

## Hearing Transcript

### Senate Foreign Relations Committee Hearing on the Interests and Values of the American People

March 30, 2017

CORKER:

Senate Foreign Relations Committee will come to order. Thank you everyone for being here. We have two outstanding witnesses today and just as a housekeeping kind of thing I guess we've got another vote. So what we might try to do is get through to opening comments now, we might run, go vote and then -- and then come back again.

We apologize especially having such distinguished people with us today. We spend a lot of time in this Committee looking at very specific foreign policy issues and whether it's the challenges we face in the Mosul campaign in or -- in or -- in or -- in Iraq appears to wind down or down in the weaves (ph) details of Venezuelan politics we rightly focus much of our attention on the tactical and operational there's not much time left for the truly strategic.

I mean let's face it. That's the way things have been both at the White House and here. That's why as Chairman, we've made it a priority to concentrate more of our time and energy on exploring the bigger questions facing our country and the world.

Members will remember that last year we were fortunate to hear testimony along those more strategic lines from former Secretary of State James Baker and former National Security Advisor Tom Donilon, both of whom I know are friends of yours. I should also make clear that we stand in a moment of exceptional opportunity to take the strategic thinking we're exploring at hearings like this one and work together with the new Administration and turn it into reality.

We have a chance right now to join forces in a bipartisan way with the Executive Branch which regardless of what side of the aisle you may be on there's no question. They're more accessible and welcoming of input than any administration I've dealt with since joining the Committee.

As a matter of fact since I'm getting reaction from Hadley, I'll just say that we had Tillerson -- we had lunch with Tillerson last week. We're going to be breaking out in small groups to look at each of their 12 strategic regions. We're going to be doing the same thing with McMaster.

So as this Administration moves ahead they really are looking on a bipartisan basis for input, so it's even more important that you all are here today and we thank you. Members know we've already had, as I just mentioned, a productive working meeting with Secretary of State Tillerson yesterday, Ambassador Haley was in. Thought we had a great meeting with her.

We learned -- what we will learn today will help and form those future interactions with the Executive Branch and if we seize this moment it will help us craft solid foreign policies in a

cooperative manner. In my view, we face four critical areas of concern as we and the new Administration move ahead.

First of all, over the past several years we've been in a crisis of -- we've seen a crisis of credibility emerge when it comes to the world's view of the United States. Put simply, people no longer believe that we can be counted on to do what we say we will do.

Second, we have a serious problem with prioritization since the end of the Cold War. The number of things being called national security priorities has expanded to an enormous laundry list. We spend too much time frankly on pet issues of specific and -- specific interest groups, individual members of Congress and the -- and administration bureaucrats and as the old saying goes "If everything's a priority then nothing's a priority" and I hope you'll help us with that today.

Third, our foreign policy has clearly and obviously become disconnected from the beliefs and desires of the American people. I mean let's face it. One of the outcomes of this most recent election was about that. I mean we have not done a good job of making sure people here in our country are connected with our foreign policy.

We must have national conversation about what constitutes core U.S. interests and policymakers. We have to do a better job of squaring those interests and the policies we pursue to achieve them with the will of the folks that sent us here in the first place.

And then finally, we have to recognize that no matter what we talk about in this Committee day to day, no matter what we discuss here this morning the top threat, a top national security threat is us. It's us and that is our inability to deal with our long-term fiscal situation. Everybody knows it. I know Secretary Albright has mentioned this in times past. I know Secretary Hadley has.

The other threat we face North Korea, Russia, Iran and all the rest are significant but so is the fact that we are staring down the barrel of the kind of fiscal situation that it's led us -- that has led to the end of kingdoms and powers in republics throughout history and it's something that we have to grapple with.

I want to extend my great gratitude to the witnesses. I don't want to prolong my opening comments any longer. We look forward to your testimony, vigorous questioning. It's an honor to have you and with that, Senator Cardin.

CARDIN:

Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for convening this hearing, and getting us two very, very distinguished witnesses. Their service to our country is legendary and we thank you very much for everything you've done to strengthen America and your public service throughout your career and continuing your inspiration to foreign policy development in our country, so thank you both.

It's a pleasure to have you here as we think about U.S. national security strategies in the years ahead. When the Cold War ended some 30 years ago we were told that we were at the end of

history and that democracy open borders, free trade, liberal economics and pluralistic (ph) societies had emerged triumphant.

Yet with the rise of populism including here in the United States with the renewed ideological challenges that we face from Russia, China and the Middle East and with still ongoing struggles with ISIS in Syria and Iraq for the balance of 21st century we are very much in history once again.

Renewed and vigorous U.S. leadership or the sort that helped us chart the 20th century, the sort of leadership that the two of you have provided to multiple administrations had never been more necessary. Yet the new Administration seems to have a very different idea about how to exercise U.S. power in the world, ideas that in my view risk undermining key tools and mechanisms that enable U.S. leadership.

I'm a firm believer in the enduring strength of the United States. Yet I am concerned that our position as a leader of the free world is at risk. The ideas of democracy as a model and of development and diplomacy as tools for engagement are being significantly challenged.

The European project which has been the source of security and prosperity for the past 70 years is now being undermined with U.S. support for indifference to for our right-wing efforts to undo European security and democratic architecture.

New Administration appears to have elevated Russia and China to privileged positions ahead of our allies in a new game of great power politics. Russia has attacked our democracy, illegally annexed Crimea and invaded Eastern Ukraine.

Putin's Russia now considers itself in existential struggle with the West. And all Russia's domestic problems, a weakening ruble, collapsing energy prices, labor unrest are framed by the Kremlin as evidence of foreign hostility rather than consequences of their own corruption and expansionist ambitions.

In my view, Russia is a revisionist power that will cause further trouble across Europe and in International Order more generally. Russia sought to undermine and interfere in our elections and how we respond to Putin's broader strategic game is one of the key challenges of our time.

Therefore, your views and advice on Russia is something that I look forward to our discussion at this hearing. Likewise we welcome your perspective -- perspectives on the rise on China which has created anxiety through the Asian Pacific region raising with their questions as how to best maintain the institutional order in East Asia that has so benefited the region and the globe for the past seven decades.

After World War II, the United States led the world towards peace, prosperity and freedom. It did not come easy. We faced down threats from the Soviets, Saddam Hussein, Milosevic and others. And we have done so effectively in the past. We need to renew and revitalize America power and leadership to advance U.S. leadership interest in the world like continuing to take back ISIS claimed territory and flooding the warped ideology of Al-Qaeda.

This challenge, this question about our commitment to basic principles, values, norms of democracy is fundamental to our role in the world. I am also interested in your views on the roles of good governance, transparency, democracy, human rights and development of U.S. foreign policy toolkit.

It is never more important than it is today. For too long, U.S. foreign policy has treated government -- governance issues any corruption transparency democracy and civil society capacity building as well as basic human rights and development as secondary issues.

Today, we need to make sure that is not the case. Yet this Administration seems to take as a given that the United States is not exceptional rather that our form of government is no different than that with Russia or China, pursuing power narrowly, conducting foreign policy in a transitional way that are not our values that is not what we are as Americans.

The President and his inner circle may not talk about American values but I will, and I know both of you will. In the face of this assault of our values we cannot be silent. We know that America derives its strength from its values and we can never retreat from that core concept.

Lastly, I'm interested in your perspective on how the Trump Administration's proposal to slash about 36 percent from the State Department USAID budgets will affect our ability to safeguard our nation's interests. The deep cuts accompanied by efforts to dismantle key U.S. foreign policy tools and institutions comes at a time when we face massive humanitarian crisis with 65 million people displaced or on the move and 20 million facing starvation in the coming weeks.

I recognize that Congress ultimately terms our spending priorities, I recognize that. But I'm deeply concerned that the proposed cuts by the State Department in Foreign Assistance Budget suggested that the Trump administration could fatally undermine our ability to renew and revive our leadership at just the time when the leadership is increasingly essential.

So for all those reasons, I look forward to this discussion today as we talk about the future of the U.S. foreign policy.

CORKER:

Thank you. We thank you again both for being here and I've never seen a President's budget ever become law, ever so we know we're all going to shape that. And I know we all have an opportunity to shape the direction of the Trump foreign policy in ways that candidly we haven't been able to shape other administrations because of just where they are in their thinking, so you being here today is most helpful.

We're glad to have Former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, known to all of us, respected and liked by all of us and former National Security Adviser Stephen Hadley, known by all of us, liked by all of us, admired by all of us. Thank you for being here.

You know I -- if you could summarize your comments in about five minutes, any written document you have will be entered into the rock -- record without objection. And with that I think the way

your protocol is when you all do many joint assessments is Secretary Albright goes first, so if you would please begin.

ALBRIGHT:

Thank you very much, Chairman Corker and Senator Cardin and distinguished Members of the Committee. And thank you for the opportunity to be here today. And in listening to the opening statements we certainly have plenty to talk about and the fact that you see the role of this Committee in the broad way that you do I think is very encouraging.

I am pleased to return to these familiar surroundings and to see so many good friends here and I'm also delighted to be able to appear alongside Steve Hadley, who truly is one of the smartest and most principled people that I know. We've worked together on a number of foreign policy initiatives in the years since we left office and most recently in co-chairing the Atlantic Council's Middle East Strategy Task Force.

And we've done this not only because we happen to like each other but also because we both fervently believe in the importance of bipartisanship in foreign policy. And this was a lesson that I learned from one of my first bosses Senator Ed Muskie when I worked as his Chief Legislative Assistant.

I know that the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee share our belief in working across party lines because this Committee has always been bipartisan in its approach and proof of that can be found in the relationship that I was able to build with Chairman Helms.

