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Abstract: Post-Cold War and post-9/11 threats to national security have impacted the purpose and goals of foreign assistance and the methods or approaches to accomplishing international development goals. To better address the mounting challenges in the rapidly changing global context, the US Government has redefined the role of foreign assistance with implications for traditional and emerging diverse partners. The main goals of foreign assistance are presented here to instruct the cadre of potential allies assisting the pursuit of the transformational diplomacy goal. US involvement within the development community is influenced by policy that provides guidance and a purpose through which resources can be aligned with objectives. A theoretical framework of that new foreign assistance policy is described to instruct development scholar practitioners. A people centered philosophical core and its corollaries buttress the strategic engagement with the development community thereby creating opportunities for new partners to fulfill the US humanitarian and developmental assistance goals. This paper addresses these issues. New partners are invited to contribute and add value to the development continuum that sustains livelihoods and communities. The role of USAID development practitioners, Institutions of Higher Education, including Minority Serving Institutions (MSIs) as partners for development is discussed throughout.

Introduction

Over the past four decades, the literature addressing concepts related to leadership (Loomis 1961, Etzioni 1964), organizations (Bennis 1966) and complex organizations (Parsons 1960) continued to evolve gaining relevance within various disciplines. The overarching theme in these discourses frames a system of dynamic, interdependent and interrelated parts at play as in the role of the leader, vis-à-vis the members of the organization, vis-à-vis the members of the community (the environment), vis-à-vis the policymakers. The systems approach to organizational development, problem solving, community development, policy planning and the like became a prevailing paradigm. This paper is intended to provide guidance for would be partners at Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) and development practitioners interested in furthering the goals of sustainable development throughout the world with use of US foreign assistance resources.

1 The information and views presented in this article are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views or the positions of the U.S. Agency for International Development or the U.S. government.
Within the international development context, the discussion over the last thirty years has focused more so on the roles played by program planners, implementers and their relationship with stakeholders and beneficiaries. Herisse (1995) pointed to the postmodern paradigm where human relational dynamics and the role of the leader/leadership led to the transformation of organizations, policies and processes. According to Jennings (2000) the “people centered” principles also emerged from postmodernism and chaos theory emphasizing a renewed focus on the partners for development, from the leadership, to the membership, to the approach applied in accomplishing the transformation desired. His insightful work prompted further curiosity to ascertain the philosophical grounding of what became (according to some) a radical change to US foreign assistance. The theoretical link was made thusly:

In international relief and development organizations…“people centered” practice became “participatory development” and great deal of persistent and determined effort went into fending off old dragons to ensure “participation” occurred in the design, implementation and evaluation of many programs.²

During the early months of 2004, the US Agency for International Development (USAID) issued a White Paper entitled, “Meeting the Challenges of the 21st Century” which began efforts to “clarify the evolving role of U.S. foreign assistance in a rapidly changing global context.” The White Paper framed the 3D’s—the integration of diplomacy, defense and development—as the driving force for national defense planning. The Paper also suggests ways to increase aid effectiveness and policy coherence through greater clarity of purpose, alignment of resources with objectives, and strategic management.”³ That stance was predicated by the fact that U.S. foreign assistance had to address more than humanitarian and developmental goals considering the many threats to national security in the post-Cold War, post-9/11 world. Exacerbating the traditional development leadership roles and function were conditions of instability and insecurity that arise from terrorism, transnational crime, failing states, and global disease. These conditions and circumstances must continually be mitigated for sustained economic and social development to take root and flourish.⁴

The Transformation of US Foreign Assistance

Under the previous USAID and Department of State organizational structure, each entity maintained independent budgeting and planning offices to focus on their own part of foreign assistance. This format required two staffs to develop multiple and parallel versions of their individual budgets in the same subject areas, two staffs to agree to and integrate a set of numbers, two staffs to brief the Congress, and a myriad of programs that may be redundant—or worse, working at cross purposes. While each agency collaborated with the other, and despite the best efforts of the people involved, it was done at enormous cost in terms of time, personnel, and impact.

