy Secretary Jack Lew; and a White House-led inter-agency review, the Presidential Study Directive on U.S. Global Development Policy, formulating development policy across the government. Slaughter said the two reviews are closely coordinated.

It is also being given in the context of Obama administration discussions about the importance of development in Yemen, Pakistan and Afghanistan, "war-torn areas where we desperately need to see better development results," Slaughter said.

"The principles outlined here are really all fundamentally about how do you get development outcomes," Shah, who was confirmed on Christmas Eve, said on the call. "How do you improve our ability to generate real results for the hundreds of millions of people we try to serve through our development programs, and do that in a way that is scalable, reaches very large numbers, [and] that is sustainable."

Shah cited people such as Mohammed Yunus, (founder of the Grameen Bank and winner of the Nobel Peace Prize for his work on micro-lending, mainly to women), Wangari Maathai and Jim Grant, "who led immunization campaigns around the world, and Norman Borlaug, the father of the Green Revolution, ... individuals that ... were, in fact, very much diplomats working with senior leaders around the world to secure buy-in and support and commitment toward the development goals."

Shah said the administration would emphasize focusing on development projects that have high impact, rather than trying to do everything.

One area of longtime commitment by Clinton has shown results — improving education and opportunities for women and girls. "We have a wealth of data and information that show that a dollar provided to a woman is more likely to be invested in child welfare, in education, in the health of a family and the sustainability of a community than otherwise," Shah said.

Shah — who served as Undersecretary for Research at the Department of Agriculture and headed several programs at the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation before coming to USAID — also mentioned looking to technological innovation — in agriculture, health and energy.

Clinton is due to speak at 1:30 pm at the Center for Global Development.



[Global Climate Funding Remains Undefined -- Clinton](#)

(Subscription required)

Lisa Friedman, 1/7/2010

America's contribution to \$100 billion in annual global climate change funding by 2020 may not be over and above existing foreign aid, Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton indicated yesterday.

The promised money -- which Clinton announced at the U.N. climate summit in Denmark last month and pledged the United States would take a lead role in mobilizing -- was a key element in the final global warming accord that world leaders approved.

Yet while the Copenhagen Accord, as it is known, calls for "scaled up, new and additional" money to help poor nations cope with climate change-provoked disasters, Clinton sidestepped the commitment when asked directly if the U.S. portion would be additional.

"We don't know yet, because we don't know what the Congress is going to do," Clinton told a crowd at the Center for Global Development.

The chaotic two-week summit ended Dec. 18 with nations acknowledging the U.S.-brokered accord calling for emission pledges from all major economies and a review system to ensure that promises are kept. The \$100 billion, which is expected to come from several private and public sources, will be delivered if the transparency commitments from other nations are met, Clinton said.

But she also noted that the State Department and others in the administration still are sorting out a range of post-Copenhagen funding issues.

"We are just beginning to work out how best to deliver on this commitment," she said. "We are just starting to figure out how we are going to implement this."

Clinton's comments came after a speech in which she outlined the State Department's development agenda for the coming year. With Rajiv Shah expected to be sworn in today as administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development, Clinton pledged to beef up staffing and expertise at the agency. She listed energy as one of six sectors in which the State Department plans to focus extra attention, but mentioned climate change policy only glancingly until asked about it specifically in a question-and-answer session.

Copenhagen pledge: a 'work in progress'

A number of people in the audience said afterward that the absence of climate policy in the speech was notable. But observers also acknowledged that the Copenhagen summit produced more questions than answers, and said Clinton's speech may simply have reflected that.

"It's a work in progress because Copenhagen was so recent and so difficult," said Harriet Babbitt, vice chairwoman of the World Resources Institute and former deputy administrator for USAID. "I'm confident of the president's commitment and of the secretary's commitment, and I'm hopeful they can put the pieces together."

Added Nancy Birdsall, founding president of the Center for Global Development, "I think it's still in an incipient stage." Climate funding, in particular, she said, still needs to be ironed out on a number of fronts, and "there's probably also a lot of sensitivity."

Developing nations have long argued that industrialized countries responsible for a long history of greenhouse gas emissions must help prevent the havoc that rising global temperatures are expected to wreak. But in doing so, they and development assistance advocates argue, wealthy countries should not raid existing aid for health, education or other important issues.

But the issue of any money at all going overseas for climate protection during an economic downturn is expected to be contentious. Republican lawmakers in the wake of Copenhagen severely criticized the \$100 billion in funding, though House Speaker Nancy Pelosi told reporters that Democrats are prepared to support the proposal.

