

The Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training
Foreign Affairs Oral History Program
Foreign Assistance Series

HENRIETTA FORE

*Interviewed by: Alex Shakow
Initial interview date: March 15, 2022
Copyright 2023 ADST*

This oral history transcription was made possible through support provided by U.S. Agency for International Development, under terms of Fixed Amount Award No. 7200AA21FA00043. The opinions expressed herein are those of the interviewee and do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Agency for International Development or the Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training.

INTERVIEW

Q: I am Alex Shakow, and I am delighted to be in Washington, DC, and by the power of Zoom—interviewing for her oral history, Henrietta Holsman Fore. Henrietta has had an extraordinary career, and we're very interested in finding out about all these various aspects of public and private service and an enormous number of activities that seem to just simply fill her curriculum vitae with boards and all that sort of thing. So, Henrietta, thank you for doing this. It is going to be fascinating for me, and I'm sure for people who will ultimately be able to read this oral history.

So, first off, you are currently in Las Vegas, but you were not born in Las Vegas. Where were you born, and when, and tell us a little bit about your parents and, what kind of a background you had, and where you began to go to school and that kind of thing? So, the floor is yours.

FORE: Alex, thank you. It's a pleasure to see you this morning. So, let me begin at the beginning of life. I was born in Chicago, Illinois. My father was from Chicago, and my mother was Swiss. When I was born in Chicago, I really did not know much about Chicago. And I only stayed until I was quite young. Chicago is a place that I have known and loved as a family location for my father's family. Alex, you'll remember that my grandfather built Holsman automobiles and was an architect in Chicago, so there's a long history for Holsmans in Chicago as artists and architects and engineers, and my father was part of that. They wanted to provide apartment homes for the average working family.

Q: You know, let me interrupt you just to say that I had not known, I regret to say, about the Holsman automobile until I read more carefully your CV [curriculum vitae], and it

says that you are a collector of antique Holsman automobiles. So maybe you should tell people what they are. It's just fascinating to know that that's part of your history, and where do you keep these automobiles?

FORE: The automobiles were, at the turn of the last century, just in their birth. It was the beginning of an industry, and Chicago was one of the real hotbeds. There was Henry Holsman, there was Henry Ford, there were a number of early car manufacturers because everybody was excited about this new technology that could change the world around them. Electric cars for women had been used, but gasoline-powered automobiles had not. And my grandfather was part of the group who had grown up—actually, he was born in the 1860s—but he'd grown up in the rural part of America, so he believed in high wheels. Grandfather is part of the strain of early automobile manufacturers who believed in high wheels. As we know, the high wheelers went out of interest in the industry. And little round wheels like Henry Ford, the kind that worked in urban centers, won out over these big high wheels that worked for the rural areas where there were muddy roads and they were rutted.

But grandfather wanted to build automobiles for the country doctor. Their mother had died early; they were orphans, he and his brother. And he felt very strongly that he wanted a people's car that could allow doctors to come out to help people, and thus you needed those rural roads; you needed high wheels. Grandfather's high wheeler is one of the inventions. They say that my grandfather invented the gear of reverse because, as you know, bicycles didn't have reverse. Horses did, but they had to be taught reverse. And grandfather was there. And I think my family has always been very creative and innovative and thinking about the times when there are bursts of industries. And I think that has stayed with me, and it certainly stayed through my time at USAID [United States Agency for International Development].

My father was also a great sailor. And he left Chicago on a sailing race that went down to Havana, Cuba. My mother was in Havana with her brother representing Swiss products for the—that were for the Americas, so Swiss watches and electronics and machinery and others. They were in Havana during the war in Europe, and my father met my mother there. They fell in love, and my mother came to Chicago with my father. And so that's where I was born. I have an older sister who is a year and a half older, and we were both born in Chicago, but I learned to walk in California. My parents took us to California when we were young. We lived in Carmel and Monterey, a beautiful part of California. And I grew up being able to run around in nature and on the beach and have a profound respect for the natural world around us. My father was always interested in business, so that led to discussions about business and businesses around the dinner table for the entire time when my sister and I were growing up. But we were just girls, so we didn't have any boys in the family. We played all the sports and did all the activities that boys did and never thought another thing of it.

Q: Did you know your grandfather? Did you know him?