He and I truly were the odd couple. The New York Times called our friendship "Perfectly naturally -- natural and utterly astonishing," but while our politics could not have been more different we did put those differences aside in order to build common ground on issues such as NATO expansion, banning chemical weapons and reorganizing the State Department.

My experience with Chairman Helms gave me an even deeper respect for the legislative branch of the government and the responsibilities assigned to it under Article 1 of the Constitution. This is Article 1 time.

I know the Members of this Committee take those responsibilities very seriously, which is why Steve and I really are pleased to be able to be here today and to join you in exploring the road ahead for U.S. interests and U.S. values in the American people.

The hearing does come at a time of deep political divisions at home and heightened instability abroad when basic questions are being asked about how and why America engages in the world. As members of different political parties, Steve and I disagree on many things but we are in vigorous agreement on how we see America's role in the world.

We both believe it is profoundly in America's interest to be engaged globally because our security and prosperity at home are linked to economic and political health abroad. This mindset is what led our country to construct the system of international institutions and security alliances after

World War II, and it is why Presidents of both parties have worked to promote peace, democracy, and economic opportunity around the world.

The system that America built has not been perfect but it has coincided with a period of security and prosperity unmatched in human history and while many nations have benefited from the investments America's made in global security and prosperity, none have benefited more than the United States.

So, we recognize that today this system is under stress in different ways that you all have mentioned, China, Iran, North Korea, resurgent Russia, and institutions of global governance are showing their edge and coming under tremendous stress as we deal with unprecedented humanitarian challenges including the prospect of four famines in sub-Saharan Africa and the Middle East, and meanwhile the value of our global engagement is also under question at home and many Americans feel that their lives have been threatened rather than enhanced by it.

So, I do think this popular dissatisfaction with international trade and technological change and the facelessness of globalization needs to be understood and acknowledged but so do the consequences of disengagement. For a while, it's comforting to believe that we can wall ourselves off from the ailments of the world. History teaches us that whenever problems abroad are allowed to fester and grows -- grow, sooner or later they do come home to America.

Isolationism and retreat do not work. We know that because we've tried it before. Now, most of you know that I was not born in the United States. Instead, I entered the world in Czechoslovakia only a year before the Munich Agreement, sacrificed my country's sovereignty in order to appease Hitler.

In my early years I saw what happened when America was absent as it was in Munich and what happened when America was present as it was during World War II. The lesson I drew is that terrible things happen when America is not engaged and that's a lesson I've shared with this Committee on countless occasions whether testifying as a Professor of International Relations, Ambassador to the U.N., or Secretary of State.

America is not an ordinary country that can just put our narrow interests first and forget about the rest of the world. We are the indispensable nation and it would be a terrible mistake to pretend otherwise but we should also remember that there's nothing in the word indispensable that means alone.

We want and need other countries to have the desire and capacity to work alongside us in tackling global problems. The testimony Steve and I have submitted for the record makes a bipartisan case for continuing American global leadership in partnership with our allies while acknowledging that the International Order needs refurbishment as do most humans and institutions over 70 years.

Drawing on the work of the Middle East Strategy Task Force, we also outlined a new approach for dealing with the chaos and disorder of that region. In a moment, Steve is going to provide a brief overview of that strategy but since we're both really looking forward to questions, I would just make a couple of points before I turn over to him.

First decades of experience have taught us that in order for America to engage effectively in the world we need to be able to use every tool in our national security toolbox. And this includes diplomatic pressure, economic leverage, technical assistance and threat of force.

Any one of these tools is ineffective on its own, which is why Steve and I are opposed to the steep and arbitrary cuts to the State Department International Affairs Budget which had been proposed by the Trump Administration. Our diplomats work every day at considerable sacrifice to ensure that the United States has superb representation and that our interests demand that our military needs to achieve its mission. We cannot have that on the cheap.

The truth is that foreign assistance including programs aiding or promoting democracy is among the most efficient and valuable tools that we have, and in the long run nothing is more expensive than poverty, suffering and war. So we have to invest the resources needed to make sure that our citizens are protected and our diplomats succeed.

And this is especially true today when our personnel are often in danger in conflict areas and when our diplomats face criticism from would-be autocrats who do not like their advocacy for democracy, American values and American non-governmental organizations.

As Senators and Members of this Committee, I know that you take your responsibilities very seriously to ensure that all of our instruments of national power are properly funded and that you will join us in rejecting these unwise cuts. As we consider America's role, another point worth emphasizing is that we need to be clear not only about what our nation is against in the world but what we are for.

We cannot and will not give in to those who threaten us or who conspire to kill our citizens but neither can we allow any enemy cause us to abandon our ideals that made America a symbol of liberty and justice. For more than 200 years, our country's strength has come from our inclusiveness. You cannot tell an American by his or her last name.

You all know me as Madeleine Albright but in fact my name is Maria Jana Korbelova. America has always been able to lead the world because we spoke and listen to people from vastly different cultures.

Today, I wear my pin of the Statue of Liberty. In today's era of interdependence these are traits that we have to retain. And so, as I said earlier, this hearing comes at a time of great consequence for our country and the world, so I thank you very, very much for your attention and for your interest and that what we can do together. Thank you.

CORKER:

Thank you so much. And I know this Committee is thankful you changed your name and that have great difficulty with those kind of thing, so the Honorable Mr. Hadley.

HADLEY:

Thank you Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Cardin, distinguished Members of this Committee. I appreciate the opportunity to be with you here this morning.

One of the great privileges I've enjoyed since leaving government is been able to work with Secretary Albright and bipartisan efforts to try and solve some of these foreign policy challenges we face, and I'm honored to be with her again this morning. She has set out and summarized our views in our written testimony. I would like to just elaborate on three points if I could.

First, the State of the U.S. late -- led Rules-Based International Order. As Madeleine has so eloquently pointed out for 70 years since the end of World War II, the centerpiece of American Grand Strategy has been to build and lead an International Order that has advanced the causes of freedom, prosperity and peace at home and abroad.

But this International Order is under enormous strain for the reasons that you and -- are all aware of. Madeleine and I would argue that the reason for the current chaos and conflict and disorder in the world today is precisely because that U.S. led International Order is breaking down in the face of these challenges.

At the same time, this global order needs to be adapted to the changes in the international environment that have occurred and to take account of the real grievances and concerns expressed by American voters in the last Presidential Election.

This presents an opportunity, an opportunity for the Congress to work with the Trump Administration, for Republicans and Democrats to work together on this common project, how to adapt and revitalize a U.S. led International Order.

Congress can begin by conducting a national debate on what a revised and revitalized order would look like through a series of structured hearings and these need to be held not just in Washington but throughout the country to ensure that congressional deliberations reflect the views of all Americans.

A good place to start in this debate I would argue is a recently issued Brookings Institution Report written by bipartisan group of foreign policy experts, of which I was one, entitled Building Situations of Strengths.

Second, let me say a word about the Middle East. This new International Order and American leadership will be sorely tested in the Middle East and as described in our Atlantic Council Middle East Strategy Task Force report the goal of any strategy for the region should be to help the people in countries of the Middle East change the trajectory of events towards a more positive future. And any effort to do that is going to have to reflect the new reality in the region since 2011 and the following guiding principles.

First, the old order is gone and it is not coming back. The region itself needs to assume the principle responsibility for defining and building a stable and prosperous Middle East free from both terrorist violence and government oppression.

Disengagement is not a practical solution for the United States. Disengagement will only allow the region's problems to spread and deepen unchecked creating further threats that's what we've seen for the last five or six years. But the role of the West must be different than what it has been in the past. Rather than trying to impose its will in the region, outsiders like the United States must support and facilitate the positive efforts of the people and governments in the region and there are some and we talk about them in our approach -- report.

A strategy for the region needs to focus more than on just counterterrorism. Pernicious as they are, even if groups like ISIS and IS (ph) and Al-Qaeda were to disappear tomorrow others would arise in their place so long as the underlying grievances that led to the Arab Spring remain unresolved.

Sectarian and ethnic rivalries are not as entrenched or inevitable in the Middle East as many assume. They wax and wane with the broader tensions in the regions. Achieving political solutions in the civil wars along with empowered local governance letting local communities take more responsibility for their own future can go a long way towards reducing these communal tensions.

The Middle East cannot build a better future however without the active participation of the people of the region including women, youth and minorities. If enabled and empowered, they can be the engines of job creation and innovative solutions to the region's problems. It's high time for us to start betting on the people of the region and not just on mistakes in the region.

So, our report outlined a two-pronged strategy.

First, the first prong involves outside actors helping countries in the region to wind down the violence starting with the civil wars. This means containing the spread of the current conflicts and accelerating diplomatic efforts to resolve them while addressing the staggering humanitarian crisis they've -- it generated.

This will require increased diplomatic and military engagement from the United States and its friends and allies, something that is already beginning to see under the Trump Administration building on what was done by the Administration before.

The second prong of our strategy, which must be pursued simultaneously and in parallel with the first, seeks to support now those efforts in the region that will create the social basis for longer-term stability, prosperity and peace.

This means supporting the bottom-up citizen-based entrepreneurial and civic activity that is already occurring throughout the region, and it means supporting those governments in the region that are facilitating these efforts that are investing in the education and empowerment of their people and that are providing them with uncorrupt and effective governance. And there are some. You see it in U.A.E. You see it in Tunisia. You're beginning to see progress in Saudi Arabia. We need to build on these efforts.

Finally, let me say a word about the significance of this last point, this prong two for the budgetary guidance recently issued by the Administration. Madeleine and I agree that we must continue to

upgrade and enhance our nation's military capabilities and to turn (ph) power. There's no question about that.

But accomplishing the second prong of the Middle East strategy we outlined requires the non-military civilian instruments of our national security toolkit, diplomacy, trade investment, development assistance, reconciliation, peace building skills and sound political advice, and this of course are exactly the things that have been targeted in the Administration's recent preliminary guidance.