Where the money will come from is another unanswered question. If Congress passes cap-and-trade legislation, experts say, the bulk of the money will likely flow through offsets and the allocation of emission allowances rather than through the appropriations process.

Clinton did say that most U.S. climate funds would likely be designated through USAID and the State and Treasury departments, though other agencies like the Energy and Agriculture departments also have significant climate programs.

She also made clear that major developing countries will have to assume greater responsibilities in funding development, presumably including climate change. She pointed specifically to China, Brazil and India as nations that have "a responsibility to support sustainable solutions."



[Clinton Says Development Aid 'Central Pillar' of US Foreign Policy](#)

David Gollust | 1/6/10

U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton speaks at Peterson Institute for International Economics in Washington, 06 Jan 2010

Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, in a Washington policy address Wednesday said the Obama administration intends to put development and foreign aid on the same level as diplomacy and military power in U.S. foreign policy. She also said empowering women around the world is not just a personal priority but a strategic interest of the United States.

Clinton, in office now for nearly a year, has spoken frequently about the need to upgrade and modernize the U.S. foreign aid program. But her speech at a Washington policy institute was the first devoted entirely to the subject and she said it is time to elevate development as a "central pillar" of foreign policy.

The Secretary, speaking at the Peterson Institute of International Economics, said the United States seeks a safer, more prosperous, more democratic and equitable world but it can't be assured of progress toward that goal as long as a third of mankind is mired in poverty.

"We cannot stop terrorism or defeat the ideologies of violent extremism when hundreds of millions of young people see a future with no jobs, no hope and no way ever to catch up to the developed world," said Hillary Clinton. "We cannot build a stable global economy when hundreds of millions of workers and families find themselves on the wrong side of globalization, cut off from markets and out of reach of modern technologies."

The Obama administration has already promised to double the non-military U.S. foreign aid budget to \$50 billion a year by 2012 and Clinton's speech offered no new commitments.

But she said the U.S. Agency for International Development, which in the process of doubling its overseas staff, must be rebuilt into the world's premier development agency. She also said the U.S. aid community must have the courage to rethink its strategies and must not simply add up the dollars spent, but assure that the programs achieve lasting change in recipient nations.

"In countries that are incubators of extremism like Yemen, or are ravaged by poverty and natural disasters like Haiti, the odds are long," she said. "But the cost of doing nothing is potentially far greater. We must accept that our development model cannot be formulaic, that which works in Pakistan may not work in Peru. So our approach must be case-by-case and country by country,

region-by-region."

Clinton paid tribute to two aid initiatives of the Bush administration - the Millennium Challenge Corporation - which makes grants to countries with concrete plans for good governance and fighting corruption, and PEPFAR - the anti HIV-AIDS program - which has provided millions of Africans and others with anti-viral medications while stressing AIDS prevention.

She also said the administration intends to better coordinate traditional aid programs with others aimed at boosting foreign trade and investment like AGOA, the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act.

And she said the United States is moving to put women at the "front and center" of U.S. development work, saying women and girls are one of the world's greatest untapped resources.

"This is not only a strategic interest of the United States, it is an issue of personal importance to me, and one I have worked on for almost four decades," Hillary Clinton. "I will not accept words without deeds when it comes to women's progress. I will hold our agencies accountable for ensuring that our government and our foreign policy support the world's woman and achieve lasting, meaningful progress on this issues."

The Secretary of State said she is working to integrate U.S. aid efforts more closely with diplomacy and defense operations abroad without politicizing aid programs - saying the "3-D's" - development, diplomacy and defense - must be mutually-reinforcing. She also said that advancing human rights is an "integral part" of the U.S. development agenda.



[New Head at USAID, New Efforts in International Development](#)

Later today, the government agency tasked with international development gets a new boss. Rajiv Shah, the new administrator for **USAID**, will begin with a mandate to fix an agency that has received a lot of criticism in the past few years. Yesterday, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton gave a speech at the **Center for Global Development** in which she described a new vision for the nation's international development efforts. We're joined by *New York Times* columnist **Nicholas Kristof** to talk about what this means for American efforts overseas.

[Listen to the show](#)

THE TIMES OF INDIA

[Hillary Clinton calls instability in Yemen a global threat](#)

1/5/10

WASHINGTON: Expressing concern over the situation in Yemen, US secretary of state Hillary Clinton on Monday said, the al-Qaida has gained ground and poses a threat to America's security.

"The situation in Yemen is a top concern," Clinton told reporters at Foggy Bottom headquarters of the state department in a joint media availability with Prime Minister of Qatar, Sheikh Hamad Bin Jassim Bin Jabr Al-Thani.

Clinton said the situation in Yemen seems to be getting worse and worse with more players involved now.