FORE: I did. And my grandmother was an extraordinary woman; she was a painter. So when my grandfather was doing his normal work, which was being an architect, he would design, let's say, a chapel at the University of Chicago or in one of the midwestern universities. My grandmother was the sculptress for many of the pieces that were in the chapel; or she would be designing the bronze work on the outside, doing casting for it; or she'd be painting the friezes or the ceilings with one type of artistic endeavor or another. Anyway, they were wonderful collaborators, an artistic duo. That clearly rubbed off on the family, and it's certainly something that I've appreciated, having my grandmother's paintings around. I knew my grandmother and my grandfather, not well, but a little bit. And I've really appreciated them as I've grown up.

Q: If you go to Chicago, are you able to see this evidence of your grandparents' artistic work and the buildings? I mean, you mentioned a chapel at the University of Chicago, where I did some of my elementary school and up to a college level for a while, and I should go back there and find the Holsman chapel?

FORE: You will. You'll see the chapel that was designed by my grandfather. The Divinity's [sic] Disciples are now in this chapel and have been looking after it. You'll also see a number of apartment buildings, town homes, and many of the neighboring buildings that my grandfather built. He was always interested in how you could have energy-saving buildings. Energy that could be produced in one part of the building; could move through the rest of the building for the residents. There always had to be green space so the children of the families that lived in the apartment building could play in a courtyard, and you know—rural roots; he felt very strongly they should have grass. You will see a style of architecture for Henry K. Holsman that's in the neighborhood.

And then my father, when he went to the University of Chicago, he was a little bit older because he'd run off to World War One early to repair, maintain, and drive ambulances in Paris. And so he started school a little bit later than his colleagues. And so when he went into a fraternity, he became the president and felt very strongly that they needed to manage their buildings and to operate them. And he knew from his grandfather—from his father, my grandfather—that you need to make sure that you're operating buildings well so that tenants have the services that they need. My father began looking after buildings in the area of the University of Chicago and the fraternity, and he started a very early real estate company. And what is now called Parker Holsman was my father's real estate company, and it maintained and managed these apartment buildings, and it was mostly in that area around the University of Chicago, so you will have seen lots of Holsman involvement around the school.

Q: I'm going to have to go back and start looking into all this. That's really wonderful. And I can see that your interest in the environment is something that also came from good roots in this case. But you weren't in Chicago for most of this time. You were in California, is that right?

FORE: That's right. I was in California, only my sister returned to Chicago to study at Northwestern University and stayed in Chicago for decades, so she carried on the

Chicago tradition while I stayed elsewhere. I was either in California or on the East Coast.

Q: I read somewhere that you didn't go to school necessarily in California, but to—what is it called? You went to Baldwin school; you went to school in Bryn Mawr?

FORE: Yes. So—

Q: How does that happen?

FORE: Well, let me backup a bit because you mentioned school in California. So I was really lucky as a young student that I was in a community that cared about education and cared about education that was very creative and experiential so that you could both experience something and study it. And I had wonderful professors who would look at the natural world like a very tall tree, and they would have you do your isosceles triangles, and all based on the tree that was in our school grounds. And we could watch the shadows that would occur during the year during standard time and daylight savings time so that we were studying how the world worked, and how they intersected. interacted. We learned both from observation of real life, as well as what you could learn in books.

Q: This was in Carmel?

FORE: No, this is in Santa Barbara, California, and it's a school called Crane Country Day School. And so that's where I started, and then I went into the public school system at Cold Springs, and it also was very interesting for me. I loved what I was doing in California, and of course, I was growing up in lots of sports, tennis, sailing, you know, all of that. But it was also, Alex, I must say, the time of the Beach Boys, so—

Q: (Laughs)

FORE: —we were really excited about getting a tan, and I have freckles and red hair, and that was a hopeless, (laughs) hopeless thing to do.

Q: (Laughs)

FORE: I loved California. It led to a love of doing sports and being excellent in sports, whether they're individual or team sports, and I think you learn a lot from sports. And then, also how education can be both in books, but it can also be something that's very practical. I was really fortunate with the basis that I had for an education so that by the time I got to the Baldwin school, which was in my, you know, mid, sort of what we would consider, early high school years, it was interesting for me. I very much wanted to go see other parts of the world. I was intrigued that people had snow where they grew up.