Military forces can push ISIS out of Iraq, Syria and the territory it controls but they will return if those liberated lands do not enjoy some measure of political stability, societal reconciliation and economic progress and such progress requires the very non-military elements of national power targeted by the recent budget guidance.

Failing to win the peace after so many have fought so bravely would be in -- an insult to the memory of those who laid down their lives in service to our nation. Thank you again for the chance to testify this morning.

CORKER:

Thank you both and again we apologize for the order of what's happening in the Senate today. I think what we'll do, if it's OK with our Ranking Members, 10:37 now is let's reconvene at -- at 10:50, so you guys don't have to sit there. You can come back here on my call (ph), as a matter of fact let's do -- let's reconvene at 10:55 to give us a chance to get over and get back and get settled, and then we'll come back for questioning at that time if that's OK. I think it's better for everybody here everyone's questions and for us to have a ...

ALBRIGHT:

Thank you.

CORKER:

A session that's remaining here (ph) if you will, so we'll be back at 10:55, thank you so much.

(RECESS)

CORKER:

I just will ask a question and I usually differ but I'll (ph) ask just one. We -- we had a great meeting with Tillerson last week just to go through I think every member of the Democratic side and there were three members on the Republican side missing but a large group.

We -- I think all of us -- most of us up here support the -- the PEPFARs (ph) in our nation. Hadley, while you were in office, put forth relative to PEPFAR -- PEPFAR unbelievable what we've managed (ph).

I think we all understand we put forth one third of the Food Aid in the world and we're thankful especially at this time of tremendous famine around the world, self-manmade conflicts creating famine we're thankful for that a plan to be in the region in the next couple weeks to highlight that.

But we also know the State Department is really bloated. You know, we -- we've realized through some hearings recently there are 15 special -- 54 special envoys. I mean (ph) it's ridiculous. I mean you look at the names of these. It's just absolutely it will -- it will make your blood boil that there's this much.

Tillerson has gotten over there and, you know, I think he wants to reform it and transform it and so I hear a lot of -- I know Condi Rice is going to be up here today talking to Republicans about, you know, the Foreign Ops budget and again I'm saying I support those things that are transformative. I really do.

Slavery, I mean I hope we're going to be able to do use the same principles that we've used with PEPFAR on modern slavery today with 27 million people. At the same time, much of what we've done for years is just doubling down on the cold war model of buying influence towards no end.

So is it not somewhat healthy to have a discussion about the State Department, about the fact that for years we've been working around ineffective Assistant Secretaries by creating envoys, about the fact that we have programs that basically are -- are, you know, need to be transformed so that we can do things that make a difference like Electrify Africa, like the Food Aid Reforms that have been put in place.

So is this not it a healthy discussion for Congress to be having at this moment knowing that again, couldn't agree more with Secretary Albright, the world -- we have to lead the world and with that comes resources and to the extent we're not successful diplomatically our young men and women in uniform who we treasure are going to be in harm's way in more instances than they otherwise would be.

HADLEY:

I would -- I would agree with you completely. I think though you have to start from the premise that these non-military elements are important and that, you know, our young men and women who served in Iraq and Afghanistan will tell you and have told you they can't achieve their military mission if they don't have a robust non- military civilian partner in all these areas to work with them.

So if we start with that premise then the question is we ought to try to have these non-military elements to be as efficient and effective as they can be and the question is how you get there and my react -- my recommendation would be Secretary Tillerson, nominated by the President, confirmed by the Senate to -- to head the State Department why not give him some time to learn his organization, figure out how he wants to reorganize it, strengthen and then on the basis of his plan for the Department come to the Congress of the United States to say I need -- I can cut these things, I can eliminate these things but some of these things actually maybe I need to plus- up.

I think the concern we have is it seems across the board mean X rather than pursuant to a plan and it seems to be premised on the notion that we don't need these non-military elements as part of our national security toolkit.

If we can agree with it we need them and the goal is then to make them more effective and to shrink them and make them more efficient where that's appropriate then the question is how do you do that and I think that's what you as a Committee should be looking to Secretary Tillerson to do and given the time to do it, that would be my view.

CORKER:

Well, I think that's kind of what's happening, is it not anyways so (ph) I mean the -- the President's budget is like, you know, goes in the waste basket as soon as they gets here so is that not what's happening? Senator -- Secretary Albright?

HADLEY:

Maybe you can make it happen.

CORKER:

Yes.

HADLEY:

Maybe you can make it happen.

ALBRIGHT:

Thank you very much. And I agree with the way Steve has framed this but I have somewhat mixed feelings in terms of the State Department. I think that it is -- there are a lot of people there that are dedicated American servants and need to be respected for what they do and so I haven't liked some of the kind of descriptions of them as kind of useless and not doing the things that they're supposed to do.

I do think that, as Steve said, we need to have the functions that the State Department does. It is a complicated place and it is a place where most of the people actually are serving abroad that is part of the issue.

CORKER:

Yes.

ALBRIGHT:

And the question then is what are the size of our missions? How do they operate? Whether they sit behind walls because they are afraid of security or whether they go out and or do as Condi actually talked about ...

CORKER:

Yes.

ALBRIGHT:

Expeditionary and really go out there and be a part of it. So, I think ...

CORKER:

Yes.

ALBRIGHT:

That there needs to be a discussion about it.

CORKER:

Yes.

ALBRIGHT:

What I am troubled by, I have to tell you, is that I think that it's important to give the new Secretary of State time and people say it's early but soon it will be too late.

CORKER:

Yes.

ALBRIGHT:

And I think therefore there really has to be a better sense of what is going on at the State Department and to have them have a feeling that they are part of America's representation and that they are respected and that it -- this will not be just reorganization for the sake of reorganization.

It is complicated. It takes time and it takes away in some way from the mission of what the -- our diplomats do, which is to be engaged abroad and to represent our country which then leads I think to the larger question that both of you raised is what is our national security policy?

When are we going to be clear about the direction in which this Administration is going in terms of the whole of government approach to it and what is the role of the State Department?

CORKER:

Well let me just move to -- I usually don't take any time on the frontend, couple of things. Number one, we had witnesses in last week, Republican and Democrat who had worked in the State Department who basically talked about these special envoys as being workarounds that in essence when they had somebody that wasn't effective we create a special envoy so I'm really referring to testimony from folks within the State Department.

Secondly, the President as I understand it and we're working closely they are developing a strategic vision. It's going to be due in September and we're going to be very involved in that. So, you know, they have come into office, let's face it and many cases had no institutional support. We're hopefully going to help with some of that and you're helping with that today so that is happening over the next six months.

And I think that Tillerson feels just for what it's worth that he's got professionals there so he's (ph) working with. I mean we -- we want -- we'd like to have some nominations. I mean we thought we were going to be in the personnel business, we're not. We have no nominations but he told us the other day, he's working with people who've been there for years.

They're very professional. He's having a -- you know, they're helping him immensely. He'll take his time to do what he's doing, so again I -- I looked at the budgetary piece. I don't know when we take it up but it seems like to me it's going to be a long time from now is it not where we'd actually deal with next year's appropriations.

So, again, as I look at this I think there's a lot of hair on fire discussions. Mr. Hadley, you know, you were kind of Tillerson's agent I think in coming in, you and Gates and Condoleezza Rice so I assume that you being his agent and wafting him into this position you can have some influence over this. But, again, I don't see this as being, you know, quite the way people are laying it out and I think it's much healthier. And I think the -- I do agree that lopping everything off to support defense is the wrong place. OK. Senator Cordin.

CARDIN:

Well, Mr. Chairman, just because we haven't done FY '17 you think we're not going to get to FY '18 for a while, I understand that. And I wish it was true that the President's budget was thrown in the waste basket, but it is very much referred to by stakeholders and it's a message to stakeholder whether they are American or whether they're international and it is troublesome. And what really worries me, it is at times used as the yardstick and if the President's budget is used as the yardstick with the programs under Secretary of State, we have serious challenges in the Congress, so I'm with you, throw it into waste basket.

I want to -- just one quick question if I might on the State Department and it's trying to figure out where it's going. We've had some really good discussions with the Ambassador to the United Nations and she's going through significant change there in a very, open transparent way and I think it's giving confidence to our mission at the United Nations as well as the international community that America's going to be a player. I don't see that from the Secretary of State. He has

a different way of operating. He doesn't hold press conferences, he doesn't do things in an open way. And Secretary Albright, I just want to get -- I mean, you got to fight within any administration as a cabinet officer for what you believe in, but if you don't have a more open way of how you're doing your business, does he see power, but not getting a better way to broadcast what he's doing?

ALBRIGHT:

Well, I do think that having a public voice makes a big difference and the Secretary of State is the person that publicly describes where -- what our policies are and the direction that we're going in. As I said, I do think that Secretary Tillerson is somebody that has not been a part of a governmental system, so I think that he is entitled to have some time to figure out what is going on. But I do think that one of the issues and you've spoken about this, we all have in a number of times, the Russians are actually very good at propaganda that is their specialty. I think we need to be better at public diplomacy which explains what our position is and the Secretary of State is the main person to do that.

And, therefore, silence is not a good idea. I think that Ambassador Haley has really done a terrific job, there's no question. And I think I may be one of the few people that truly understands the relationship between Secretary of State and U.N. Ambassador, having been both. It is a peculiar relationship, if I may say so, because what happens is the U.N. Ambassador is an instructed ambassador, but at the same time a member of the Principles Committee that is required to have an independent voice. And so the question is how they actually do relate, how they work together.

And I think that Ambassador Haley has really done a great job in explaining our position internationally. She's appreciated in New York and internationally, but I do think it's important -- I wish that the Secretary felt more comfortable taking the press with him when he goes abroad, because they provide an echo chamber of what is going on in terms of how others understand what our policies are.