"It's time for the international community to make it clear to Yemen that there are expectations and conditions on our continuing support for the government so that they can take actions which will have a better chance to provide that peace and stability to the people of Yemen and the region," the secretary of state said.

Noting that the instability in Yemen is a threat to regional and even global stability, she said the US is working with Qatar and others to think of the best way forward to try to deal with the security concerns.

"We know that this is a difficult set of challenges, but they have to be addressed," she acknowledged.



[New US Approach to Development Aid](#)

United States Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has said that the country's security is dependent on the success of its development aid. The battle against terrorism will never be won as long as hundreds of millions of young people grow up without prospects of work and a better life, she stressed.

Ms Clinton argued for a new approach to development aid. In the past, the US frequently dictated what other countries should do from afar, a strategy doomed to fail, she said. The new US development aid should be based on equal partnership.

On taking office, Ms Clinton promised to make development aid one of the spearheads of US foreign policy. Her budget for this purpose in the coming year is nine percent more than in 2009.



[Tower of Babble](#)

Hillary Clinton's speech about development was not all bad, but it still contained plenty of nonsense and overly political thinking.

BY WILLIAM EASTERLY |1/ 6/010

Once upon a time, I believed in the theory that logic and evidence influenced public policy. After experience rudely contradicted this thesis, I switched to Theory No. 2: Political incentives cause public officials to say things inconsistent with logic and evidence -- babble.

These thoughts were prompted by Secretary of State Hilary Clinton's **speech today** on the U.S. government's new approach to economic development. It was not ALL babble. Among other things, she had some good ideas about soap. However, there was evidence in speech for Theory No. 2. Let's show some compassion for gifted individuals like Secretary Clinton, whom politics forces to babble.

Here are classic signs of babble, and the political incentives that cause them:

1. Announce in the speech that you are going to do one thing, and then spend the rest of the speech doing the opposite.

Babble: "The challenges we face are numerous. So we must be selective and strategic about where and how we get involved."

In the next sentence, this selective approach includes conflict, Afghanistan, Tanzania, poverty, human rights, community development, democracy, governance, global stability, U.S. security, U.S. values, and U.S. leadership.

A few more selective areas come up later: Yemen, Haiti, Pakistan, Peru, sound economic policies, natural resources, rule of law, inflation, girls' education, marginalized populations, AIDS, women, refugees, female genital mutilation, energy, improved seeds, food riots, health systems, mobile banking, solar-powered laptops, advance market commitments, Mexico, narco-violence, microcredit, conditional cash transfers, infant mortality, hunger, everywhere from the Democratic Republic of the Congo to Bangladesh to Costa Rica to South Africa to Vietnam and dozens of countries in between, hurricanes, earthquakes, famines, floods, tsunamis, Darfur. Did I mention the soap?

Political incentives: "Selective" specialization by country and issue is the best thing that any aid agency could do. But every country and issue has its interest group (often very good-hearted humanitarian ones). Politicians need to satisfy as many interest groups as possible, so they are NOT "selective." This problem has gotten **WORSE** in aid, not **better**.

2. Announce you are going to solve problems that have been insoluble for decades.

Babble:

Hillary R. Clinton, 2010: "[W]e are working to improve the coordination of all the development work taking place across Washington ... "engaging in partnerships with countries and organizations ... the U.N. Development Program ... private businesses."

Harry S. Truman, 1949: "This should be a cooperative enterprise in which all nations work together through the United Nations and its specialized agencies ... With the cooperation of business."

"Coordination" and "partnership" are the equivalent in foreign aid of U.N. resolutions for world peace. Every different national donor, U.S. government bureaucracy, or private business has its own agenda, will not voluntarily sacrifice its own interests for some other organization, and there are no binding contracts to enforce any such sacrifices.

Political incentives: Admitting that coordination problems are insoluble could point in a more fruitful direction (such as specializing more - see Sign No. 1 -- and then you won't have to coordinate!) . Unfortunately, admitting that coordination is impossible is more likely to make voters think the politician heading an organization is just self-serving and lazy.

3. Mention obvious tradeoffs, then deny their existence.

Babble: Secretary Clinton's big idea is the merger of the 3 Ds: development, diplomacy, and defense. These areas have nothing in common except for that nice poetic alliteration. Advancing a goal in one arena will at least **SOMETIMES** come at the expense of a different goal. The frequent contradiction between defense and development is obvious, despite much desperate rhetoric unlinked to evidence. For a less obvious example, what was good for diplomacy was for President Obama on Christmas Eve to punish the nondemocratic government of Madagascar by taking away trade access to U.S. markets. This same action was terrible for development -- killing hundreds of thousand of Malagasy jobs made possible by textile exports to the United States under the African Growth and Opportunity Act (mentioned as a success story by Clinton).

