



**Celebrating Women Leaders Dinner
November 3, 2011
Washington, DC**

Senator Dianne Feinstein

***Technology, Terrorism, and Intelligence:
Economic and Security Challenges in a Globalizing World***

Elisabeth Bumiller: Hello, everyone. I'm Elisabeth Bumiller, a pentagon correspondent [*Applause.*], a pentagon correspondent for *The New York Times* and I'm your MC for the evening's Celebrating Women Leaders Dinner with Senator Dianne Feinstein, who is here in the front row, table. I'm delighted to welcome all of you to tonight's program. As you all know, Senator Feinstein has had a long and important career in public service, she began her political life on the San Francisco county board of supervisors and then served as the two-term mayor of San Francisco. In 1992 she was elected as the first woman senator from California. [*Applause.*] Since then she has become an influential leader in the Senate, where she serves on the Judiciary, Appropriations and Rules and Administration Committees. In 2009, she assumed the chairmanship of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence where she oversees the nation's 16 intelligence agencies. She is also the first woman to hold that position. After dinner, we will hear from her on technology, terrorism, and intelligence, which is the title for the evening, as well as the economic and security challenges facing the United States around the world. We are very pleased to have her with us tonight. Now, I'd like to introduce you to Patricia Ellis, as you know, the president of the Women's Foreign Policy Group. [*Applause.*]

Patricia Ellis: Thank you so much Elisabeth for joining us for this terrific program. It is really a pleasure to have you back with us again as our MC and moderator.

I am thrilled that all of you could join us for this very special evening and to show your support for the Women's Foreign Policy Group and its mission of promoting women's leadership and women's voices on pressing international issues of the day. It is truly exciting to be here with such an accomplished group of women leaders who show the breadth of the Women's Foreign Policy Group family. We have ambassadors, government officials, representatives NGOs, international organizations, and the media.

I'd like to begin by recognizing Maxine Isaacs, who is, so if you want to stand up Maxine. [*Applause.*] Maxine is not only is chairing tonight's event, but she serves as chair of the WFPG Board and does a fantastic job. We just want to thank you so much for your outstanding leadership and support of the organization. There are also several other WFPG Board members here with us tonight. They never cease to amaze me with their dedication and enthusiasm. So I'd like to recognize them, Ann Korologos [*Applause.*], Gail Kitch [*Applause.*], and Diana Negroponte [*Applause.*]. I'd also like to recognize the WFPG's associate director Kimberly Kahnhauser who coordinated tonight's event, [*Applause.*] and also did a fantastic job, so where is Kimberley? Not even in the room. Kimberly, where are you? and all of our wonderful WFPG interns and volunteers who made this event possible. Let's give them all around of applause [*Applause.*]

I also now want to thank our sponsors and begin with our Benefactor Maxine Isaacs, our Patron Oracle, I'm going to ask everyone to stand after we finish, our Sponsors Amgen, Goodyear, Host Hotels & Resorts, and Shell. If everyone could please stand so we can recognize you. [*Applause.*] I'd also like to

thank our Embassy colleagues, the Embassies of Canada, Croatia and New Zealand for their generous donations of wine. So, please stand, those who are here. [Applause.]

And we are very pleased that we have a number of ambassadors here with us tonight. So I will start first, since this is the Women's Foreign Policy Group with the women ambassadors. So if the woman ambassadors could please stand, not a shy group, thank you very much. [Applause.] And all the other ambassadors [Laughter.] please stand, [Applause.] We also have senior State Department officials here with us tonight and I'd like them to stand too, please. [Applause.]

So, this has been a great year for the WFPG. We started the year off with a wonderful Embassy Series event with the Ambassador of Singapore at her [embassy] and she spoke about the impact of Asia's growth and we've had a number of other embassy events, one at Embassy of Zambia where we heard from several African women ambassadors, and then we had a wonderful celebration at the Bulgarian Embassy where we had our annual celebration of women diplomats. And then we had a very exciting program on US-Pakistani relations with the Ambassador from Pakistan. And then in New York we had a real privilege to hear from Michelle Bachelet, now head of UN Women and the former president of Chile, who was an absolutely amazing speaker, and of course we hope to have her here in Washington. We're excited to announce that to close the year with three very special Embassy [Series] events which we hope that you will all join us for. We will be having upcoming events at the residences of the Turkish Ambassador, Brazilian Ambassador and right before Christmas, at the French Embassy. So please make sure to mark these on your calendars.