CARDIN:

That's very helpful. I want to get both of your response to a real concern I have about human rights. We're seeing more and more atrocities around the world that's going in Syria, that's going on in South Sudan and we can mention many, many other countries where atrocities are going on and just points out the importance of dealing with the seeds of discontent and U.S. presence in the global community through what we do at the Department of State.

I am concerned that how high of an elevation these issues will be in critical meetings that are going to be taking place shortly. President Trump will be with President Xi. How important is it that human rights be on that agenda? That there be mention of our concern about what China is doing in repressing its own people so that Americans' value and ideals are at the table. We know that the Secretary of State will be travelling to Russia. How important is it for him to meet with opposition people or NGOs in order to show Mr. Putin that America stands by its values? President Sisi will be here from Egypt. How important is it on the agenda that the reform issues that are so critically important to the Egyptians are on the agenda between the President at that meeting? And if they're not, what signal does that send? Either -- I like to take both of your answers.

ALBRIGHT:

Let me just say that I do believe it is essential for the United States to make our value system clear. I believe in a moral foreign policy. I think the question always is how do you combine idealism and realism. My -- I had real problems with this because I didn't know whether I was an idealistic realist or a realistic idealist. And in many ways it's a false dichotomy because you need both. And I often compared policy to a hot air balloon that you need the idealism in order to get the balloon up and then the ballast of realism to give it a direction. So, you need both.

But in terms of when the Secretary of State or the President of the United States goes out in order to represent us, I think the human rights issues have to be on the talking points, because if they are not, then people do not understand that it is a basic aspect of our foreign policy. And whenever I went out, we went through various talking points and business, but always I raised the human rights issues wherever I was and I did have kind of a trick which I would say I have come a long way so I must be frank. And it really is one of the basic aspects of American foreign policy.

I am deeply troubled by the fact that the Secretary was not there to present the human rights report that this administration has not really spoken on the values aspect of our foreign policy.

CARDIN:

OK.

ALBRIGHT:

Because it is a basic aspect of it. I also do think it's important to meet with opposition people. So -- but I think this balance always to be completely fair about it is a balance between the realism and the idealism and you figure out what you can do where, but it's a mistake if it is not brought up.

CARDIN:

Let me take the Chairman's prerogative and ask Mr. Hadley as the Advisor to Secretary Tillerson, what advice will you give him on these issues.

HADLEY:

I am not an adviser to Secretary Tillerson. I think he's a terrific candidate for Secretary of State. Look, Ambassador Haley is a practicing politician. She's been doing with media, she knows the role they play, you know. Tillerson is a former Fortune 100 chief executive officer, is, as he said, he's an engineer. Give him some time to make the transition. It's a difficult transition he's trying to make. He's an engineer. He learns the facts and then follows the facts. And I think we need to give him some time to do that. And I'm encouraged at what the Chairman said that from the standpoint of this Committee he will be given the time to figure out how to strengthen and make more effective our State Department. That's where it ought to happen.

One -- briefly on your question on human rights. I think the pursuit of our deals -- our ideals in our foreign policy is one of the most realistic things we can do, because a world that is more based on our ideals is going to be a more congenial place for America and the United States. So this notion that there's a war between realism and idealism I have never embraced.

Second, you indicated you're having a good dialog with the administration. I would put this issue of the role of human rights in our foreign policy on that dialog and have a candid (ph) discussion about how to do it. It is a I think a fairly subtle mix of some things you do publicly, some things you say privately and some trade- offs and compromise you make, because human rights is not the only thing that is in our interest to pursue. It's a delicate matter.

And Egypt is a good case. And we say in this report that we have done we need to embrace Egypt, we need to show we're going to be a strong ally, we need to maintain our military assistance. I think if you put your arm around a country and show that you are a strong friend and ally and stand with them, it is easier to have a candid conversation where you say to President Sisi, you cannot crack down your country into stability. In the end of the day there will be no long-term stability and tell you open up your politics in a way that is consistent with the pressure you face from the terrorism. But that is the only way to get true stability. I think you've got to reassure someone before you deliver that message.

CARDIN:

Thank you.

CORKER:

So I want to apologize to everybody for both of us having gone over and I just want to say, look, I had strong disagreement the foreign policy positions coming in on January 20th. I've seen a significant evolution, significant, NATO, Israel, on China, on numbers of issue and I really believe that once we can all get past what happened on November 8, this Committee has more opportunity to shape this administration than in any time I've seen since I've been here in 10 years, and I think that's a positive thing. Senator Young.

YOUNG:

Thank you, Chairman. Thank you so much Madam Secretary, Mr. Hadley for appearing before this Committee. First thing I'd like to ask you about relates to our organization over at State Department. State and USAID seem to operate in stovepipes of sorts as we carry out our diplomacy efforts, our aid efforts, and the stovepiping continues not just within our State Department and USAID, but across agencies as we look to try and improve our diplomatic efforts. Our inter-agency coordination seems to be fertile for improvement at least from this vantage point.

So, Mr. Hadley first, if you please, and then perhaps Secretary Albright, do you believe it would make sense to establish a statutory requirement for state and USAID to periodically produce and submit to this Committee a national diplomacy and development strategy in direct support of our

national security strategy. It would establish real diplomatic and development priorities, objectives, metrics, balance, ends and means and at least that would be the idea. I'll be quite for now and get your thoughts on this.

HADLEY:

I think it's a terrific idea. And what I would hope to see is that we get a national security strategy out of the White House and the administration that reflects the priorities of the President hopefully this fall. And then that document would be taken to develop a national defense strategy, if you will, with the Defense Department in the lead and the kind of national diplomacy development and democracy strategy out of the State Department. And I would hope those two organizations would develop their products on an inter- agency basis and with -- in coordination with each other, because in theaters like Iraq and Afghanistan, they have to be mutually supportive.

The hardest thing in the government is integration. It's all organized with vertical cones, with people operating in their narrow spaces and the hardest thing is to integrate across those in service (ph) of a national strategy. And we need the kind of process you describe to give that strategy and to integrate and give people, you know, basically the plan for going forward to achieve that strategy.

YOUNG:

Secretary Albright.

ALBRIGHT:

I do believe that, one, we need to have more of a whole of government approach to all of this. In addition to the Defense Department, there are other parts of the government that also need to be a part of it. We were talking earlier today with some people about the Agriculture Department needs to be a part with P.L. 480 and how it affects our farmers, et cetera. So one of the things, frankly, Secretary Clinton tried on this called the QDDR of trying to bring more rationality to the State Department budget and the USAID budget. I have to tell you I tried, because part of the thing that you want to do is to have there be some relationship between the projects that USAID does and American policy. But I do think the stovepiping hurts. I can't tell you how many various re-orgs I have looked at ever since even the Carter administration on how to bring all this together.

YOUNG:

So do you think codifying the QDDR would...

ALBRIGHT:

I think it would -- I think would make a difference.

YOUNG:

Would help...

ALBRIGHT:

Yes, but it also is in terms of the preparation of it that kind of action together is good for work.

YOUNG:

Forcing mechanism to plan, yes. Let me briefly pivot to the AUMF. I know it's something you've spoken to in a previous hearing here on the Hill. On March 22, we had Secretary of Defense Mattis testified before the Senate Defense Approps Subcommittee indicating that he thought that a new AUMF focused on ISIS would be a statement of the American people's resolve. It would hearten our allies -- something of importance to this Committee certainly -- and give our troops a sense of purpose. You echoed your support for that, Mr. Hadley. You said you thought it would be a good thing in response to Representative Banks. In your testimony to HASC (ph) recently you indicated that you thought you believed that there needs to be an AUMF. Why do you believe there needs to be an AUMF? I'll start with you, Secretary Albright.

ALBRIGHT:

I think, first of all, because the old ones are not really representative of what is going on now. And second, because I think that we need a public debate about what America's role is in the world and in many ways an AUMF is a very good vehicle for it. I know Senator Kaine has been talking about this for some time. I do believe in the executive-legislative relationship on this, but most of all I think the American people need to understand why we send our troops somewhere, what is the purpose of it, well, how does it add and it is a great mechanism for actually forcing a national debate that Steve and I have been talking about generally is necessary and especially given what's already been said by some of you which is we're in a different kind of a world. And the American public needs to witness their representatives having this serious discussion.

YOUNG:

Well, I agree with you that' why I've introduced an AUMF. Senate Joint Res 31 on March 2nd. Mr. Hadley, anything to add to the Secretary's commentary?

HADLEY:

I've not -- I agree with Madeleine -- I've not read the resolution you introduced, but we need a new AUMF to clarify the mission and the authorities in light of the fact that we have a new administration in the White House. Second, we need the kind of debate, national debate Madeleine talked about. And third, the Congress needs to be on record in support of this effort against ISIS. You are the vehicle for the expression of the popular will and you need to be on record.

YOUNG:

Thank you.

CORKER:

We expect -- I know that Mattis has developed a strategy, gave it to the President 30 days ago all though that was not accepted as I understand it. They're reworking it, but we do wish for them to come up and lay out their new strategy and I think that will be the appropriate time for us to take up an AUMF. And we have a new administration and really tees out where we're going, so I think that's very healthy. Senator Menendez.

MENENDEZ:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you both for your extraordinary service to our country and for consistently coming back to the Committee to give us insights. We appreciate it. I want to focus on one part of your testimony and where you talk about the international order and you mentioned and I'm going to quote directly from your written testimony, "China, Russia and other countries should understand that there is a larger place for them at the decision-making table provided they are constructive and respect the interest of other nations. And they need to understand that there will be costs if they do not.