Political incentives: Some voters care more about defense, others about development, a few nerds about diplomacy. Get all the voters by telling the different groups that their different goals are consistent! Hope they don't read **blogs about Madagascar**.

4. When you say "THAT is not what we will do," you mean it except for the "not."

Babble: "There is a concern **THAT** integrating development means diluting it or politicizing it -- giving up our long-term development goals to achieve short-term objectives or handing over more of the work of development to our diplomats or defense experts. **THAT** is not what we will do."

Political incentives: **THAT** already happened. The war on terror is a much higher priority with U.S. voters than development; so development has become subordinate to that war (see Sign No. 3's discussion of tradeoffs).

What to do about the strong political incentives to babble? Maybe a good politician like Secretary Clinton can babble and do occasional good things at the same time. Like maybe occasionally specialize a bit more in something that's working -- say, a few more resources for programs like that hand-washing program in India that prevented the spread of disease? You know, the one involving soap?



Development in the 21st Century

The prepared text of U.S. of Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton's speech, delivered to the Center for Global Development in Washington, D.C.

JANUARY 6, 2010

I would like to start today with a story about America that often goes untold. It's the story of what can happen around the world when American know-how, American dollars, and American values are put to work to change people's lives.

Like many of you, I have seen the transformative power of development and the passion and commitment of aid workers who devote their careers to this difficult work. I have seen it in a village in Indonesia, where new mothers and their infants received nutritional and medical counseling through a family planning program supported by our government. In Nicaragua, where poor women started small businesses in their barrio with help from a U.S.-backed microfinance project. In the West Bank, where students are learning English today through a program that we sponsor. In South Africa, where our development assistance is helping bring anti-retrovirals to areas ravaged by HIV and AIDS.

I have also traveled across this country and heard farmers, factory workers, teachers, nurses, students, and hard-working mothers and fathers wonder why the United States is spending taxpayer dollars to improve the lives of people in the developing world when there is so much hardship here at home.

That's a fair question -- one that I'd like to address today: Why development in other countries matters to the American people and to our nation's security and prosperity.

The United States seeks a safer, more prosperous, more democratic, and more equitable world. We cannot be assured of that progress when one-third of humankind live in conditions that offer them little chance of building better lives for themselves or their children.

We cannot stop terrorism or defeat the ideologies of violent extremism when hundreds of millions of young people see a future with no jobs, no hope, and no way ever to catch up to the developed world.

We cannot build a stable global economy when hundreds of millions of workers and families find themselves on the wrong side of globalization, cut off from markets and out of reach of modern technologies.

We cannot rely on regional partners to help us stop conflicts and counter global criminal networks when those countries are struggling to stabilize and secure their own societies.

We cannot advance democracy and human rights when hunger and poverty threaten to undermine the good governance and rule of law needed to make rights real.

We cannot stop global pandemics until billions of people gain access to better health care, and we cannot address climate change or scarcer resources until billions gain access to greener energy and sustainable livelihoods.

Development was once the province of humanitarians, charities, and governments looking to gain allies in global struggles. Today it is a strategic, economic, and moral imperative -- as central to advancing American interests and solving global problems as diplomacy or defense.

Because development is indispensable, it demands a new approach. For too long, our work has been riven by conflict and controversy. Differences of opinion over where and how to pursue development have hardened into entrenched, almost theological, positions that hinder progress and hold us back. These stand-offs aren't fair to the experts who put their lives on the line doing their work. And they aren't fair to the American taxpayers who, by and large, want to do good in the world, so long as their money doesn't go to waste.

It's time for a new mindset for a new century. Time to retire old debates and replace dogmatic attitudes with clear reasoning and common sense. And time to elevate development as a central pillar of our foreign policy and to rebuild USAID into the world's premier development agency.

The challenges we face are numerous. So we must be selective and strategic about where and how we get involved. But whether it's to improve long-term security in places torn apart by conflict, like Afghanistan, or to further progress in countries that are on their way to becoming regional anchors of stability, like Tanzania, we pursue development for the same reasons: to improve lives, fight poverty, expand rights and opportunities, strengthen communities, and secure democratic institutions and governance; and in doing so, advance global stability, improve our own security, and project our values and leadership in the world.

A new mindset means a new commitment to results. Development is a long-term endeavor; none of the changes we seek will happen overnight. To keep moving in the right direction, we must evaluate our progress and have the courage to rethink our strategies if we're falling short. We must not simply add up the dollars we spend or the number of programs we run, but measure the results -- the lasting changes that those dollars and programs have helped achieve. And we must share the proof of our progress with the public. The elementary school teacher in Detroit trying to send her kids to college and the firefighter in Houston working hard to support his family are funding our work. They deserve to know that when we spend their tax dollars, we're getting results.