I didn't know about that, but I'd heard from my mother that there was snow in Switzerland, so I wanted to go see it. I wanted to go be part of the world. It was great fun

for me to go to Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania. The leaves changed colors in the fall, and we had cherry blossoms in the spring, things that I hadn't seen in Santa Barbara, and I was very excited to see that world. And I was a boarding student, so I was away from my family, and I found it to be very interesting to get to know my fellow students. This is an all-girl school, Alex. You will see all-girls education and women's education strongly in my background. And so we got to do everything. We were secretary, treasurer, and president of our class. We did everything.

We didn't think about what the boys did versus what we did.

Q: But I'm still intrigued by your example of the triangles and the trees, and so you were doing that when you were in sixth grade or in seventh grade? You were very young and doing all these interesting scientific things that—

FORE: This was seventh grade, and also eighth grade, that I was doing this, and I love math and science; it was very clear that that was my preference over anything else. And I just—I loved it. And I had a wonderful teacher, and he, you know, when you get a good teacher, they open up so many ideas and windows of opportunity for you, it becomes fun.

And I also found that I could use that sailing because the principles of sailing are very involved with triangles, you know—

Q: Right.

FORE: —whether it's a genoa that's there, whether it's how the air moves through the slot between the genoa and the mainsail, how you move forward, why you slip sideways, you know, all of that became much more understandable if you studied science and if you knew what was going on in the world around you. It was all very exciting and interesting to me, and I loved what Benjamin Franklin did, and I studied meteorology when I was at Baldwin because Philadelphia has that institute, the Franklin Institute, and it's interesting how you can be interested in science, and yet you can use meteorology and climate when you're sailing because you need the winds, you need the waves, you need to understand how it moves together and how you're going to win the race. You can put it to use, which is, I guess, one of the themes in my life that I've loved, to understand a subject and to put it to use so that we make it better—

Q: That sounds very exciting, especially since I don't know a thing about sailing. But to hear you talk about it so enthusiastically, it is a wonderful combination of being able to use your interest in sports, base it on what you've done academically. What was it that led your parents to decide, or you to decide, that you wanted to go to Baldwin? I mean, it is yes, you wanted to see other parts of the country, but that wasn't necessarily the step that led you there.

FORE: Well, that was very insightful of you, Alex. The trigger was that my older sister went off to school. And once your older sister goes off, well, there goes your major friend.

Then, I mean, you know, just everything changes, you're left at home alone with your parents. I was really excited about going off to school, too. I think I became rather a constant drumbeat about where I could go off to school.

Q: Where did your sister go?

FORE: He went first to a school in Palm Beach called Graham-Eckes, that offered sailing and tennis teams, and I joined her there for a year. Then we changed schools. I chose an all-girls school in Baldwin and Bryn Mawr because I liked the academics, and they were strong in math and science, which I knew I wanted. It was a whole different part of the world. I loved learning; I loved education; I loved what it brought to you; and that it was so portable that you could carry it with you—you didn't have to be in one place; you could carry your education. And I think that's true in our development work, Alex. You realize that if you can give someone an education, it's with them for their life; they carry it in their head.

Q: That is kind of a theme of your UNICEF [United Nations Children's Fund] period as well, so—and your parents did not object to being empty nesters early on, before most of the rest of us are?

FORE: No, they could see that I just had this, you know, burning desire to go see the world, and it stayed with me the rest of my life. And so my parents understood, which is great. And I think it helped that my mother was Swiss so that she knew of another world, and she'd always taught us to be respectful of Switzerland and her country and to learn about the world and to love different cultures and their histories and geographies and religions. And so, I was just very open-minded and wanted to learn about the world around us.

Q: Had you, in fact, visited your mother's home and her, you know, her Switzerland family, and others? Did you travel outside the United States as a child?

FORE: I did just when I was during my Baldwin years. When I went to Baldwin, my sister went to Switzerland, to the American School in Lugano in Montagnola. And as a result, we went to go visit her, and that meant I was able to see my mother's family in Switzerland. That was the first time that I had a chance to go. But it was very interesting. And, Alex, there was lots of snow.

Q: (Laughs) Just what you were looking for! Did your mother have children with her first husband?

FORE: She didn't have a first husband, so—

Q: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm thinking of your grandmother. I'm sorry, I can't keep track of this. Okay, so did you have cousins there?

FORE: Yes, I had cousins and aunts and uncles, and so I—we had a chance to meet family. But it was a short trip because you're just going in between your—I think it was Christmas vacation for me. So you can't stay very long. You can't stay months; you can stay a week or two.