And so my question is understanding your views that the international order needs to be updated in terms of its institution, its magnitude to deal with the realities of the new world. But to the extent that we have countries that violate the international order, what is that we do to bring them back into the international order, because I am concerned that if at the end of the day -- just to take Russia by one example, but they're not the only ones -- if you can ultimately go ahead and invade Ukraine, take Crimea, continue to destabilize eastern Ukraine, indiscriminately bomb civilians in Aleppo, try to undermine the Baltic States, try to undermine democracy across Europe and have a cyber attack against the United States in terms of our own democracy. Regardless of whether they succeeded or not, the mere fact that they tried should be upsetting to the President of the United States and to the average citizen and everybody in between.

There has to be consequences for that because otherwise the answer or the message to people -- to countries globally and leaders globally is you can violate the international order and ultimately face little if consequence. So, my question to you is what are best ways in which we get countries that do violate the international order to seek to bring them back within the international order?

ALBRIGHT:

Well, let me say I think that what we have to do is look at all the tools in the toolbox in terms of being able to bring them back. I believe that the previous administration did the right thing in terms of imposing sanctions on Russia for their behavior because what they did was illegal and I think part of it though now is how you get others to be with us on it so therefore diplomacy and getting the European Union to stay with the sanctions program I think is very important.

I also think that public diplomacy -- and this very important -- for people to speak out that our public officials about what has happened because it is completely illegal and needs to be called. The other part, however, is to use some silent diplomacy. And I hope very much then when

Secretary Tillerson goes to Russia that he makes very clear where we are on this, because unless we speak with one voice, it will be very hard for the Russians to get the message.

And the other I think is, in fact, to see how generally the international community can be on the same side of this, so it takes diplomacy. I think sanctions that have to remain in and to make our message completely clear, because if we don't, then it will happen again somewhere else. And I would also use the alliances that we have, NATO, to makes those kinds of statements.

HADLEY:

I think it depends on the country. I think China, most Chinese understand that they have dramatically benefited from this U.S.-led international order over the last 30 years in terms of their own prosperity and security. And that I think for China the way you bring them into the order is actually show them that they can have a place at the table. That there needs to be revisions to the international order to reflect the changes that have occurred. That's why it was so important that Congress finally changed the shares (ph) of the IMF so that China would have a bigger role. I think we also ought to be receptive to proposals of China to supplement that international order like the Asia infrastructure and investment bank which I think is a good thing and I think the United States should have joined.

Russia is a different category. Russia has clearly ripped up the international order in Europe. And that's why the sanctions are appropriate, that's why it is important that we be strengthening NATO, positioning troops in the Baltics and the Balkans and the likes so Russia knows it can't pull again what it did in Ukraine. The question is having put those sanctions and those consequences for the violations for an order, do they want to come back into an international order and how do you walk them back into that order? I think that's the challenge for the new administration and...

MENENDEZ:

So does it concern you as it concerns me that the President as obviously the chief leader in foreign relations has not raised the concerns about Russia that, you know, one would think that he would even as he seeks to develop a new relationship, but that doesn't stop you from calling out a country that has violated the international order, because when you speak, Madam Secretary, you're speaking with one voice. That would be the most powerful voice to send a very clear message to the Russians.

HADLEY:

I think that's right, but I echo the point Senator Corker made, the evolution and the attitude of the administration on Russia since the days of the campaign is pretty dramatic. And it's changed. It's changed because of things that the new administration has heard from the Congress...

MENENDEZ:

Right.

HADLEY:

From friends and allies and from things Putin has done. So Tillerson is now going to go to Russia. There is a policy review going on to try and set the policy for that. I think we need to let this evolution go and I think there will be an opportunity pretty soon early on to see where the administration is heading, but I think there's been a pretty dramatic correction in their attitude towards Russia and I think it's a good thing.

MENENDEZ:

Yes, thank you.

CORKER:

I couldn't agree more and I think people on both sides of the aisle have, as you mentioned, played a big role in that evolution and I think Tillerson is going to be very much in the mainstream of U.S. previous thinking. Flake.

FLAKE:

Thank you. Thank you for your testimony and thank you for your long service to the country. I'd like to know what is your -- what are your thought -- I apologize if it's been asked before -- with regard to the travel ban (sic) that has been proposed? How is that viewed by our allies and our advisories? Does it work in our favor?

ALBRIGHT:

I don't think the travel ban works in our favor. I think that it has made it a more dangerous place for the United States and I have and a number of us have made that point in terms of that it has become a recruiting tool. It's a gift in many ways to ISIS. It also I think undermines what America's really about. We have not discriminated against people coming into this country based on religion and ethnic background and I really do think that it has not been helpful.

I do think that a country is entitled to make decisions about its immigration policies and I do think that it would be very useful if in fact there was an overall approach to what our immigration policy should be.

FLAKE:

Right, thank you. Mr. Hadley.

HADLEY:

Obviously, it is legitimate to say we need to make sure we have the best vetting we can of refugees and immigrants, that's fine. The problem with the ban, of course, is it's had all the negative effects in terms of the reactions about countries overseas and the Muslim community here at home and

it's never been in effect, so it's the worst policy you can have, all the negative effects and none of the benefits, because each version has been quickly suspended by the court.

I would hope the administration is using the time during the fact the period that the ban has been suspended to improve the vetting process so that we in some sense don't need this temporary band and can get back into regular order. I don't know whether they're doing that. I hope they are.

FLAKE:

Thank you. You're talking about the importance of bipartisan foreign policy. Sometimes I think we feel in the Committee that we the last bastion of bipartisanship, but I do feel that it's important what message is sent to our allies and our adversaries abroad when there is disagreement, the failure to agree on an AUMF, for example, and to speak with one voice on foreign policy matters. Why does that matter to our allies and our adversaries.

ALBRIGHT:

I think there are really two parts to it. I do think we need to make clear that in a democracy there is discussion and respectful listening to other people's views. That is one of our strengths. I think the question is how the message is distributed in the first place, which makes it look as though there's massive disorganization rather than really an overall policy.

The other part that I think we often forget is that other countries don't get a clear message about what we're about. And I think that that is what's worrisome. I think some of you were at the Munich Security Conference and it was very clear that people were very confused about what our message really was when we speak and what our words and what our actions. And so there's this balance between making clear that we respect each other's ideas and then looking as though we don't have a policy together.

And may I say I really do understand the need to give a new administration time. But I think there really is a question about how long it takes. And that that is also providing something negative. Most of us travel abroad and I think that people are confused and we only have a certain amount of time to set the message straight.

FLAKE:

Senator (ph).

HADLEY:

Bipartisan foreign policy is going to be much stronger and sustainable. I worry that we're in a situation that when we have a Republican president, we have a Republican foreign policy and then a Democratic President, we have a Democratic foreign policy. And this back and forth flip-flopping is not progress. The foreign policy successes we've had are ones where we've had bipartisan support for a policy that is sustainable over generations of political leaders, quite frankly, whether Republican or Democratic, that's how we ended the cold war successfully, that's

how we dealt with Colombia, that's how we dealt with the war on terror. That's where we make progress and this back and forth is not working for us.

FLAKE:

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CORKER:

I could not agree more and I -- that's why I think this next six months gives us an opportunity that, frankly, we've never had. I mean, let's -- generally speaking, I don't think there is a strongly formulated foreign policy coming out of the White House. I think that's an observation that's fair and I think we have an opportunity to shape that. Senator Coons.

COONS:

Thank you, Chairman Corker, Ranking member Cardin and thank you to both our witnesses for your lifetimes dedicated to public service and to advancing American diplomacy and to defending the post war world war that we built and from which we deeply benefit. I do think it's vital that this Committee in a bipartisan way engage in this conversation both with the administration and with the American people.

So let me ask you first, it was touched on earlier in passing. Given the real disconnect between the political or professional or elite class in Washington that pays attention to foreign policy on a regular basis and is distributed around the country and what we've seen in the last election cycle in both parties a deep skepticism about globalization, about international engagement.

How do we better explain to the American people of the value of international engagement and the need to secure our interest and promote our values? And how would you structure that engagement in a way that actually makes a difference and moves the needle so that we're not just talking to ourselves, but we're engaging with and accountable to our constituents as we try to craft an enduring world order 2.0? If you might, Madam Secretary.

ALBRIGHT:

I think the important part would be take it on the road, frankly. And I think that we not only need to respect each other, but we need to respect the American people and to explain what our foreign policy is about. I have to say I keep trying to make foreign policy less foreign. And basically what needs to happen I think is to identify with the interest of the people in X place and in many ways people do understand that we depend on export market or that our farmers appreciate PL 480 or that there are certain aspects that definitely affect a specific district or a region.

And what I would hope is that you all would go on the road and may I say that I volunteer to go on the road with any of you because I think that's important to have a discussion and that takes it to the American people and understands that our stake -- it is the job of the President of the United

States to protect our people, our territory and our way of life. That depends on how we operate in the world and we need to bring the American people into that discussion.

COONS:

Thank you. Mr. Hadley.

HADLEY:

I completely agree. At the end of our written testimony, we gave you a bit of a roadmap because we think Congress needs to lead this national dialog. The Congress has done it at times in our history in the 19th century, first after the 19th century over the Vietnam issues. I think there's a huge opportunity for Congress in a bipartisan basis to lead this debate. I would urge you to figure out how to use the new media and new vehicles.

Madeleine and I have this long 80-page report which will put you right to sleep though there's a lot of good stuff in it, and we went out on the road with it and she would talk for 10 minutes, I would talk for 10 minutes. The people at the Atlantic Council made a three- minute video that is the essence of the report as the better communication vehicle. I would like to see that Congress figure out how to do the new media so that the American people would look to Congress as the forum for debate on major national issues. I think that's a huge opportunity for you.