We must also be honest that, in some situations, we will invest in places that are strategically critical but where we are not guaranteed success. In countries that are incubators of extremism,

like Yemen, or are ravaged by poverty and natural disasters, like Haiti, the odds are long. But the cost of doing nothing is potentially far greater.

We must accept that our development model cannot be formulaic -- that what works in Pakistan may not work in Peru. So our approach must be case by case and country by country -- analyzing needs, assessing opportunities, and tailoring our investments and our partnerships in a way that maximizes the impact of our efforts and dollars.

Two important reviews of our nation's development policy are now underway: the inaugural Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review, led by officials from USAID and the State Department; and the Presidential Study Directive on U.S. Global Development Policy, which is led by the White House and includes representatives from the more than 15 agencies that contribute to our global development mission.

As these reviews are completed and recommendations are sent to the president, new ideas and approaches will be refined. In the meantime, I'd like to share a few of the ways in which we are already taking steps to make sure that development delivers lasting results for the American people and people worldwide.

First, we are adopting a model of development based, as President Obama has said, on partnership, not patronage.

In the past, we have sometimes dictated solutions from afar, often missing our mark on the ground. Our new approach is to work in partnership with the people in developing countries by investing in evidence-based strategies with clear goals that the countries have taken the lead in designing and implementing. This kind of rights-respecting development, built on consultation rather than decree, is more likely to engender the local leadership necessary to turn good ideas into lasting results.

True partnership is based on shared responsibility. We want partners who have demonstrated a commitment to development by practicing good governance, rooting out corruption, and making their own financial contributions to development programs. We expect our partners to practice sound economic policies, including levying taxes on those who can afford them, just as we do; or, in countries rich in natural resources, managing those resources sustainably and devoting some of the profits to development. The American taxpayer cannot pick up the tab for those who are able but unwilling to help themselves.

Some might say it is risky to share control with countries that haven't had much success developing on their own. But we know that many countries have the will to develop, but not the capacity. That's something we can help them build.

One approach is that of the Millennium Challenge Corporation, which focuses on countries that have met rigorous criteria, from upholding political rights and the rule of law to controlling inflation and investing in girls' education. Under MCC compacts, we provide funding and technical support; the country provides the plan and leads the way toward achieving it. Early

indications of the program are promising. We're using our resources to help countries cultivate their ability to build their own future.

This approach points to the difference between aid and investment. Through aid, we supply what is needed to the people who need it -- be it sacks of rice, cartons of medicines, or millions of dollars to fill a budget shortfall. But through investment, we seek to break the cycle of dependence that aid can create by helping countries build their own institutions and their own capacity to deliver essential services. Aid chases need; investment chases opportunity.

This is not to say that the United States is abandoning aid. It is still a vital tool, especially as an emergency response. But through strategic investments in programs like the Millennium Challenge Corporation, we hope to one day put ourselves out of the aid business, because countries will no longer need this kind of help.

Our commitment to partnership extends not only to the countries where we work, but to other countries and organizations working there as well.

New countries are emerging as important contributors to global development, including China, Brazil, and India -- nations with the opportunity to play a key role, and with the responsibility to support sustainable solutions.

Long-time leaders like Japan, the United Kingdom, Canada, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Norway continue to reach billions through their long-standing work in dozens of countries.

Multilateral organizations like the World Bank, the IMF, the UN Development Program, and the Global Fund have the reach and resources to do what countries working alone cannot, along with valuable expertise in infrastructure, health, and finance initiatives.

Non-profits like the Gates Foundation, CARE, Oxfam International, and the Clinton Foundation bring their own resources, deep knowledge, extensive networks, and commitment to humanitarian missions that complement our work in critical ways.

And private businesses are able to reach large numbers of people in a way that's economically sustainable, because they bring to bear the power of markets. Companies like Starbucks, which has worked to create supply chains from coffee-growing communities in the developing world that promote better environmental practices and better prices for farmers; or Unilever/Hindustan, which has created soap and hygiene products that the very poor -- long-overlooked by business -- can afford.

Engaging in partnerships with countries and organizations like these will open up opportunities and increase our impact.

Second, we are working to integrate development more closely with defense and diplomacy in the field.

I know that the word "integration" sets off alarm bells. There is a concern that integrating development means diluting it or politicizing it -- giving up our long-term development goals to achieve short-term objectives or handing over more of the work of development to our diplomats or defense experts.