We also do these Author Series and Beyond the Headlines Series and it also has been have also been a great year for that, and we launched with a great program, "The National Security and Foreign Policy Challenges for the Obama Administration" and we had Karen DeYoung from *The Washington Post*, and David Sanger of *The New York Times*. Followed by many other great events and covered issues from Egypt, Libya, Afghanistan, the Arab Spring, and women and war and some of our authors included Robin Wright, Pam Constable. The other activity we are really, really excited, very proud of is our annual mentoring fairs which we hold in both New York and Washington. So we hope that everyone continues to participate in these activities. We want to thank you for your ongoing participation. And we really want your continued support and we need your support because together we can make a difference. We can continue to offer a place where one has great dialogue and expand the dialogue on the pressing international issues of the day. And also work to support the next generation of women leaders. We feel that together with all your support that we can make a difference. So, for this reason, we are encouraging those who are members to renew their membership for 2012 and those who are not members to please sign up. There are cards on the table.

I also, just in closing, wanted to remind everyone that there are other cards on the table, and you should write out questions for our speaker because she will be having a conversation with Elisabeth Bumiller in a short while. The volunteers will collect them during the dinner and we will get them to Elisabeth so we can get to as many questions as possible. So please keep the questions brief, keep them legible and put your name and affiliation. So in closing, I just want to thank everyone again for coming here tonight to honor Senator Feinstein. [Applause.] I now invite you to enjoy your dinner and we [will] resume in a short while.

Maxine Isaacs: Please feel free to continue to eat and we will begin our program. Thank you, I am Maxine Isaacs, I'm the chair of the Women's Foreign Policy Group, and the chair of tonight's dinner and I'm delighted to be here and I'm delighted all of you are here. It is my privilege and pleasure tonight to introduce our honoree, Senator Dianne Feinstein she's an extraordinary woman leader, and a role model for women everywhere and I am proud to call my friend.

Her impressive career in public service began in her home state of California, and is one of firsts, as Elisabeth alluded to some of this. She was the first woman president of the San Francisco board of supervisors, the first woman mayor of San Francisco, in 1992 she became first woman elected Senator of California, and she was the first woman member of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

During the 110th Congress, Senator Feinstein became the first woman to chair the Senate Rules and Administrations Committee and in that capacity presided over the inauguration of President Obama. Most recently, in the 111th Congress Senator Feinstein became the first female Senator to assume the chairmanship of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence where she oversees the nation's intelligence agencies. Throughout her career in the Senate has worked tirelessly to help strengthen the nation's security both here and abroad, and is recognized for her national security legislative achievements on issues such as electronic surveillance, and protecting America's seaports. In addition to her continued service on the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator Feinstein is also a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, where she chairs the Subcommittee on Energy and Water.

She's a member of several organizations, including the—she's co-chair the Senate Women's Caucus on Burma, she co-chairs of the Senate Cancer Coalition and a member of the Aspen Strategy Group and the list could go on and on.

I'd like to take a moment, however, to talk to you about my friend. Senator Feinstein is an extraordinary person, first of all a very loyal friend, a very true friend. She has the strongest internal compass of anyone I have ever known. Some might even call this stubbornness, but I call it uncommon integrity. She has an unusually strong sense of right and wrong, and I have never seen her flinch or hesitate in the face of strong criticism or opposition. These qualities have served her—and our country—very well throughout her long and distinguished career. And, of course, in an age of seemingly endless partisan bickering and testing of the winds and timidity, in our national politics, she's a beacon of strength, integrity, reason and courage. So it's with great privilege, it's a great privilege and it's a great pleasure to introduce to you tonight Senator Dianne Feinstein. *[Applause.]*

What's going to happen this evening is that Elisabeth Bumiller is going to interview the Senator, have a conversation with her, and then we will organize your questions into some kind of order and submit your questions to her directly. Thank you very much.

Ms. Bumiller: Everyone can hear me fine? Okay, great. So I'm going to ask about three questions or so and then you will all be thinking of good questions to ask or writing them down and then I'll open it up to all of you when I get the cards. The first thing, thank you for doing this.

Senator Dianne Feinstein: You're welcome Elisabeth.