Q: Sure, sure. Okay. So you're at Baldwin, and you graduate. And you're sitting around right there in Bryn Mawr, but you don't go to Bryn Mawr; you go to Wellesley. Now how did that happen?

FORE: Well, (laughs) as you can understand, there was the adventurer in me. I was ready to go see somewhere else, even though Bryn Mawr was right around the corner from us. My physics teacher was a Wellesley graduate, and she encouraged me to go to Wellesley. I'd seen it when my sister had visited colleges with my parents. I thought it was a beautiful campus.

Q: It is, yeah.

FORE: It offered the intellectual rigor that suited me, and I didn't mind that it was an all-women's college. I'd just been to an all-girls secondary school, so it just seemed normal. So off I went. So I applied and was accepted and went to Wellesley.

Q: And what did you major in while you were at Wellesley?

FORE: So you may have guessed that I went in thinking I would be a physics or a math major, but I came out as a history major. And I loved diplomatic history. So the diplomatic history of Europe and of Asia just fascinated me. And my minor was in economics because, of course, I was interested; in putting my math to work, and I was interested in business because of my father. And my other minor was in art, and that probably came from my grandmother and grandfather, and I love art. So a major in history, a minor in economics, and a minor in art.

Q: And did you have to write a thesis or—at the end of your career in history? And what was that about? If you did have to write one.

FORE: I did have to write one. And, Alex, (laughs) it's good for you to bring back a memory here. So it was a thesis on how Russia and America were looking at the world, and that we had moved from great wars into little micro-competition around the world, and then what that meant for the world and how history could inform what we could do next, and how diplomacy and economics could affect it. And I can see that now this is a good subject for a lot of students to be taking on.

Q: Right.

FORE: All of that in—let's see, I graduated in 1970. So I haven't thought of that in fifty years, but now that you brought it up, fifty years ago, the world was thinking this, too.

Q: Yeah. I mean, who would have thought we were going to be in this kind of situation today. But did you have to try to visit Russia for this? You didn't try to do that?

FORE: Yes, my sister and I visited for a few days one summer to compare the lifestyle and economics in Scandinavia and Russia.

I did go for a summer to Greece under the AIESEC [*Association des Étudiants en Sciences Economiques*] and served in the Bank of Greece during my sophomore and junior year, and that was very—

Q: For both summers, you went?

FORE: No, just one summer between sophomore—

Q: Oh, between sophomore and junior [year], yeah.

FORE: And I found that fascinating because it was a centrally based economy. And so the central bank that I worked for did a lot of the buying of cotton and sisal. We saw the trade route among Egypt, Lebanon, and the Mediterranean. The financing was centralized with the bank, government as well. It was not done through the corporations that I was used to or with private banking. So I thought that was a very interesting view of an economy that was quite different from the United States.

Q: But tell me again about AIESEC. What does it stand for?

FORE: AIESEC, it's an organization that still exists. And that's how we economics students could exchange and move. And so you go as a sophomore, a junior, or a senior.

Q: Yeah, and you didn't need to speak Greek in order to be able to—

FORE: You did not need to. I think it did help that we were a Wellesley women's college. So it meant that when the young men of the other AIESEC chapters were looking around at who to accept, they figured (laughs) the women of Wellesley would be good because they'd get all girls. They wouldn't just get boys who were studying economics; they'd get lots of girls. And so that worked out well. We were all girls, and we were happy to go. And so off we went.

Q: How many of you went at that time?

FORE: Well, we all went to different places. So I and another went to Greece, but others went to France, Germany, Bulgaria, and Malaysia, etcetera. They went to various places around the world. But my Greek sponsors suggested that sailing was part of what they could be offering, and you knew I had a soft spot in my heart for sailing. And so there I was, and I had studied art. And if you study art, you want to go to Greece. I wanted to see the Parthenon; I wanted to see—

Q: Sure.

FORE: —all of those great—and if you study history, which I was now very interested in, I mean, this is where all the great battles took place, and this is where history was made and how democracy started. So of course, you'd go to Greece. So for me, it was very easy to say yes to Greece.

Q: And did you live with a Greek family, or did they—

FORE: I did and had a very meager salary, which mostly went to my room. And then, you know, you'd eat whatever—you could find a little soup, souvlaki on the street, and you'd save all of your money so that on the weekends you could go see the islands, and you'd go to pay entrance fees at the museums, and you could hop on the buses to get places. Anyway, we had a great time, and I love to travel. I love what you can learn from travel, and of course, all the other societies and how they're organized and what people believe in and why and how their families are structured and how their governments are structured. And it was just fascinating to me. I loved it.