That is not what we will do.

What we will do is leverage the expertise of our diplomats and military on behalf of development, and vice versa. The three Ds must be mutually reinforcing.

The experience and technical knowledge that our development experts bring to their work are irreplaceable. Whether trained in agriculture, public health, education, or economics, our experts are the face, brains, heart, and soul of U.S. development worldwide. They take our ideas, dollars, and commitment and turn them into real and lasting change in people's lives.

Some of the most transformative figures in the history of development represent the convergence between development and diplomacy. People like Norman Borlaug, the father of the Green Revolution; Jim Grant, whose global immunization campaigns saved millions of children; and Wangari Maathai, whose Green Belt Movement has planted millions of trees in Kenya and trained thousands of women to be leaders in conservation. These development giants combined outstanding technical expertise with a passionate belief in the power of their ideas. They did whatever it took to convince at times reluctant leaders to join them, and as a result, helped build and lead national and regional movements for change.

Today, we have many such "development diplomats" working at USAID. They embody the integration between development and diplomacy that, when allowed to exist, can amplify both of these disciplines.

For example, development projects can be stalled or stymied by too little support from leaders -- particularly programs that target marginalized populations, like people with HIV, women, or refugees. In those cases, our diplomats can help make the difference. They have the access and leverage to convince government ministers to give these development programs their support.

Development also furthers a key goal of our diplomatic efforts: to advance democracy and human rights worldwide. I remember vividly my visit some years ago to the village of Saam Njaay in Senegal, where a former Peace Corps volunteer, Molly Melching, set up a village-based NGO called Tostan. And through Tostan's projects, women in the village began speaking out about the health consequences and pain of female genital mutilation, an accepted practice there. This collective awakening led to a village-wide discussion and soon the village voted to end the practice. Men from Saam Njaay traveled to other villages to explain why FGM was bad for women and girls -- and by extension, their families and communities -- and other villages banned it too. A grassroots political movement grew and eventually the government passed a law banning the practice nationwide.

Sadly, enforcement has been harder to achieve because cultural norms are so entrenched. But the larger point is that the experience in this village demonstrates how development, democracy, and

human rights can and must be mutually reinforcing. Democratic governance reinforces development, and development can help secure democratic gains. So those who truly care about making human rights a reality know that development is an integral part of that agenda.

Development is also critical to the success of our defense missions, particularly where poverty and failed governments contribute to instability. Consider the situation in Afghanistan. Many people ask whether any development programs can succeed there. The answer is yes. The World Bank, for example, supports a reconstruction and rural infrastructure initiative called the National Solidarity Program, which has made progress even in that challenging environment. Through the program, more than 18,000 Community Development Councils have been elected and more than 15,000 infrastructure projects have been completed.

Progress is difficult. But it is possible. That is why, as we prepare to send 30,000 new American troops, along with several thousand troops from our allies in NATO and the International Security Force, we are also tripling the number of civilians on the ground. They include agriculture experts who will help farmers develop new crops, so they don't have to grow opium poppies, and education experts who will help make schooling more accessible to girls so they can become pillars of their country's future progress.

The work of these development experts helps make future military action more remote. It is much cheaper to pay for development up front than to pay for war over the long run.

And in Afghanistan and elsewhere, U.S. troops are helping to provide the security that allows development to take root. In places torn apart by sectarianism or violent extremism, long-term development gains are far less likely.

In the past, coordination between the Three Ds has often fallen short, and everyone has borne the consequences. Secretary Gates, Administrator Shah, and I are united in our commitment to change that. The United States achieves the best results when we approach our foreign policy as an integrated whole, greater than the sum of its parts.

Third, we are working to improve the coordination of all the development work taking place across Washington.

In the 21st century, many government agencies have to think and act globally. The Treasury Department leads and coordinates our nation's engagement with the international financial system. The Justice Department fights transnational crime. The Department of Energy works with global partners to develop new energy sources. Disease control is a global challenge in an interconnected world; so is the quality of our air and waterways. But as a growing number of agencies broaden their scope internationally, even working on the same issue from different angles, coordination has lagged behind. The result is an array of programs that overlap or contradict.

This is a source of growing frustration and concern. But it's also an opportunity to create more forceful and effective programs. The challenge now facing USAID and the State Department is

to work with all the other agencies to coordinate, lead, or support effective implementation of the administration's strategy.

Indeed, this is part of our core mission. Through our permanent worldwide presence, our strategic vision, and our charge to advance America's interests abroad, we can help align overseas development efforts with our strategic objectives and national interests. This will not be easy, but it will make our government's work more effective, efficient, and enduring.