⁴ Ibid.
In announcing her Transformational Diplomacy and Development initiative in the latter part of 2005 and early 2006, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice noted that both the content and organization of foreign assistance required adjustment to meet the challenges of today’s world. This new paradigm has the goal of “Helping to build and sustain democratic, well-governed states that will respond to the needs of their people and conduct themselves responsibly in the international system.” From the US standpoint, Secretary Rice (2006) remarked:

Our current approach to foreign assistance planning and budgeting is fragmented across multiple departments and agencies, duplicative, and difficult to track. The result is poor accountability and a lack of focus—all matters that dilute our impact. … The world has changed and we must make adjustments to recognize that change. As we all recognize, globalization has drastically reduced the barriers to communication with our international neighbors, allowing ideas, goods, and people to travel across borders at speeds unknown just a decade ago. The ease of proximity makes our security vulnerable to previously unheeded enemies. The locus of national security threats has shifted to the developing world, where poverty, oppression, injustice and indifference are exploited by our foes to provide haven for criminals and the planning of criminal acts. Foreign assistance is an effective tool for countering these new threats, and thus has become a foundational pillar of our new national security architecture.⁵

In January 2006, Secretary Rice announced a major change in the way the US government directs foreign assistance. “In a time of transformational diplomacy — as America works with our partners to build and sustain democratic well-governed states — changes are necessary to meet new challenges.” This reorganization will:

- Ensure that foreign assistance is used as effectively as possible to meet our broad foreign policy objectives;
- More fully align the foreign assistance activities carried out by the Department of State and USAID; and
- Demonstrate that we are responsible stewards of taxpayer dollars.

Serving concurrently as USAID Administrator and Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance, Administrator designate Henrietta Fore is charged with directing the transformation of the U.S. Government approach to foreign assistance to ensure that foreign assistance is used as effectively as possible to meet broad foreign policy objectives. She holds a rank equivalent to Deputy Secretary.⁶ The Director of Foreign Assistance:

- Has authority over all Department of State and USAID foreign assistance funding and programs, with continued participation in program planning, implementation, and oversight from the various bureaus and offices within State

⁵ [http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2006/59306.htm](http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2006/59306.htm)
and USAID, as part of the integrated interagency planning, coordination and implementation mechanisms;

■ Develops a coordinated USG foreign assistance strategy, including multi-year country specific assistance strategies and annual country-specific assistance operational plans;

■ Creates and directs consolidated policy, planning, budget and implementation mechanisms and staff functions required to provide umbrella leadership to foreign assistance;

■ Provides guidance to foreign assistance delivered through other agencies and entities of the USG, including the Millennium Challenge Corporation and the Office of the Global AIDS Coordinator; and

■ Serves as USAID Administrator (was nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate on March 29, 2006).

For Fiscal Year (FY) 2008, President Bush submitted to Congress the first-ever combined USAID-Department of State budget for U.S. Foreign Assistance incorporating the reform efforts that harmonize disparate budget cycles.

As a result, the new U.S. foreign assistance framework depicts the overarching goal “to help build and sustain democratic, well governed states that respond to the needs of their people, reduce widespread poverty and conduct themselves responsibly in the international system.” The broad spectrum of this goal aims at:

■ Promoting transformational development
■ Strengthening fragile states
■ Providing humanitarian relief
■ Supporting U.S. geostrategic interests
■ Mitigating global and transnational ills

Each of the foregoing presents distinct challenges, and achieving each will require different knowledge base, skill sets, and responses.

Considering USAID’s complex and dynamic challenges, the foreign assistance goal has been reframed in light of the conditions prevailing in those communities wherever those results are pursued. From that context, the USAID resources for foreign assistance are packaged to support the following objectives:

■ Peace and Security
■ Governing Justly and Democratically
■ Investing in People
■ Economic Growth
■ Humanitarian Assistance

Moreover, the world community has been subdivided into five broad category definitions, namely nations that are:
Rebuilding—States in or emerging from internal or external conflict (i.e., Afghanistan, Haiti, Kosovo, Sierra Leone, etc.).
Developing—States of low or lower middle incomes that do not meet Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC)\(^7\) criteria (a majority of countries where USAID operates).
Transforming—States with low or lower middle incomes that do meet MCC criteria (i.e., Bolivia, Ghana, India, Philippines, etc.).
Sustaining Partnership—States that are upper middle-income or greater and that support partnerships, progress and peace (i.e., Argentina, Croatia, Egypt, South Africa, etc.).
Restrictive Countries—States of concern, where there are significant governance issues (i.e., Belarus, China, Iran, North Korea).