COONS:

I agree. I think we may conclude that the outcome of these years is to make the Senate again for a variety of reasons. As you both know, I have an annual conference in Delaware, I've done it six years now that's focused primarily on Africa. It was to try and help explain to the people of my state why I was going to Africa regularly and to help me get better input from them about how it connects to faith communities, to diaspora (ph) communities and to business concerns and opportunities for our state. And I've looked to you as GLC for some partnership in expanding that, broadening it and sustaining it.

I'd be enthusiastic about working with any member of this Committee because I, frankly, think when we go to our home states in bipartisan pairs to talk about and hear about the challenges we face, we strengthen and sustain our long-term work. Could I ask one more quick question, Mr. Chairman?

CORKER:

Sure.

COONS:

As we look at the world order, I'm particularly curious about India. We have, as you both discussed real challenges with both Russia and China and their infractions or persistent and active actions to

remake or violate or break the world order. How do we better engage India? And are you optimistic that they might be a solid partner for us in strengthening and reimagining the world order?

HADLEY:

I think we've already started it and, again, on a bipartisan basis. President Clinton actually started the first outreach to India. Bush administration build on it in terms of the Civil Nuclear deal. The Obama administration pursued it. We all did that because we saw India emerging as a major global player and wanted it to be with us in maintaining that U.S.-led international order, not undermining it. So I think the foundation is laid and I think there's a real opportunity for the Trump administration to build on that because India is increasingly a player and it's in our interest for them to be so since we share a lot of common values.

ALBRIGHT:

We're the world's oldest democracy. They're the largest. We have an awful lot in common. And I think that the bipartisan approach that Steve described, it was great to go to India with President Clinton and then to have it be picked up and it goes to the business that we've been saying earlier. You can't have a Democratic foreign policy and a Republican one. And things kind of take longer to evolve and so I really do think that it's an important relationship by location as well as by character of what the country is about.

COONS:

Terrific. Thank you, both. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CORKER:

Thank you. Senator Shaheen.

SHAHEEN:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, both, very much for being here. I had the opportunity to go with some other folks here to the Munich Security Conference this year. And it struck me as we heard the vice president come and address the group and said all the right things about our relationship to Europe. We heard that from Senator McCain, we heard that from General Mattis and yet the European who were there who I talked to were still very anxious because they were hearing a different message coming from the President.

And it strikes me that one of the challenges that we have right now is getting everybody on the same page when it comes to our foreign policy. So -- and I think one place that that continues to be an issue is in Europe because of Russia and what Russia appears to be doing, but also because of statements that have been made with respect to the E.U., to NATO. And I know you just finished your report on the Middle East and issues have been raised about Russia and China and India, Africa, but it seems to me that one of the places where there is the greatest potential for harm right now is in Europe. With Brexit, with what's happening in the elections with Russia's meddling there

and so what can we do to -- and given the importance of our trans- Atlantic relationship with Europe and the stability that that's provided since World War II, what can we do to better reassure our European friends and allies about our support for Europe and for this relationship? And how we can help as there are challenges that they're facing right now?

ALBRIGHT:

I also was at the Munich Security Conference and I think we've always been the center of attention there, but never in quite the way that made -- was uncomfortable in terms of what America's role was. And I think that part of the issue with Europe is I happen to believe that we always wanted to have a strong European Union, because they are potentially our best partners in doing things in other parts of the world.

They felt that we weren't paying to them enough, but they also have had serious internal problems of kind of the E.U. seems like disconnected bunch of bureaucrats whereas they are not -- they have internal problems and we're seeing them there. I do think that the United States has to have a double approach to this, which is to deal through the European Union and NATO and, by the way, I'm very glad that Secretary Tillerson is now going to a NATO meeting.

SHAHEEN:

Me too.

ALBRIGHT:

But also to look individually at what the countries need and want, especially as there are stresses and strains on it. I do think we have a vital relationship with Germany and Chancellor Merkel's visit here was an important one. I hope the right messages really came through in terms of our support. But I think we need to return to some realization of the centrality of the Euro-Atlantic relationship that it has been the real basis of what our post Cold War security has been about.

SHAHEEN:

Thank you.

HADLEY:

I think we're making progress on that. I didn't go to Munich, but I've heard from Madeleine (ph) and others that that was the rap. We've heard it from Mattis, we need to hear it from President Trump. And my recollection is three days later in his appearance before the joint session of Congress, he embraced NATO pretty strongly. And I think that is helpful. I think the fact that he's having some additional credibility into our foreign policy that we're going forwards the deployments in the Baltic States and Balkans, all that is helping.

And the evolution in the attitude of the administration towards Russia and a more realistic attitude towards Russia I think all of that helps. The NATO thing is think is in the process of being fixed.

I'm more worried about the E.U., President Trump recently did say something like the E.U.'s fine if that's what the Europeans want. But he's put his finger on something. The European project does not have a lot of support in the rank and file among the population. It has not been sold. There are real reservations about it. And the E.U. actually needs to renovate itself if it's going to save itself. And I think that is -- this is really a message the Europeans need to hear.

SHAHEEN:

I appreciate that and I share that concern. One of the places where I think the E.U. could be more helpful than it currently is in the Balkans where the long lead time and I appreciate that we need to support those countries or encourage them to move to more transparent democratic processes. And Secretary Albright I'd be interested in hearing your thoughts about the Balkans, but it seems to me that one concern has been it takes so long to get through the process of joining the E.U. that the public is discouraged before you can get very far down that road and start looking, they start looking elsewhere. But Secretary Albright, can you talk about how -- and my time is up, I know, Mr. Chairman.

CORKER:

(Inaudible).

SHAHEEN:

Just briefly respond on the Balkans.

ALBRIGHT:

Let me just say that part of the issue generally is that success in kind of fragile democracies takes longer than we think. And I happen to -- am concerned about the fact that after the Clinton administration left office that not enough attention was paid to the Balkans that we thought it was all done. It was not all done. And there really are questions.

And I think there are issues in fact, and it's germane to this whole point is where we are not active, the Russians are being very smart in getting in some or another. And I think that the E.U. membership activity is something that's useful and takes too long. That's what happened in Ukraine. And so I think the question is to realize that we're not operating in a field where we have all the time that we want is that there is something else going on. And what Putin wants is to break up Europe. That's my sense is that's his agenda. And we should not be a part of it and we should try to figure out as how to be supportive and push the process forward and not just decide that everything is done everywhere.

SHAHEEN:

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CORKER:

Senator Udall.

UDALL:

Thank you to the panel very much for your testimony today. It's been very engaging and very insightful and I thank the Chairman for your statement in response to Senator Young about the Committee reviewing the 9/11 AUMF. I think that's really important to do and I think many of us have been speaking up on that and I know Senator Young's not here but I look forward to reviewing his AUMF.

Last week I asked Secretary Mattis about the lack of an AUMF in Syria. As you know in Syria the U.S. has not been invited in by the government. U.S. military vehicles, heavy artillery and troops are in Syria and easy to argue that the United States has effectively invaded Syria, violating the sovereignty of a country in the Middle East, which is a de facto declaration of war. Secretary Mattis who I've great respect for answered the question that there was really no border between Iraq and Syria and the United States could not, "Draw that imaginary line in the midst of an enemy." But he also supported the effort to pass a new AUMF calling it, "A statement of the American people's resolve."

I understand Secretary Mattis' response. ISIS doesn't respect international borders, but ISIS is not the only force in Syria. The Assad government is still the internationally recognized government and it is being supported heavily by the Russians and Iranians. I don't think it's right for the U.S. military to become involved in the Syrian civil war based on the 9/11 AUMF. I voted for that AUMF as a House member. I never imagined that vote being used to justify U.S. ground troops in Syria in the year 2017 and I don't think anyone else who voted in favor of it did either.

So my questions to the panel starting with Secretary Albright is do you think the 9/11 AUMF applies to the situation in Syria? What does this mean, this situation we have now in terms of the international rules based order? And are you worried that the conflict could continue to spiral towards a wider conflict that will further entrench the United States in another Middle Eastern war?

ALBRIGHT:

I do think that a new AUMF is necessary because one can interpret and reinterpret, but the bottom line is we need the American people to understand what our role is in whatever country and especially in something that's as complicated as what is going on. And it is a problem between Iraq and Syria and where the border is, but which is exactly the reason why there needs to be more discussion of it.

I also think that we need to understand the U.S. needs to be more involved in the political aspects of this and in fact understanding where Syria's going, how many things need to be done. And by the way, the Atlantic Council put out a terrific film in terms of what the Russian role has been in terms of breaking Aleppo and in terms of what the Russian role in that has been and Ambassador Haley, I think, has been terrific in describing that.

So there needs to be a larger discussion about what we're doing in Syria, what the future of Syria is, why we need to be there and an AUMF is the only way to do it. So I think that having kind of followed the discussions on previous issues, there's no question that it's a complex issue in terms of how much power you give to the executive branch, what the duration of it is, what the various component parts of it is, which is exactly the reason why a deliberate discussion and national one needs to be held.

UDALL:

Mr. Hadley.

HADLEY:

I think the current AUMF does apply to what's going on in Syria because Al-Qaeda is there and ISIS is a successor organization to Al-Qaeda, so I don't think there's any question about the authority of what we're doing. Also, you know, states have a responsibility to govern their territory and make sure they're not used as a basis for attack of their neighbors and we know there is plotting going on in Iraq today directed against Europe and the United States, so we have to defend ourselves against that. So I'm not troubled by that.

What I'm troubled by is that if we make ultimately an accommodation with Assad, we send the message to the world that if you're brutal enough with your own people and kill enough of them, the international community will let you stay in power. And I think it's a terrible message to send to the international community.