Ms. Bumiller: The first thing I wanted to ask you was, just today there was a new intelligence report that was submitted to Congress about cyber-warfare, and specifically the report found that China and Russia steal sensitive American technology over the internet as a matter of national policy. And specifically the report said that China and Russia hide behind proxy computers and routers in third countries and they steal proprietary corporate information. They also have targeted computers at universities and government agencies. So, my first question of course is, what should the United States do about this? And, secondly, as you know better than I do, the US has tremendous offensive cyber capabilities and should those be used against China and Russia?

Senator Feinstein: Elisabeth, that's a big question. If you ask me what would be the number one national security fear I would have to say it is in the cyber arena and the possibility of a cyber war. What's happened is, and you're right, and the report is right and it's credible and it is true that China is a major offender. And, it's really economic espionage, they are searching to find certain technological advances and when they find them, they steal them and they use them. Now, I've said this to the

Chinese government and of course they deny it, but there's no question that it's going on. You're right it's routed from here to there, to there, to there and but I think we now know enough to know that China is a real problem in this direction. I had the occasion when I was in China last to speak with some of the leadership and they said they would welcome international cooperation. As you know the Budapest convention in Europe really is the first attempt of European nations to set up a convention and this has taken some four years and we supported it and participated in it to really, to begin to deal with cyber. We need cyber agreements, we need cyber treaties, that doesn't mean that everybody's going to follow them. It means that it's the first step so it's brought to government's attention. I remember, and this is now public so I can say it, when I heard that the Royal Bank of Scotland had been robbed of \$8 million, then a second bank of \$10 million. And the banks don't want it known because obviously it affects the views of the clients so to a great extent a lot of this is kept quiet.

We know there is attack after attack by the thousands. Defense computers—attempts have been made to attack. And those attacks come in, probably, by the thousands a day. Well, my view is this: we are now in the process of writing a cyber bill and trying to reconcile a number of bills that exist. Commerce Committee has a bill, Jay Rockefeller and Olympia Snowe, Homeland Security has a bill, the Administration has a bill. And so what's—the attempt is to reconcile these bills and bring something to the floor. I think the .mil is in good shape with the NSA—National Security Administration. I think that .gov is in increasingly good shape because Homeland Security is now becoming more sophisticated and they are responsible for the domestic part of this. The problem is really .com, because .com does not want standards. They want a voluntary situation. I don't think that works—I've said this to the Administration, I've said it in meetings. I think you have to have—particularly for infrastructure, airports, dams, things that are run—you have to have a specific security standard that goes across the board, and everyone would be required to adhere to it. That's very controversial, strangely enough. So yes cyber is a big problem, yes we need to deal with it, and we need to deal with it as a nation, in a bill, and the world in terms of international compacts of conduct.

Ms. Bumiller: Just to follow up. I mean, I don't—should the United States be thinking about offensive cyber warfare?

Senator Feinstein: I really am not going to get into that at this stage. There's a way of responding which is short of warfare, certainly and we have not really gotten into that, and you know I'm under some limits as to what I can say. I don't mind your asking the question as long as you won't mind my not answering it. *[Laughter.]*

Ms. Bumiller: Okay, well let me move to something—let me move to Pakistan, another easy topic. You have twice tried to designate—have the State Department designate the Haqqani network in Pakistan which attacks American troops in Afghanistan as a terrorist organization. So far, nothing has happened. You also are well aware that Admiral Mike Mullen—former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—said in September that the Haqqani network was the veritable arm of the ISI, Pakistan's spy agency. So my question to you is this: what, at this point, can the United States do about Pakistan and the Haqqani network? And, there's a second question related, which is should—what—we're now negotiating with the Haqqani network at the same time that we're bombing them, trying to wipe them out—what could the Haqqani network bring to the negotiating table to bring peace to Afghanistan?

Senator Feinstein: Well I have a very specific view. I think the Haqqani, in killing the former President of Afghanistan, who was head of the negotiating commission, President Rabbani, clearly said where they stand—that they do not want an agreement. And I know the Administration's position is a fight/talk bill. But Pakistan, in particular, walks both sides of the street. And they are home base for Lashkar-e-Taiba. They are home base for the Taliban. They are home base for the Haqqani. And, as you know from Abbottabad, they've been home base for al-Qaeda. And it's a very serious situation. I think the ISI—there's no question in my mind—walks both sides of the street. And I don't think you can do that with terror—you have to take a position. Now, the United States understands Pakistan's stress. We understand the problems with Kashmir, with India—they are a nuclear power, they are a democracy,

and I think every effort is made to work with them. But the trust, I think, is at a low level, and there are mechanisms taking place to try to rebuild that trust. We'll see if it works. But I believe—it's interesting because I just got a letter and Marc Grossman is coming in to talk with me—but I see no downside to designating the Haqqani as a terrorist organization because, in fact, that's what they are.