And we are already emphasizing this kind of coordination with our food security initiative, which brings together the Department of Agriculture's expertise on farming, USAID's experience with extension services, the Millennium Challenge Corporation's know-how on road building, and the contributions of several other agencies.

We know that attracting investment and expanding trade are critical to development. So we are looking to coordinate the foreign assistance programs at USAID, MCC, and other agencies with the trade and investment initiatives of the U.S. Export-Import Bank and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation. And we seek to build on the success of regional models of coordination like the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act.

We also need to ask hard questions about who should be doing the work of development. For too long, we've relied on contractors for core contributions and diminished our own professional and institutional capacities. This must be fixed. Contractors are there to support us, not supplant us. USAID and the State Department must have the staff, the expertise, and the resources to design, implement, and evaluate our programs. This is why we are increasing the numbers of foreign service officers at USAID and the State Department. And the QDDR is developing a set of guidelines for how we work with and oversee contractors, to make sure we have the right people doing the right jobs under the right conditions.

Fourth, we are concentrating our work in what development experts call sectors and what I think of as areas of convergence.

In the past, we invested in many programs across many fields, spreading ourselves thin and reducing our impact. Going forward, we will target our investment and develop technical excellence in a few key areas, like health, agriculture, security, education, energy, and local governance. Rather than helping fewer people one project at a time, we can help countries activate broad, sustainable change.

To start, we are investing \$3.5 billion over the next three years in partner countries where agriculture represents more than 30 percent of GDP and more than 60 percent of jobs, and where up to 70 percent of a family's disposable income is spent on food. Farming in these places plays such a large role that a weak agricultural sector often means a weak country. Small family farmers stay poor, people go hungry, economies stagnate, and social unrest can ignite, as we have seen with the riots over food in more than 60 countries since 2007.

By offering technical support and making strategic investments across the entire food system -- from the seeds farmers plant to the markets where they sell their crops to the homes where

people cook and store their food -- we can help countries create a ripple effect that extends beyond farming and strengthens the security and prosperity of whole regions.

We are applying the same approach in the field of health. One of our countries' most notable successes in development is PEPFAR, which has helped more than 2.4 million people with HIV receive life-saving anti-retroviral medications. Now PEPFAR will be the cornerstone of our new Global Health Initiative. We will invest \$63 billion over the next six years to help our partners improve their health systems and provide the care their people need, rather than rely on donors to keep a fraction of their population healthy while the rest go with hardly any care.

Fifth, we are increasing our nation's investment in innovation.

New technologies are allowing billions of people to leapfrog into the 21st century after missing out on 20th-century breakthroughs. Farmers armed with cell phones can learn the latest local market prices and know in advance when a drought or flood is on its way. Mobile banking allows people in remote corners of the world to use their phones to access savings accounts or send remittances home to their families. Activists seeking to hold governments accountable for how they use resources and treat citizens use blogs and social networking sites to shine the spotlight of transparency on the scourges of corruption and repression.

There is no limit to the potential for technology to shrink obstacles to progress. And the United States has a proud tradition of producing game-changers in the struggles of the poor. The Green Revolution was driven by American agricultural scientists. American medical scientists have pioneered immunization techniques. American engineers have designed laptop computers that run on solar energy so new technologies don't bypass people living without power.

This innovation tradition is even more critical today. And we are pursuing several ways to advance discovery and make sure useful innovations reach the people who need them. We are expanding our direct funding of new research. We're exploring venture funds, credit guarantees, and other tools to encourage private companies to develop and market products and services that improve the lives of the poor. We are seeking more innovative ways to use our considerable buying power -- for example, through advance market commitments -- to help create markets for those products, so entrepreneurs can be sure that breakthroughs made on behalf of the poor successfully reach them.

Here again, there is potential for fruitful partnership between our government and the dozens of American universities, laboratories, private companies, and charitable foundations that chase and fund discovery.

With help from the State Department, U.S. tech companies are working with the Mexican government, telecom companies, and NGOs to reduce narco-violence, so citizens can easily and anonymously report gang activity in their neighborhoods. We've brought three tech delegations to Iraq, including a recent visit by Eric Schmidt, the CEO of Google, who announced that his company will launch an Iraqi government YouTube channel to promote transparency and good governance. And we're sending a team of experts to the Democratic Republic of Congo this spring to begin the process of bringing mobile banking technology to that country.

Of course, innovation is not only the invention of new technologies. It's any breakthrough idea that transforms lives and reshapes our thinking. Like Muhammad Yunus's belief that poor women armed with credit could become drivers of economic and social progress. Or the insight behind conditional cash transfer programs, which seamlessly and successfully integrate efforts to fight poverty and promote education and health. These innovations have traveled the world; New York City launched a conditional cash transfer program modeled after Mexico's; Muhammad Yunus's Grameen Bank has opened a branch in Queens. We must ensure that other extraordinary innovations are also discovered and disseminated.