The graphic below depicts the **USAID Country Level Assistance Matrix**\(^8\).

The Matrix above is depicted as a wheel for some obvious reasons. The inner wheel of broad category definitions “turns” according to unique country situations. As an example, USG assistance to Haiti, a rebuilding country, can be in the form of

---


\(^8\) This matrix and the general theme of this paper were inspired by Jeffrey R. Lee, EGAT, Agribusiness and Markets Team Leader, from a presentation “Is There a Role for Agricultural Development in Transformational Diplomacy?” presented at Tuskegee University, October 2006.
humanitarian assistance, and/or economic growth. While all these elements (broad pursuit or goal and development environment or category) require a deep understanding of the local context and drivers of change, each must be approached with different considerations for risk, relevance, program design, and accountability. Whenever faced with such considerations, the lenses with which one approaches to decipher the makeup of the parts and their relational significance are of utmost importance. To that end, the analysis of the evolution of the emerging foreign assistance and international development paradigm revealed a consistent theme. Moreover, it is essential for academics and scholar practitioners to link their theories to real world applications or whenever they approach or imply policy changes.

The Prevalence of the People Centered Core in the Emerging USAID Development Paradigm

A review of the literature on Organizational Development9, Leadership10 and Community Development11 revealed a recurring theme that placed a great value on the human involvement or relations and interactions. Within these broad categories, the end result was affected by the roles played by the people—whether it involved policy planning, program design, development administration, and project implementation.

The systems approach was useful to understand the broad framework that was emerging. With the systems approach, the viable parts and their interrelationships were explainable to both internal and external stakeholders (Herisse 1995). According to Katz and Kahn (1978), problems of relationships, of structure, and of interdependence are the basic concerns of systems theory. When applied to international development, the result is a holistic view of the whole with all its interrelated and interdependent parts. Not only are development practitioners using the systemic model or systems approach for program design in conducting needs assessments, it is also useful in program implementation.

Jennings (2000) linked the systemic development to a “people first” paradigm shift that engages communities holistically to achieve transformational outcomes in a participatory manner.

“This newer paradigm maintained that big was not always better, centralized hierarchies were suspect, big outcomes may be born of small inputs and that a “more heads are better than one” philosophy would more readily sustain productive, durable change…Few advances withstood erosion by the still intact traditional systems they were intended to transform.”12

According to the World Bank’s Participation Learning Group, “participation is a process through which stakeholders influence and share control over development initiatives and

the decisions and resources which affect them”. Effective participation is an engaging process whereby real communication takes place—considering the sender-message-receiver-feedback continuum. In that case, development practitioners are required to actually listen to the feedback on the transformational process in the form of feedback. The new paradigm seeks the emergence of participants who go beyond the old thresholds of indirect interventions and shuttle diplomacy. The human dimension of communication and in international development is stressed here once more because strategic failure is not an option. Past successes in this sort of engagement between Minority Serving Institutions (the US Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs) and Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs)) with limited resource farming communities and disenfranchised clients represent an untapped potential for promoting the participation agenda.

The graphic below with a “People Centered Core” depicts the logical path of the “interrelated and interdependent parts” mentioned earlier. The intent here is to show how systems engage, evolve, and transform. To that end, the Country Level Assistance Matrix above and the People Centered Core are seemingly at the crossroads for performing humanitarian assistance and development. Together, they illustrate the foreign assistance paradigm that is emerging at USAID. The two templates are also effective when viewed side by side because of the underlying themes identified in this paper.

Viewing the framework in a clockwise manner, the process begins with a Systemic Development tool such as a Participatory Rural Appraisal or a Rapid Rural Appraisal which calls for the Participation of the stakeholders in a Participatory Development program also known as Transformational Development because the program involves more than technological transfers.

The People Centered Core at USAID

---

The development program or intervention involves decision makers in the communities and inspires **Transformational Leadership** among the citizenry. In an instance where theory approaches policy, the new US foreign assistance paradigm stresses for the transformed leaders around the world to develop an enabling environment for **Transformational Diplomacy** vis-à-vis the US presence in the country and the sustainable democratic governance afforded by US international partner States.