Ms. Bumiller: But then it's okay to negotiate with them at the table?

Senator Feinstein: Well, they'd have to give up terror as a way of life and say, "this is what we want to do. We want to be peaceful, we want to talk, and we're prepared to change." I see no sign of that. They are still attacking our people. They are still manufacturing improvised explosive devices, and they're still carrying those across the border to—to explode.

Ms. Bumiller: So I guess the answer is no on—well—okay, you would—you're not—just to follow up—you're not comfortable with them as a negotiating partner?

Senator Feinstein: Well, when you kill the leader of the negotiating committee—And I am one—look, we have spent ten years in Afghanistan. We have lost people, it costs a lot of money—Pakistan is fundamental. If all the terrorists can go across the border and hide—and time means something different than it means to us—they're prepared to wait. And if the United States is going to pull out in 2014, and I hope we're very considerate about the way we go about this. I hope we take our time, because I, for one, am very worried about what happens. And I'm delighted that there's so many women here and one of the things I'm most worried about are the women of Afghanistan. And—*[Applause]* we have a real role to play there. I mean, I remember when young girls, when they went to school when the Taliban was in power, had acid thrown in their faces. I remember the carts being rolled into the stadiums, and women in their burqas being stoned for some reason or another. And what worries me is, if we don't cement domestic reforms to really develop the rule of law, to really stop the corruption, that we give credibility to the Taliban if, the minute we pull out, they move back in. That's my great concern.

Ms. Bumiller: Let me—let me move to Iran.

Senator Feinstein: Sure.

Ms. Bumiller: Last month, as you know, the United States accused Iran of plotting to murder the Saudi Ambassador to the United States, Adel al-Jubeir. Now, in your view, is this a sign of a more aggressive Iran or a stepped-up activity of the Quds Force, which is the external arm of Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, and I assume you've attached some credibility to the charges.

Senator Feinstein: Well there's no question that that was accurate, in my view. And we have, Intelligence Committee has taken a very good look at it. We have reviewed the complaint in court in which the gentleman who held dual citizenship confessed. There are four members of the Quds Force that were involved. There's just no question about it. Now, the question is why? Why would they enter into this kind of a thing which seems kind of wildly put together. For somebody to find someone from Mexico to come up and kill the Saudi Ambassador. But that was the plan—what does it mean? I think it means that the Quds Force, which is the elite part of the Revolutionary Guard, and charged with carrying out some of these missions—and has, in fact, carried out terrorist events—is exerting itself. It's hard for me to believe that the head of the Quds Force did not know that. And it's hard for me to believe, although there's no evidence, that either President Ahmadinejad or the Supreme Leader actually knew about it. But it did take place, four Quds Force were involved, and I have no doubt about that.

Ms. Bumiller: Let me just move to another part of Iran. There's talk in—a lot of talk in Jerusalem this week about a potential strike on an Iranian nuclear facility. Is there any light you can shed on that for us? *[Laughter.]*

Senator Feinstein: Probably not. [*Laughter.*] I mean we all know Israel views Iran becoming nuclear weaponized as an existential threat. I think most people know that the Israelis have talked about attacking—it's no secret. We had a lunch for members of the Knesset a while ago and it was very easy to tell that they were ready to do something and that it has likely been more gained and, in my view, it would be a big mistake. I think there's great turmoil in the Middle East. I think the Arab Spring leaves very undecided future—a very undecided future for the area. I'm delighted that the Ambassador Shoukry, the Ambassador from Egypt, is here because I view Egypt as being a bellwether in that area, big country, 85 million people. [*Applause.*] And if Egypt can really become a democracy, really provide a stable government, provide freedom for its people, and provide economic upward mobility, that will set a wonderful example for the other countries that are going through the same thing. All of us have doubts. None of us know what may—what will really happen, so it's a time of great uncertainty and imprecision. The question comes: does this increase the Israeli ability to attack or not? As I say, it would be a big mistake. I do not believe we should be dragged into it—and we probably would be—at least the attempt would be there. And I am of the opinion that we should begin some talks with Iran, back-channel, however it's done, that not having any discussions for some 30 years has not been an asset. And just my observation—when you absolutely isolate a country, it doesn't do anything to improve dialogue and to bring that country along. I mean you can look at North Korea and see another example of an isolated country striving to become a nuclear power because they believe it gives them clout. And I think Iran is in somewhat the same position. I also believe that the sanctions are working—Ahmadinejad himself said that the other day and they very well may be increased. So I would hope that Israel would have some patience. Let's get through the Arab Spring, let's do an agreement with the Palestinians—to me that's foremost. If you ask me what could change opinion, what is one issue that could change opinion in the Islamic world, it would be a settlement between Israel and the Palestinians, that remains the icon of discontent. [*Applause.*]