UDALL:

Yes. Senator Corker, I would also like to put into the record a New York Times editorial on this called Congress' Duty in the War with ISIS and it specifically mentions our colleague, Senator Kaine who's been who's been pushing a long time to urge that we address the issue an AUMF and really constructively look at this issue as a whole, Democrats and Republicans trying to get what I think you all are urging is a bipartisan foreign policy on these kinds of things. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CORKER:

Thank you. I now have interjected more than I should, but I do want to -- Senator -- Mr. Hadley just stated he believes that the authority to against ISIS exist. The present -- President Obama felt the same thing and I agree 100% that the authority is there. And I think a debate on an AUMF on the other hand is timely and especially with the new administration laying on a strategy.

I will say that it's a pretty short document and it still doesn't draw us into the full debate of what we should be doing, so for us to think for a moment that writing some two or three page document about an AUMF really is the kind of thing that I think these two are laying out it's not. It is not. It causes us to talk about a lot of things that are important, but it in no way comes close to really

focusing on a long-term strategy. But, again, I appreciate the conversation as it is. With that Senator Murphy.

CARDIN:

Mr. Chairman, I just interject just very quickly. Along with Senator Udall, I voted for the AUMF when I was in the House. I really think Senator Udall's absolutely correct. I think any of us who voted for it did not anticipate it would be utilized as it's utilized today. The legal interpretation of the language is subject to the legal scholars and I understand that. But the AUMF is a Congressional authorization and it seems to me that it is the responsibility of Congress to give authorization for the contemporary needs and that was not done in 2001. I think we're stronger if we can do it. So I just make that point that I think is the right thing for us to do.

CORKER:

I think everybody is in a -- most everybody is in agreement. I just again -- I do not think that this administration nor the Obama administration was operating without legal basis when they were going against Al-Qaeda and ISIS, but I agree that it's very healthy to update. I said Murphy, but I meant Markey, thank you.

MARKEY:

I always wanted to name Murphy, but not today. Markey is a much more rare Irish name, thank you. Two years ago, Mitchell Orenstein, Professor of Central and East European Politics at the University of Pennsylvania observed that President Putin's hatred of NATO is well known and that Russia under Putin can never become as democrat (ph) as necessary to become a full member of the European Union or of NATO. And Putin does seem to want to return to 19th century global power politics where authoritarian governments ruled spheres of influence and have a free hand to suppress popular aspirations and democratic government and also on the human rights issue.

At his confirmation hearing in January, Secretary of Defense Mattis said that Putin is trying to break NATO. Likewise, he appears to be trying to break the E.U. So my question is since we know what Putin is trying to do in Europe and what he tried to do here in United States we're all politicians up here, so we know get out the vote effort when we see it. Is in your opinion what Professor Orenstein talking about accurate? Are we in an effort -- are we in a situation where we need to have a proactive policy? And what would be your strategy for us to counteract Putin right now? What would you have us do, the European do in order to push back? Can you give us a one- or a two- or a three-step program that you would like to see us actively implement?

ALBRIGHT:

Well, first of all, I think we need to understand that Central and Eastern Europe was artificially put under the Warsaw Pact and the power of the Soviet Union and when the Cold War ended, the big deal was how, in fact, to let them be a part of a system where people could make up their own minds about where they lived. I'm very proud to have been a part of NATIO expansion in the

beginning and I think that it is not just a military alliance but also a political alliance that has great strength.

I do think, and I've read everything I can about what Putin's strategy is, and what their military doctrine it is in fact to break up NATO, they see NATO as the major threat. It was very interesting to be at the Warsaw Summit last summer and, in fact, that there was a declaration that what we needed to do as far as the Russians or NATO was to do deterrence and dialog. I have explained it sometimes like this. It's a little hard to do both things at the same time. But that is part of the issue is that we need to show the deterrence and therefore I think the movement of the forces that have been undertaken by NATO makes sense. But we also need to have a dialog with the Russians because that was something we began to (inaudible) a Russia- NATO council and a way to make them not isolate them completely. So one has to say that the alliances had not been against them, but that they really need to be brought part of it. I also think that it would be useful.

They have been in violation of the INF Treaty. And I think it is always worth it to call out what's wrong and then try to figure out how to have a dialog on the issues that we can agree with. I don't believe in spheres of influence. I think those countries need to be able to make up their own minds.

MARKEY:

Mr. Hadley.

HADLEY:

Thank you. I would do four things. One, strengthening NATO that means more European spending. Turning into real operational capability. The reposition of forces in the Baltics and the Balkans and Central and Eastern Europe to deter Russia. And reaffirming our commitment to NATO and NATO members' commitment to each other.

Second, I think we need to support the E.U. to renovate itself and build popular support among its populations, so it is a vital institution. And then I would hope it would open its door to further membership.

Third, we need to counter, you know -- Russia is waging a war against western principles of democracy and freedom and making the case for authoritarianism and we have not -- we're not even in that game anymore. And finally I think we have to make -- help Ukraine succeed but do it in a way that does make it -- does not commit it to becoming anti-Russian. It's a delicate balance. I think those are the four things we need to be attending to.

MARKEY:

OK. Does the -- does Brexit harm the E.U. in a way which strengthens Russia?

HADLEY:

It probably does, but Brexit, that is not why the Brexit vote went the way it did. It went because the E.U. actually concept lost the support of the British people.

MARKEY:

(Inaudible) it supports strengthening of E.U. is your point number two. Does Brexit then undermined the E.U, you know -- I understand the reason why it moved that way, but it -- is that effective at harming of the (inaudible) yes.

HADLEY:

In the short run, it probably undermines the E.U. The question is does it provoke the E.U. to revitalize itself and to reengage its populations. If it does, then maybe at some point U.K. would think to reconsider its decision.

MARKEY:

OK, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CORKER:

There again, I hope that the outcome. Senator Murphy.

MURPHY:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I worry that sometimes and we're talking about this administration's policy on Russia we selectively read comments and actions from the administration to create a policy that we want to be true, but is it really true yet. Just as recently as a few days ago, the President of the United States was sending out tweets suggesting that news of Russian interference in the U.S. election was fake. And so I want to believe that realist in this administration are ultimately going to create a more sensible Russia policy. I don't know that the President is there yet. He seems to advertise that pretty regularly to people who follow him.

And I read the 40%, 30% recommended cut to the State Department in that same vein. That is an absolute gift to the Russians, right. They project their power not just through military means, but through propaganda and energy, bullying, through outright graft and intimidation and, you know, it's really the State Department programming that is most effective in pushing back on that.

And so Secretary Albright, I wanted to ask you in that context a more general question which is about our expectations for what the results of our national security budget should be as we approach '17 and '18. The President has made it pretty clear that he doesn't believe that the United States interest can be adequately protected with current appropriations levels for the Department of Defense and he's recommended a pretty robust increase. An increasing that, you know, I think will get bipartisan support. But let me ask you about what our expectations should be for the State Department budget. Do you think that we can adequately protect the U.S. interests abroad, Russia, you know, as an example, with the current appropriations for the State Department, i.e., should we

be in a debate about a 40% cut versus flat funding or should we be suggesting that if the Defense Department is going to get plussed (ph) up to meet these new threats, then we also have to demand that our non (inaudible) tools get similar attention?

ALBRIGHT:

I have to say I always was in a difficult position when I saw the size of the defense budget versus the size of the foreign policy budget, I mean, 10 times as much and kind of the weak partner in this when, in fact, the kinds of work in terms of diplomacy or programs where we do -- people were talking about education, for instance, and exchanges and our public diplomacy and our assistance programs. There's no way that this can be done by cutting the budget. It is barely adequate in the first place and then we pay -- it comes to United Nations bills and dues come out of that, various support things. And I think that it is -- we are under cutting our own power by cutting the State Department budget.

I do think it is worth always looking at where savings can be made -- the Pentagon might do that also -- and basically -- but I think that we are under cutting the power of the United States and the security of the American people if in fact we cut the State Department budget.

MURPHY:

Mr. Hadley, I wanted you to maybe try to operationalize one of your key recommendations which is with respect to the proxy wars playing out in the Middle East today. You have one recommendation in which you say listen the Middle East has to sort of take control of their own affairs and yet with respect to Iran, you do recommend that we continue to try to push back against their advancements in the region. Those two may be don't square with each other in part because the U.S. has lent unprecedented levels of support to the Saudis, military support over the last eight years to help them win that battle in the region.

So maybe operationalize this, maybe in the context of Yemen, right, a place where the proxy war is real, it exists today. There is right now proposals on the table from the Trump administration to lend new serious military support to the coalition mainly to the Saudis, and yet it doesn't seem like there's any diplomatic component to that strategy. There is a potential diplomatic solution, a political solution inside Yemen, but today it doesn't seem as if there is any effort in the administration to try to find that. you sort of suggest threading the needle, pushing back against Iran, while keeping the door open to political negotiation and discussion. Isn't Yemen maybe an example in which ultimately a political solution has to be found and if you close that door, you're closing yourself off to, you know, any real potential settlement there?

HADLEY:

Yes, I think it's difference between what we call prong one of our strategy and prong two. in terms of winding down the civil wars. The countries in the region can't do it themselves outside intervention is required with the support of friends and allies in the region. Prong two, which is renovation of these societies. Though the countries and the peoples of the region have to take the

lead on that, we have to support them. Yemen, difficult problem. Of course, we need a diplomatic solution.

The way our policy -- and I think what the Saudi and UAE and the administration are talking about is a way to get to a diplomatic outcome. People don't understand. I was told just yesterday that there were 70 strikes, missile and rocket strikes from Yemen into Saudi and 400 schools have been closed in Saudi Arabia because of the threat posed from Yemen. So this is real national security challenge. And what the Saudis and UAE wanted to see is an American policy that understands and helps them deal with that challenge. And I think the changes that are being contemplated are useful in that respect.