**Transformational Development Applications to Development**

The evolved paradigm of development assistance focused on technology transfer and capacity building (now human resource development as per the Matrix). These programs were indistinguishable in their approach that included international experts as leaders (Managers) and highly sophisticated technologies as inputs (computers, irrigation systems, “improved seeds”, and heavy machinery, etc.). As the name implies, this transferential development model alone proved to be relatively less successful and more expensive. In their heyday, these programs were being designed by development agents and agencies in search of rapid impact and quick absorption of development resources. Their needs assessments would be limited to the capital city or urban centers where the infrastructure is best, logistics are suitable and qualified staffs are readily available.

Considering their general focus to the urban and peri-urban settings with their established nuclei of complementary industries and services, the transferential mode largely benefited entrenched urban elites. As Ruddle and Rondinelli (1978) remarked, “although commonly raising gross productivity and income levels in the rural sector, the transferential approach to development often exacerbated existing inequities in distribution of income and wealth.”

Complementing the transfer of technologies, techniques and institutions, the transformational approach argues "... that directed change in resource use must be appropriate to existing local systems, and should aim at finding critical points and processes within these systems that can benefit from and sustain specific changes; and [that] prior to formulating and instituting change, more sensitive forms of socio-cultural and environmental 'impact' assessment are needed."

Ruddle and Rondinelli (1978) explain that “transformational development is a deeper-reaching approach which … seems particularly well-suited to the development of marginal areas and to the implementation of an equitable growth policy. Consistent with the systemic development corollary, its main underlying principles are that development efforts never start with a clean slate, nor do they exist within a vacuum. Something else always existed before the practitioner’s intervention—at the least, a community with established values, assets, and coping mechanisms.

---

The transformational approach to implementing equitable growth policies is different from earlier ones in its underlying concepts. Rondinelli and Ruddle (1978) note that "unlike development strategies that attempt to substitute modern organizations, technologies and methods of production, attitudes and social relationships for 'traditional' institutions and practices, transformational development seeks to increase incrementally the productivity of indigenous institutions and practices, reinforcing and building on those appropriate to local conditions and needs and adaptive to changing circumstances, and gradually displacing those that are not."

Canvassing the literature, Rondinelli and Ruddle (1978) describe eight basic principles of transformational development:

1. Building on existing culturally embedded resources, institutions and practices;
2. Involving local people who will be affected by transformation and change in the process of development planning and implementation;
3. Adapting modern technologies, services and facilities to local conditions, resources and capabilities;
4. Promoting specialization in production and exchange activities based on existing resource, human and spatial comparative advantages;
5. Using appropriate, low-cost, culturally acceptable methods of change to generate "demonstration effects" that lead to widespread adoption of methods that have been tested in the local area and have been proven successful;
6. Planning for the displacement of unproductive and inadaptable traditional methods, institutions and practices as change occurs;
7. Establishing, through planning based on "strategic intervention", preconditions for change and transformation in social, technical, political and administrative structures and processes and in elements of the spatial structure; and,
8. Creating a planning process that is flexible, incremental and adaptive and that provides for experimentation and adjustment as transformation takes place.  

Activating transformational development plans depends on providing decision-makers and planners with more appropriate information about the implications of alternative courses of action in specific circumstances. The success of transformational development depends as well on the organization of technologies and institutions that are appropriate for and relevant to the socio-cultural, economic, biological and physical environments of the particular areas to be developed. While this literature and the resultant theories are not immediately linked to U.S. Government policy formation, current USAID strategies and rhetoric, or the Secretary of State’s assertions about transformational diplomacy, they can still serve as a framework for academics at the academy and practitioners in the discipline. Furthermore, the important policy implication to the transformational diplomacy goal is greater sustainability and host country leadership through: increased reliance on indigenous organizations; and increased number of organization involved in foreign assistance. Well how is this done? What are the anticipated roles for institutions

---

of higher education, scholars, practitioners and the many partners in the non-government organization (NGO) community?

**Opportunities for Institutions of Higher Education**

The implications of the emergence from this paradigm shift affect scholars and practitioners from Institutions of Higher Education that can be engaged to assist USAID in the full adoption of this approach to development. The reason is because if transformational development is to succeed, USAID’s technical officers and project development officers will need to translate programs and projects from policies to plans. The role of education and educators is preponderant because the science of leadership within cultural contexts can best be taught and exemplified from those vantage points. Thus, institutions of higher education should develop curriculum and programs that are congruent with cultural traditions. They must also serve as catalysts for change, transforming developmentally inadequate practices and behavior at a locally acceptable pace. This process often requires blending traditional and modern procedures to produce imaginative and flexible new systems. Moreover and as shown here, the transformation process is human-centered and calls for people to people engagement. These are the types of engagements that institutions like Tuskegee University have been doing since 1954.