Ms. Bumiller: So let me get to your questions now. Just looking through here. This is from Gia Cromer, US Airforce retired, PhD student. Senator, in light of the necessary budget cuts and the very likely significant cuts in trained, experienced intelligence professionals, do you have concerns for the quality of intelligence in the near future? If so, what do you see as mitigation for those concerns?

Senator Feinstein: I actually think that tremendous progress has been made since 9/11. And I do not believe that budget cuts will effect the quality of intelligence. And I believe that there is support to keep a strong intelligence budget going. Let me just quickly point out to you what, I think, amazing things have been achieved. The stovepipes are down—that's one of the things that the arrest of Nazibullah Zazi, was going to attack the subways—the gentleman that came over from Nigeria—the stovepipes are down. There is communication between agencies, analysis is better, red teaming is better. I think there's a much more direct, centralized leadership now with a director of national intelligence. So, I think a big lesson was learned, both by a bad national intelligence estimate with Iraq, and secondly by really not being able to anticipate 9/11. And everything possible that I know of is being done. I think amazing strides have been made.

Ms. Bumiller: Okay, thank you. Here's another one—I'm looking for some on the budget. Here's another one on the budget. Um, this is, okay—this is from the Ambassador of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. With the current budget debate, domestic pressure is on the Congress as well as the Administration. What should be the US strategy in strengthening cooperation in the fight against terrorism when some members are threatening to cut foreign aid?

Senator Feinstein: Well, Madam Ambassador, this is very hard. You know, foreign aid is about a percent of our overall budget, and it suffers when the rest of America suffers, because people say—if I ask people, “how big do you think the foreign aid budget is?” they'll say, 10%, 15%. It's 1%. So it's a small amount, and it's a vital amount. And you know, so many people, billions, have such a struggle just to exist. And in this country, regardless of all our problems, we are blessed with so much. And so I believe very strongly in pure, humanitarian aid. I believe in practical aid, I believe in training, I believe in

normal education—reading, writing, arithmetic so kids can grow up, wherever they are, and get a job in what's going to be a new economy for virtually every country on earth in the future. [Applause.]

Ms. Bumiller: Let's see. Let's move to Libya. We're all over the world. What was—where did that go? This is from—I don't know who asked this. What was—oh okay, okay, okay. What was learned from your experience—from our experience in Libya? To what extent were these the right—and by—yeah, what was learned by our experience in Libya, and who learned it? And to what extent were these the right lessons?

Senator Feinstein: I think the right lesson was America cannot do everything and it was time for NATO to step up. And NATO did step up, and overall they did the job. And I think that reinforced the value of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We helped, we provided backup, we provided some intelligence—not a lot, but some and I think the people of Libya did it themselves. And so I think Obama did exactly the right thing.

Ms. Bumiller: And let me follow up with that. Do you see that as—this as a future way we would engage in wars around the world? Do you see this as a model of what we would do?

Senator Feinstein: Well, a future—no, I don't think it's necessarily a model. I think there are sometimes the United States can respond—and should—and there are sometimes that others should. The United States can't be the world's keeper of all things—and that's what you have NATO for. And so I think Europe has to do more. You know we can try and buttress, like in Africa, the regional security forces, the fight against the Lord's Resistance—that kind of thing. But it's very hard because there are so many problems in so many places. And so—just for one—the encouragement that I think this sent to the European community, if they can get over the economic problem, is the fact that they have a mechanism now to respond, which can be effective.