Sixth, we are focusing more of our investments on those most responsible for growing the world's food, caring for the world's sick, and raising the world's children: women and girls.

And I want to commend the Center for Global Development for the ground-breaking work they are doing to advance girls' health, with their remarkable report titled "Start with a Girl." It's a comprehensive blueprint for action, and I look forward to working with them to carry it out.

Women and girls are one of the world's greatest untapped resources and a terrific return on investment. Studies have shown that when a woman receives even just one year of schooling, her children are less likely to die in infancy or suffer from illness or hunger -- and they're more likely to go to school themselves. And one reason that microfinance is ubiquitous around the world is because women have proven to be such a safe and reliable credit risk. The money they borrow is not only invested and re-invested, and turned into a profit, it is used to improve conditions for their families. And it is almost always repaid. I have seen for myself the transformative power of microlending in women's lives and their families and communities' lives from Bangladesh to Costa Rica to South Africa to Vietnam and dozens of countries in between.

You know the proverb, "Give a man a fish and he'll eat for a day, but teach a man to fish and he'll eat for a lifetime"? If you teach a woman to fish, the impact is even greater. It takes a woman to teach a village.

So today, the United States is taking steps to put women front and center in our development work. We are beginning to disaggregate by gender the data we collect on our programs, to measure how well our work is helping improve women's health, income, and access to education and food. We're starting to design programs with the needs of women in mind -- by hiring more women as extension workers to reach women farmers, or women health educators to improve our outreach to women and girls. And we are training more women in our partner countries to carry forward the work of development themselves -- for example, through our scholarships to women agricultural scientists in Kenya.

This is not only a strategic interest of the United States, it is an issue of personal importance to me, and one I have worked on for almost four decades. I will not accept words without deeds when it comes to women's progress. I will hold our agencies accountable for ensuring that our government and our foreign policy support the world's women and achieve lasting, meaningful results on these issues.

As we apply these six approaches, more will follow -- some new; some variations on the past; all reflecting our commitment to find, test, and embrace ideas that work and to learn from our work at every step of the way.

A half century ago, President Kennedy outlined a new vision for the role of development in promoting American values and advancing global security. He called for a new commitment and a new approach to match the realities of the post-war world. And his administration created the United States Agency for International Development to lead that effort and make the United States the world leader in development.

In the decades since, our nation's development efforts have helped eradicate smallpox and reduce polio and river blindness. We've helped save millions of lives through immunizations; put two million people with HIV on life-saving anti-retroviral medications; and made oral rehydration therapy available worldwide, greatly reducing infant deaths. We've helped educate millions of young people. We've provided significant support to countries that have flourished in a number of sectors, including economic growth, health, and good governance -- countries like South Korea, Thailand, Mozambique, Botswana, Rwanda, and Ghana. And we've supplied humanitarian aid to countries on every continent in the wake of hurricanes, earthquakes, famines, floods, tsunamis, and other disasters.

Americans can and do take pride in these achievements, which not only have helped humanity but also have helped our nation project our values and strengthen our leadership in the world.

And these efforts have not been the work of government alone -- which, most people don't realize, contributes only about one percent of our budget to foreign assistance. The balance is made up the generous spirit of Americans and is reflected across our nation's landscape, from farms to civic groups to churches to charities. Over the years, the American people have opened their hearts and wallets to causes ranging from eradicating polio in Latin America to Saving Darfur to helping poor people in Asia purchase livestock to investing in microenterprise on multiple continents. And the cumulative effect of all of this private giving is literally to double the amount our country spends on foreign assistance.

Today, we must call on that same American spirit of giving to meet the challenges of a new century. Not only giving materially but giving time and talent.

So those of you who care deeply about development... who care deeply about the future of our country and our world... help us enlist more Americans in this effort. Help us recruit technology experts, business leaders, farmers, teachers, doctors, lawyers.

And help us tap into the talents of the first global generation of Americans -- the young men and women graduating from our colleges and universities, the finest in the world. Encourage them to volunteer. To intern. To work not only for NGOs but to lend their energy and skill to the State Department and USAID. And I promise that with Raj's help, we will do more on our end to make sure that our doors are open to this emerging pool of thinkers and doers.

Development work is never easy. But it is essential to creating a world in which more people in more places have the opportunity to live up to their God-given potential -- a world that is more equitable, democratic, prosperous, and peaceful.

Thank you.