Rondinelli (1979) provided some insights into what practitioners might consider in programming for transformational development.

> …An innovative rural education system, for instance, might combine elements of formal, non-formal and informal methods to reach the rural poor. It might use a traditional, informal arrangement as the primary vehicle, making it an entry point for non-formal, and perhaps even formal, education. Similarly, an appropriate agricultural extension system would combine, transform and disseminate with modifications to the process based on evaluation by users, information about marketing opportunities, new seed varieties, modern techniques, information on farmers' problems and current prices. The information would be transmitted, after translating it into the language of the subsistence households by building on existing knowledge through channels already familiar to them: mass media, pamphlets, brochures, posters, formal meetings and demonstrations.16

Institutions of Higher Education, including the US Minority Serving Institutions described earlier (HBCUs, HSIs and TCUs) must be mindful to properly preserve traditional institutions and prevailing coping mechanisms so not to create leadership vacuums in their absence. As Lele (1975) experienced from lessons learned on development projects in Africa, “where institutions are established on a temporary or ad hoc basis, as are many rural development project implementation units, special attention must be given to transferring functions, methodologies and outputs to regular

---

administrative agencies in order to ensure beneficiaries continuing services when the project is completed.”17

From the perspective of long-term U.S. interests, the goal of transformational development remains the best investment. Only through building good policies, stable institutions, and local capacity will developing countries create their own prosperity and assume responsibility for their own security. As a nation develops, it has less need for external aid to deal with disasters and conflict or to address disease pandemics and transnational crime. Stable, prosperous, democratic nations make better partners for the United States as they address their own interests from a foundation of interdependence. And, such countries offer growing opportunities for mutually beneficial trade and investment.18 A tremendous opportunity has emerged for Institutions of Higher Education and Minority Serving Institutions (MSIs) to contribute to the development of these future leaders through coursework, apprenticeships, and exposure to transformational leadership in effect. Moreover, language education is becoming a greater necessity for development practitioners to truly engage transformational processes. New and innovative approaches to language instruction, beyond the traditional classics (English, French, and Spanish) to new societies (i.e., Dari, Farsi, Hindi, Arabic, Chinese, etc.) should be developed for current and new cadre of Foreign Service personnel.

Transformational Leadership in the USAID Development Paradigm

Earlier in this presentation, a distinction was made between transferational and transformational development. Here, while avoiding the popular transactional versus transformational leader debate, consider the end sought in the foreign assistance goals as described in the USAID development paradigm. Transformational leadership motivates others to do more than they originally intended, more than they thought possible, and to move beyond self-interest and focus on the larger goals of the group or organization. As Carey (1992) has argued, it is possible to see transformational leadership as promoting the end values of justice, equality, and human rights, as well as endorsing the model values of honesty, loyalty and fairness as its basis for influencing change.

Practitioners are required to be guarded against instances where this style is subverted to endorse perverse end values such as racial superiority, submission, and Social Darwinism. Bass (1997) makes a fascinating philosophical connection between transformational leadership and organizational development. To make the point, he cites Stevens, D’Intino and Victor who “accuse transformational leaders of changing the values of the employees of an organization so they will adopt them as their own which fundamentally violates the democratic and humanistic values" of Organizational Development. In this case, however, from viewing the Country Level Assistance Matrix above, it appears that USAID has considered this element. Moreover and as Bass (1997)

explained, “humanism and democracy require that all change and development efforts be without coercion or dictation but rather result from participative leadership.”

Herisse (1995) traces transformational leadership in the literature from as far back as John Dewey and B.F. Skinner (1910) and their Behavioral Approach to leadership. The major premise of that leadership frame is:

Every decision must ultimately be expressed as a behavior. Leader controls group’s overall behavior and performances by providing stimuli as reinforcements.

Similar attributions can be made to Abraham H. Maslow (1954) and his Relational Approach for which the major premise is:

Leader’s needs explain how social relationships can be coordinated with organizational goals to maximize performance satisfaction and productivity.