Ms. Bumiller: There is a question here about Africa and I don't—where did it go? It was about what can be done to make—yeah here it is from Mozambique—someone from Mozambique, how much—the Ambassador from Mozambique. What can you do to make the United States more aware of the need for partnerships in Africa? I believe was the question. Or, I don't know if that's intelligence. Is that quite you're—

Senator Feinstein: I think we are aware of the need for partnerships, and I think there is a very willing feeling to try to provide that wherever we can. It's very hard because we also have the spread of terror now going into Africa, particularly with al-Shabab, and the Kenyan military should be backed up in that fight against al-Shabab. We certainly can with humanitarian aid, with educational aid, with all kinds of human assistance. I think with respect to governance that's difficult—you have to be asked, you can't just barge in and say we're going to help you run your government.

Ms. Bumiller: As long as we're on the topic of Africa, I was going to ask you—and this is sort of a follow-up to that question, about al-Qaeda. As you know, the Administration has been saying for some months now that al-Qaeda is on its heels and it's taken out a number of leaders in Pakistan but that Yemen and Somalia and to some degree North Africa remain quite dangerous, and I would be very interested in your assessment—your intelligence assessment of that and how you view it.

Senator Feinstein: I view it extremely seriously. Yemen is a problem. There is a bomb maker in Yemen and they now have an explosive as you know, PETN, which goes through a magnetometer and that's what Abdullmutallab had, wearing as underwear and there was enough PETN to blow up that plane, I can tell you that. They now can detonate it in a different way that's much more secure—that's a problem. So I think that what's happened with al-Qaeda is we've been very successful in taking out a lot of the leadership—it is replaced, and if you will, there is a kind of metastasis, there are now nine different organizations really sort of merged with al-Qaeda. Prior to 9/11 al-Qaeda was its own group, and now there is sort of a synthesis in a loose way with those groups, and this was in the newspaper so

I can tell you this, this PTN was in a computer printer's cartridge at the Dubai airport. And a source came in and our people went out and they had a bomb-smelling dog and they couldn't find anything. They went out and called the source and the source said you've got to go back and look again. They went back and looked again and saw that you've got to take it apart, and sure enough there was enough PETN in these cartridges of these printers headed for Chicago—so they're smart. And it's not over by a long shot so I think we have to be on our guard, we have to be prepared, we have to make sense in what we do and intelligence has become the key to this, so whoever asked that first question, I think it's really important that we keep intelligence as alert, working together as well as we can, and as effective as we possibly can.

Ms. Bumiller: Let me follow up on that—you're old friend Leon Panetta, a man I now cover, said last summer on his first trip to Iraq and Afghanistan that the US was in—within reach of defeating al-Qaeda, which caused a lot of talk at the time. And he said then that there were about 20 top leaders and that was all that was left—those were the only people left. We always wondered about that number and that would have included Yemen and Somalia as well as Pakistan, so with all these recent targeted killings by drone attacks is that number down? I don't know to what degree you follow it.

Senator Feinstein: Well there are high value targets which are the leadership, that shouldn't be a surprise to anybody, and a large number of them have been killed, but they are being replaced, there is somebody to take their place so the movement to an extent comes—goes on. But no question with the Abbottabad situation it has changed the dynamic. Al-Qaeda is not what it was, I believe that, but that doesn't mean other groups can't step up, it doesn't mean they can't work together and that's a big concern.

Ms. Bumiller: You were part of the—early on, you knew early on about the Abbottabad compound, and what became the raid. Could you share with us to the extent that you can about the briefings you got early on about what the CIA knew about the compound and the plans that they developed?

Senator Feinstein: No, probably not. *[Laughter.]* The only thing that I can say is the vice chairman, Saxby Chambliss, and myself, we worked closely together, were in fact briefed, and that's all I'm going to say.

Ms. Bumiller: But so much of it is public now.

Senator Feinstein: Yeah but I still can't. I'm sorry.

Ms. Bumiller: Let me move on to my questions here. This is from Urmila Venugopalan from Jane's Intelligence Review, The Asia Edition. Can you please talk about current India-US intelligence cooperation post-Mumbai and where you think it's going?

Senator Feinstein: Well I think there is an increasing effort to work with India and work with Indian intelligence. As far as I know it's been going very well and it's very welcomed on both sides.

Ms. Bumiller: Let's see, let me ask you about this. This is a follow up—you kind of answered this, again no one signed this, in your opinion is a major cyberattack on the US inevitable?