What -- if you talk and -- I know you have talked to all of them and they say to you the same thing they say to me. They want to get in a situation where there is a political resolution that is acceptable to the Yemenese, but it doesn't have either Houthis which represent about 70,000 or 80,000 folks taking over the whole country, and they haven't been able to get there. And I think what they're trying to design is a strategy to support our friends and allies in the region, get some progress on the ground and to set up a situation where there could be a diplomatic outcome. That I think is what they're trying to do. I hope they succeed.

CORKER:

Senator Kaine.

KAINE:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thanks to the witnesses. My Chair will be disappointed with me if I don't just weigh in on the Yemen -- of course on the AUMF. I do think we're in a position and I agree with the Chair that it's a propitious time because of the change of the administration, because of the development of the anti-ISIS plan that I hope will be briefed on. But also because of the deepening level of conflict in new theaters. We've seen the first ground operations by the United States military in Yemen and significantly increasing ground operations beyond just special forces in Syria.

And the activity in Syria raises a tough question because unlike Iraq or Yemen or Afghanistan, we're not in Syria at the request of the government. Russia was invited into Syria by the government and Vladimir Putin had the Duma vote on it before he went in. And so this is just the time where for many reasons -- there are many of us who actually feel like their current operations are not authorized by domestic law and the source of our belief is comparing the 9/11 authorization that Congress rejected, the request that President Bush made was turned down in the wording that the administration asked for. And the original wording would clearly have covered everything. But Congress rejected a broad AUMF and decided to make it narrower, so many of us feel like we really are on legal thin ice. But be that as it may, I think there is -- you know, the lawyers will defer about this. I think the time is right and I look forward to the discussion as the change of administration, new strategies in place.

Lot of good questions have been asked and -- that I was going to ask, but you've already covered it. Let me just bring you into a new area we haven't talked about yet. I was at two subcommittee hearings yesterday. One was about the U.S. Mexico relationship and one was about sort of strategy vis-a-vis China and it was interesting. U.S.- Mexico relationship, there's a lot of concern that some of the rhetoric from the President might have an effect on domestic Mexican politics and, you know, possibly increase the odds of a Chavez-type leader being elected President of Mexico. We talked a little bit about that.

On the China hearing, we talked about China's increasing investments in Venezuela and other nations to our south in the Americas. And Robert Gallucci, Ambassador Gallucci was the witness from Georgetown. And he basically said yesterday, yes, you know, China actually has a much more defined strategy about the Southern Hemisphere, Africa, and Latin America than the United States does. This is a hearing about big picture, about if we're -- if we are engaged around, you know, big picture definition or strategy, how about the Americas? How about Yukon to Patagonia, you know, why should our thinking about these 37 nations of a billion people after the Colombian ceasefire without war for the first time probably in recorded human history, how should we be thinking about the Americas as we're articulating a strategy? So it's not just a Northern Hemisphere or NATO or East-West route that our diplomats travel, but that we take the responsibilities in the Southern Hemisphere, especially in the Americas seriously.

ALBRIGHT:

Let me just say our policies vis-a-vis the -- in the hemisphere have always been complicated. It's a little bit damned if you do, damned if you don't in terms of mucking around or not paying attention. But I do think without making it be a sphere of interest, which I think we have to be very careful about, I do think we need to have better relationships that are respectful. And you mentioned Colombia.

Colombia is a perfect example of a bipartisan foreign policy that actually took quite a long time to effectuate. I do think that we need to look at what is necessary in those countries, whether it has to do with the problems that they have, some created by us and the drug issues that come up, but also how to see how the OAS can operate. We talk a lot about the role of regional organizations these days. The OAS was the original one in all of this and I think it's important to look at where that goes.

I also do think the other point is the Chinese are willing to come in wherever there is a vacuum. We have seen that not only in this hemisphere, but also in Africa and other places and I think that we have to be very careful about what is going on. But I think we have not paid enough attention. I think what has helped, frankly, is the change in our relationship with Cuba and potentially so that when President Obama went to an OAS meeting, that was not the only -- or the Summit of the Americas -- that was not the only subject.

KAINE:

Yes, it cleared out an obstacle. That was an obstacle for a lot of the other nations (ph).

ALBRIGHT:

Yes, and so I do think that there are opportunities and it has to be viewed, but not as us taking advantage of Latin America but having it be genuinely a partnership in terms of the issues that take place.

KAINE:

Mr. Hadley.

HADLEY:

I agree with what Madeleine has said. You know, we've had a lot of literature now talking about the North America strategy, which we didn't talk about that way 10 years ago. I'd like to hear us have a Western Hemisphere strategy. You know, the Chinese I think appreciate the importance of Latin America perhaps at this point more than we do. And I think the fact that Chavez -- Chavezistas are sort of in decline in Latin America is a real opportunity for us to engage in a hemisphere wide dialog about where do we want this hemisphere to go in this 21st century and I'd like to see us start thinking about a hemispheric strategy, not just a North American strategy.

KAINE:

Thank you so much. Thanks, Mr. Chair.

CORKER:

Thank you. I thank you both for being here and we all admire so much the work that you have done and continue to do. And I notice Secretary Albright probably took a step back at some of my comments about the State Department. I just want to say, look, I think we've lost the American people on foreign policy in many ways and I think this last election was in some ways about it. I appreciate the comments that have been made about us maybe going out into the country discussing these things. I think that will be very important.

But I think there's a huge disconnect between the American people and our foreign policy and I think that's partially our fault. I think it's -- you know, a lot of reasons for that. And I think that to the extent we can do everything we can both at the U.N. and at the State Department to make sure that everything we're doing matters and that we're not doing wasteful things that don't matter, I think that actually builds a case for us to be able to do some of the important transformative things that I see us doing around the world. So I'm all for Secretary Tillerson and (inaudible) I really am. I couldn't be more in support of his efforts to look at the organization. He'll do that in conjunction with us, he won't do that -- he won't be behind what happens here budgetarily, because we always do things way beyond when we're supposed to. So I'm actually very excited about that and encouraging him on at this.

And I think Nikki Haley last night was laying out -- I know that she's planning on significant reforms, significant reforms that seem to be being received very well by our partners there on the

U.N. Security Council. So those things excite me because what they do is not weaken us, they build strength when people think that what we're doing is connected to, number one, making sure we're spending our monies wisely, but that also towards our national interest.

I don't think we did enough here today to really talk about what our core national interest are and I know that's sometimes difficult in a setting when each person has their particular issue, but my sense is we really do have and I could be wrong and I know there's still tensions about the November 8 election, but I think we got more opportunity than ever -- than ever to come up with a bipartisan strategy on the various areas of the world that matter.

I really believe that and Secretary Gates, who admire, you know, as much as I do our two witnesses, has continually talked about the Cold War and I think he's exactly right. We had 50 years of common policy. And I don't want to diminish our Cold War warriors, but, God, it was so much easier than where we are today with the various issues that are happening around the world. So this is a wonderful time for our Committee for great members like you who've been so engaged in these things, have lived overseas, care about these issues deeply.

I cannot thank you enough for your contribution. I understand that you'd like to have this report entered into the record and without objection it will be. And if you want to say any closing comments that you weren't asked about or you want to get something out that you'd like to vent, we'd be more than welcome for that right now.

ALBRIGHT:

Thank you, because I don't want this to seem out of order. But let me just say the following thing. I teach at Georgetown in the School of Foreign Service which are people that want to think about having an international career. And I am getting questions as to whether they should take the foreign service exam or be a part of our Diplomatic Service given what is going on. And so I think we need to think about what the future of diplomacy is. And part of it has to do with the money now, but I also think just so you know, there's kind of a weird feeling...

CORKER:

Yes.

ALBRIGHT:

The other part that bears specifically and we've been talking about educating the American people in many ways. The ban and the immigration policy has made it very complicated for universities to welcome students from foreign countries. I can tell you that that is what is absolutely basic in terms of having an American population that understands what our needs are, what our policies are vis-a-vis the rest of the world. So we need to think about the next generation.

CORKER:

Yes.

ALBRIGHT:

In terms of having this discussion and how it is affecting what the future of America's position is in the world. Thank you.

CORKER:

Well, I would like to respond and Kaine may want to also, but, look, as a person who travels pretty extensively around the world, I would say to these young students, absolutely, we've got a whole generation of people who are retiring out of foreign service that have been around for many, many years and I don't -- I can't imagine a better time to be taking the foreign service test and to be coming into this service, diplomatically. We have more problems today than we've ever had it seems and they need to be dealt with in this manner.

As it relates to the administration, I think that Senator McConnell may have said it best and, you know, I don't always quote him, but "I would not pay attention to what's being said, I would pay attention to what is being done." And I think if you look at people like Tillerson, Mattis, McMaster coming in, I just have a sense that we're going to end up in a pretty decent place as it relates to our foreign policy. I can't speak to some of the messages that are going out, but what I can say is I think we have some really capable people that are in these positions that truly are embracing Congress more so than I've ever seen a group come in. And I think we've -- if we can move beyond some of the shocks that have occurred and some of the statements that are made, I think we can truly put in place together, help put in place some great policies for our country. So I don't know if you want to retort to that.

ALBRIGHT:

Thank you very, very much and I -- I think I speak for both of us that this was a remarkable opportunity to air views and I hope that in some settings we can continue to do that, because I believe that it is time for a national debate and I can't think of a better group of people to do it with than all of you.

CORKER:

Well, thank you. Thank you, both. There'll be some questions that will come in. We'd like to leave the record open until Monday afternoon. To the extent you have time, we'd appreciate if you, you know, answer those. I know you have staff members who'll help you with that, but it's been a real pleasure and an honor for us to have you and thank you.