The challenge for USAID practitioners and implementation partners, therefore, is to assure that transformational leadership and the new foreign assistance goals do not obfuscate “real” development. The “real” development was defined thusly (Herisse 2004):

Development is the process by which the members of a society expand themselves and their institutions. It requires that they pursue this goal in ways that enhances their ability to mobilize and manage resources to produce sustainable and justly distributed improvements in the quality of life consistent with their own aspirations.

Avolio, Waldman, and Yammarino (1991) introduced perhaps the greatest contribution to our understanding of transformational leadership. They identified four characteristics, referred to as the four "I's", which transformational leaders use to stimulate and engage followers.

The four I's of transformational leadership are:

1. Individualized Consideration: Gives personal attention to others, making each individual feel uniquely valued.
2. Intellectual Stimulation: Actively encourages a new look at old methods, stimulates creativity, encourages others to look at problems and issues in a new way.
3. Inspirational Motivation: Increases optimism and enthusiasm, communicates high expectations, points out possibilities not previously considered.
4. Idealized Influence: Provides vision and a sense of purpose. Elicits respect, trust, and confidence from followers.

Heretofore the discussion has been focused on the ability of the leaders to inspire and cajole others into a desired goal that surpasses even their own expectations. The type of

19 http://www.academy.umd.edu/publications/klspdocs/bbass_p1.htm
development that is touted in the new USAID paradigm, as a people centered concept has similar ends in sight. A dose of caution was offered from a USAID Foreign Service Officer. While assigned to northern Iraq as USAID Regional Coordinator in Kirkuk (2005-2006) to plan and program assets from USAID, the Department of Defense, and the Provincial Reconstruction Teams, Ronald Senykoff experienced the value of “focus of effort”. In his words, “we need to have true strategic leadership to cause a focusing of program efforts. Otherwise we just rename our program activities.”

Policy Implications from Transformational Diplomacy in Development

At first glance, the link between Diplomacy and Leadership and Development are not immediately recognizable. In fact, there is no direct correlation (that I know of) between the Secretary of State and Rondinelli and Ruddle’s (1978) eight transformational development principles. In fact, on the development side, there are concerns that diplomacy is incongruent to development and therefore should be left out of the USAID portfolio. Heretofore, the territorial lines from the different US Government personnel working overseas are dissected. With its stable of development agents, USAID is seemingly poised to assist in rebuilding, developing and transforming countries. Since its inception, USAID has enabled the transformation of communities either through agricultural growth and economic trade activities, natural resources and environmental protection, maternal health and child survival, and democratic governance (i.e., women empowerment, conflict management, civil society strengthening, etc.). The Country Level Assistance Matrix above illustrates the policy line for the Agency going forward.

Putting it in her perspective, US Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice explained:

Diplomacy has long been about representing the point of view of one government to another government. Some persuasion...which sometimes includes stern messages about consequences...is part of diplomacy. Finding a win-win solution when the interests of two or more nations collide is often the highest calling of diplomacy.

In the early part of 2006, Secretary Rice announced a major change in the way the US government directs foreign assistance. According to Secretary Rice:

As America works with its partners to build and sustain democratic well-governed states, changes are necessary to meet new challenges. This reorganization will ensure that foreign assistance is used as effectively as possible to meet our broad foreign policy objectives and more fully align the foreign assistance activities carried out by the Department of State and USAID.

Secretary Rice’s definition of the concept reinforces the new alignment of foreign assistance to diplomacy or what be described as the US geopolitical interests. The People-Centered Core and the Country Level Assistance Matrix are encapsulated by this remark from Secretary Rice:

---

20 Interview with Ronald Senykoff, Ph.D. of USAID, Economic Growth and Agricultural Trade Bureau.
21 http://globalization.about.com/od/usforeignpolicy/a/transformdiplo.htm
22 http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2006/59306.htm
I would define the objective of transformational diplomacy this way: to work with our many partners around the world, to build and sustain democratic, well-governed states that will respond to the needs of their people and conduct themselves responsibly in the international system. Let me be clear, transformational diplomacy is rooted in partnership; not in paternalism. In doing things with people, not for them; we seek to use America's diplomatic power to help foreign citizens better their own lives and to build their own nations and to transform their own futures.23

Looking back, the definition presented here incorporates elements of systemic transformational development from the people centered core, meaning it is participative process. One would expect that the implementation as described here would also be normative as opposed to tyrannical bordering on Social Darwinism. Institutions of Higher Education, including Minority Serving Institutions, responsible for preparing the nation’s future diplomats/development agent must be mindful of this requirement in their curriculum and program designs.