Senator Feinstein: I'm not one to say anything is inevitable because circumstances change and can change events. If we keep going the way we're going, if we don't take action, if there isn't an international set of controls that governments are willing to have their countries abide by. If the mafias, whether it's the Russian mafia or anybody else is able to go on unabated and do some of this then it's a real problem long term. My own view is that when governments really learn what's going on by some of their forces, let's say the Chinese military, the situation changes and I think it has to be brought to their attention up front, close, personal and direct.

Ms. Bumiller: You said you were in China recently?

Senator Feinstein: No, I was in China I guess it's a year ago.

Ms. Bumiller: And who did you meet with there?

Senator Feinstein: I met with a number of people, a whole group of people. I did not meet with Hu Jintao, but I did meet with Jiang Zemin and met with various ministers.

Ms. Bumiller: How forthcoming are they when you meet with them, there are interpreters I assume, but do you make any headway?

Senator Feinstein: Particularly Jiang Zemin is very forthright. We were mayors together, he in Shanghai and me in San Francisco, and we had the first sister city relationship together. He would visit San Francisco one year and I would visit Shanghai the next year and so we alternated. And then he became president, and another mayor, Zhu Rongji, became premier and I think Zhu is responsible for a lot of the economic transformation of China, and those who knew Jiang Zemin knew that he was very fulsome in his remarks and blunt and candid so it made for a good conversation.

Ms. Bumiller: But do you—can you—when you engage with them do you feel like you make policy headway?

Senator Feinstein: No. *[Laughter.]* I've been going for more than 30 years and I hope they regard me as a friend, but a friend who has some very strong ideas on certain subjects and I think they do listen. I've tried to be helpful when I can and indicated non-support when I couldn't.

Ms. Bumiller: Right, interesting—the journalist in me just always wants to know what goes on in those meetings. *[Laughter.]*

Senator Feinstein: I understand.

Ms. Bumiller: This is from Pat Ellis. Which is—I should have gotten to this question. What are the implications of the withdrawal from Iraq for US defense and for intelligence and the fact that most US troops will be gone by mid-December.

Senator Feinstein: We don't—I certainly don't know what the impact will be, and there is concern that this is too deep a pull-out too fast and there are great unknowns. Iraq has been trying to permeate the Revolutionary Guard, which has been buying businesses in Iraq. I understand that Iran has made an offer to train military and so I have no doubt that Iran is going to try to extend a tentacle into Iraq politically, socially, economically, any way it can. The interesting thing will be to see how much Malaki wants to allow these things to happen and how strong he really is in that regard. It's hard to know what will happen to the general security situation but obviously that's a concern. You know, if you've got to pull out, I think slower is better than all at one time but then one of our problems is strategic lift so it takes time too to move people out, it can't be done that quickly.

Ms. Bumiller: Right, they've been moving people out for a year and it's been one of the biggest logistical challenges in the history of the military so they say.

Senator Feinstein: Yes, yes.

Ms. Bumiller: These are some interesting personal questions. Well this is a good one—we know—I don't know who this is from. We know you could handle the call at 3 a.m. but what keeps you up at night? I guess it's "all of the above", but if you could specify.

Senator Feinstein: Well I guess what keeps me up at night, actually is the incredibly polarized situation in the Congress and the Senate of the United States [*Applause.*] And I really believe that thoughtful people who have a modicum of knowledge and good reason can run a government effectively, but I am really concerned. Because—one thing—I have 18 years on the Judiciary Committee, I'm not a lawyer, but I've had a lot of exposure to the Constitution and how the justice system works in the United States, and we can be very proud of our rule of law in this country, it really does work. [*Applause.*]