In practical terms, Secretary Rice and USAID senior officials have explained what this new foreign assistance paradigm means:

Transformational diplomacy requires us to move our diplomatic presence out of foreign capitals and to spread it more widely across countries. We must work on the front lines of domestic reform as well as in the back rooms of foreign ministries. There are nearly 200 cities worldwide with over one million people in which the United States has no formal diplomatic presence. This is where the action is today and this is where we must be. We have nearly the same number of State Department personnel in Germany (a country of 82 million people) that we have in India (a country of one billion people).24

In terms of the staffing and human resources:

There would be a new focus on regional solutions to address such issues as counter-terrorism, drug trafficking and disease. America’s diplomats will be required as part of their career advancement to serve in hardship posts like Iraq, Afghanistan and Nigeria. More Foreign Service officers will be based outside of our embassies which are located in world capitals (American Presence Posts) and some will do their diplomatic work making contact with foreign nationals by managing newly created Internet sites (Virtual Presence Post).25

Secretary of State Rice summed up the transformational diplomacy concept thusly during a 2006 budget testimony to the US Congress:

23 Ibid.
24 http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2006/59306.htm
25 Ibid.
What we have to have is a focus on building capable, democratic governments; governments that are responsive to their people, governments that govern wisely, that fight corruption and governments that we are giving the capacity to do this in a sustained way, so that our foreign assistance does not become a crutch for permanent dependency. But rather, a means by which to transition countries to self-sufficiency, to economies that are able to attract foreign direct investment, that are able to benefit from free trade, and are therefore able to govern on behalf of their people, wisely and effectively. That is really the definition of what we have been calling transformational diplomacy and I think that this budget is in support of those goals.\textsuperscript{26}

As evidenced earlier in this text, the description of transformational diplomacy fits in the diplomacy realm because the process involves a person to person engagement. This nature of the work explains why the Secretary of State is calling for more physical presence by Foreign Service Officers in different type posts where language skills will be essential.

Conclusion

Throughout the literature of international development, leadership, organizational development, and diplomacy, there is now a recurring theme ushered by the post-modern humanistic ethic. By focusing on the people and the human potential to reach beyond their own expectations, development practitioners are now within a paradigm shift that looks at communities from a systems approach. A theoretical framework has been developed to depict the dynamic interdependent interaction of elements in the development construct. From the people centered core, the participation of stakeholders in assessing their needs and deciphering the solutions to their sort leads to participatory development which is more sustainable. When communities are involved in development of their communities, the results are both sustainable mutually beneficial to the partners who assisted in fulfilling those goals. Through transformational development, inspired by transformational leadership, communities have proven their capacity to go beyond the initial vision that any one leader or external force could imagine.

The US Agency for International Development was created to transform the world and to promote development and those goals continue to be its essential pursuit. Due to increasing pressures placed on US foreign assistance since post-Cold War and -9/11 terrorist attacks, the US State Department and USAID have streamlined their efforts to better manage the resources that customarily gets allocated to humanitarian and development assistance pursuits throughout. The aim is to both better manage those resources and move partner countries steadily away from the crutch of dependency and towards partnership for trade. More significantly, the new strategy for foreign assistance seeks to recognize and assist those countries that express transformational leadership and transformational development. A logical framework for USAID’s approach to working with countries throughout the world in light of the new foreign aid policy graphically

\textsuperscript{26} http://globalization.about.com/od/usforeignpolicy/a/transformdiplo.htm
suggests an interrelation between the core themes linking transformational development with transformational diplomacy.

As implementing partners for humanitarian and developmental assistance for USAID and the US Government, there is a significant role that can be best played by the nation’s Institutions of Higher Education (IHE), especially the Minority Serving Institutions (MSIs)—Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs), and Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs). These institutions, many for over 150 years have been relied upon to prepare the men and women who play leadership roles in developing policy, designing development activities and participate in the implementation of the programs that move countries from aid recipients to trade partners. In other instances, these institutions have been instrumental in developing the concepts or framework for engaging these external communities. It appears that a great opportunity has been presented once again for the IHEs to contribute to development of both the cadre that will marshal this new paradigm both at USAID for transformational development and the State Department for transformational diplomacy.
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