Having said that, when you have two parties it takes an element of compromise to make progress. The more you elect outliers right and left who will not compromise no matter what, even if it takes down the government, they don't care. That's a big problem. I remember when Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neil did a deal, shook hands, and everybody fell into line. We thought that would happen with John Boehner and he couldn't bring his own people along. That is something that shouldn't happen in my view because compromise is essential to the functioning of a democracy. There are things I want to accomplish, and I might have to accomplish them a step at a time, but you want to keep the government running, you want to keep the country healthy, and I'm really worried about that. I'm really worried about if the Super Committee doesn't come to an agreement and we go to sequestration, the cuts are huge, they will have an impact on the economy, it will not be done easily. Let me give you some figures. Over the last ten years, the population of our country has gone up 9%. Defense has gone up 74%, entitlements 32%, discretionary spending has been flat, and taxes down 17%. That's a problem. Those numbers tell a big, big story and this ability or disability to be able to compromise is really shocking to me and yet it's what I'm in, so how do you get anything done. What we've seen is a majority in the Senate is now a super majority. Unemployment is up, we've had four votes on job programs, every one of them has gone down, couldn't get 60 votes, two got 50. Took apart, which we're now talking about infrastructure. Look, we built amazing infrastructure early on, beginning in the 1930s. If we're going to compete we have to have the highways and the ships and the fast rail to be able to do it. Having said that, nobody wants to, it's a problem. So the bill that we have will go down again. If we went back to the majority, which is the way it was when I came to the Senate in 1993, we'd get this done. You wouldn't have this—we would have never used cloture the way it's used today. We would never hold up a secretarial appointment or a judgeship because we wanted something else and use it kind of as a hostage, and yet now that's commonplace. And that's what keeps me up at night because I love this country and I want it to work—and it can work and reasonable people should be able to sit down and compromise.

So it's a very hard time. And I really worry about what's happening in Europe right now. Nobody knows exactly where Greece will be, what will be the next domino to fall there, will it be Spain, Italy, will it be Portugal? What will be the outcome of that? What's the wash over the world economy and to us? The Fed is now downgrading productivity for next year. So those are really the things that keep me up. We are really blessed. We've got some very good people, that's the upside of being in the Senate. You really have access to the brightest minds in the world and we ought to use them more and learn from them, because when you come here you don't know everything, contrary to popular thought. [*Laughter.*] You asked what keeps me up—that's what keeps me up.

Ms. Bumiller: Well Maxine asked, as a follow-up, I think we have the answer. Do you ever get discouraged—I mean I would say, given the political climate—Maxine Isaacs just asked that question here. But I think the question should be, do you ever feel like throwing in the towel and doing something else?

Senator Feinstein: Sure, I get discouraged. But my particular metabolism is, I get discouraged at night, and then wake up refreshed in the morning, so that's pretty good.

Ms. Bumiller: And I wanted to follow up on the Super Committee, what do you hear, what do you know? What's going on in there, about defense cuts especially?

Senator Feinstein: Well I know that—because it's been in the newspaper—that the Democrats have made offers, and part of the problem is you can't only do cuts because they're too deep. I mean, we've already cut about \$800–\$900 billion. So what they're trying to do is \$1.2 trillion in addition which takes us up to \$2 trillion or try to get the debt down to 60% of GDP which will take \$3–\$4 trillion to do. You can't do that without additional revenues. And one of the great problems is the upper 1% of our society has done so well through this and the bottom quintile, the bottom has fallen out. Jobs have disappeared. The great strength, of course, of our country is technocracy, but I'll give you an example. I shop at CVS on Wisconsin and I'm accustomed to going in and seeing 10 to 12 people. I go in a month or so ago—no one, nobody, except a pharmacist. I couldn't find Tylenol, he didn't know where it was. Nobody at the checkout, it's all automated. And that's what's happening, so there are no jobs—increasingly less jobs for people who really need them. And that's a very—I'm for technology, but you just hate it when it replaces people.

Ms. Bumiller: I see Maxine here. I have one last question—this is a personal question, I like this question. This is for the young people in the room. I don't know who asked this. What was your biggest obstacle when you first started out? Did you not get hired somewhere or go through obstacles that you overcame to get where you are today?

Senator Feinstein: Oh. Well my first obstacle was in 1969, before some of you were born, when it wasn't de rigueur for women to run for political office. And my obstacle were other women. I was a lot younger and I could read their faces. Why is she doing this? There must be something wrong with her. She must have a bad marriage. [*Laughter.*] Truthfully! And the beauty of that story is that it's all changed, and women do support women today. And that's one of the greatest things because it may be up to us to right this world, and I really think we can. [*Applause.*]

Maxine Isaacs: That's a wonderful place to end our evening. Thank you so much Senator Feinstein for taking time out of your busy schedule to be here with us and thank you Elisabeth for your wonderful, probing questions. Elisabeth has always been a very tenacious reporter. On behalf of the Women's Foreign Policy Group I would like to present you, Senator, with a very small token of our very great appreciation and thank you very much. [*Applause.*]

Senator Feinstein: Thank you! [*Applause.*]