Q: Yeah, no, you were a great participant in this because you were absorbing so much. And you actually got to sail as well, somehow, or other?

FORE: Yes, exactly. So they had thought that sailing meant that you just sort of take one of the little dinghies out onto the water, which soon I told them, no, no, we want bigger boats, we want to go further. (Laughs) So pretty soon, we were able to find bigger boats, and we could go all sorts of places. And then we hopped on ferries, and then we found little boats. And so weekends were always fun. And somehow, the Bank of Greece did not have very long Saturday or Sunday hours—

Q: (Laughs)

FORE: —so they allowed us as interns to race off and go do something else. I think they also sort of took a kindly view of the interns. They knew we were from other places and that we were probably not going to make our lives as bankers in the Bank of Greece, and therefore, we should go see Greece, and that we should learn all about the foods and the people and the places and—

Q: You know, I'd never heard of Greece being a destination of this kind. And I'm fascinated that there was an organization that made this all possible in 1970. When you were at Wellesley, in addition to this kind of summer activity, were you able to take classes at Harvard or not? Was this not possible?

FORE: So Wellesley had a relationship with MIT [Massachusetts Institute of Technology]. This is the time of our world where many of the colleges were wondering if they should go co-ed or not. And so Wellesley was part of the Seven Sisters. And some of us decided to become co-ed and some decided to stay single-sex institutions, and Wellesley stayed single-sex. And so it meant that we needed to collaborate with some

institutions. And all the Wellesley girls went out with Harvard men. But MIT offered to do a link because we had lots of liberal arts classes, and they had lots of science and math and technology classes. So our link and our buses that would—I didn't have a car, most of us didn't at that time. And so, you were dependent upon whatever systems were in place publicly. And so we began running shuttles back and forth to MIT.

But by the time that came in place, I now was in my—gosh, maybe my junior or senior year, and I really didn't take advantage of it even though I'd gone in thinking I'd be a physics and math major, because by now I had moved into economics and art and history rather than into physics and science. And so I didn't take any classes at MIT at all. And I didn't take any classes at Harvard, even though I had quite a few classmates who did take one class or another at Harvard. It was frowned on if you took a class that you could take at Wellesley to go take it at Harvard because you had a boyfriend there. (Laughs)

Q: (Laughs)

FORE: You really should take a class at your own institution. And so that was it. But I did get married between my junior and senior year, and it was to a young man at Harvard Business School. So I would commute to Wellesley during that final year, my final, senior year, and there were several of us who were commuting into schools in that year, but I never took classes.

Q: How did you meet your husband? I mean if he was [at] the Harvard Business School, [you] know, how did this happen?

FORE: Well, Alex, there is a well-worn path of mixers between Harvard—all entities of Harvard, so Harvard Law, Harvard Business, and Harvard undergraduate—with Wellesley. And so, as a result, you know, we had at least weekly mixers, if not twice or three times a week, with Princeton and Yale and Harvard because they were all looking for dates. And there we were as an all-women's college. And so, you know, we saw a lot of men at mixers. We just didn't have them in our classes.

Q: And your husband—

FORE: I met him at a Harvard Business School mixer, and we liked each other and debated about all sorts of things. It was a wonderful period for how educational institutions were trying to let their students connect and let their curricula connect in a way that they just hadn't before. They'd been single standing institutions before. And now it became sort of an ecosystem of single-sex and co-ed and male-only and female-only institutions who connected on liberal arts and technology, and it was challenging to see the connections. Wellesley students are often the graders for the Harvard Business School papers.

Q: (Laughs)

FORE: Therefore, every Harvard Business School student wants to know the Wellesley graders who are doing their grading, and—but I was not one of them. But it just meant that we saw a lot of students from every school.

Q: Graders—I—so you mean, whenever there was a paper, the Harvard Business School people didn't know how to write, the Wellesley people would do corrections?

FORE: Yeah, and so—

Q: I see; this is the kind of cooperation you're talking about in this ecosystem. (Laughs) What did the Harvard Business School people offer to Wellesley, other than a husband?

FORE: Well, after being graders, Wellesley students would consider applying to Harvard Business School. It was a time when women were just coming into the business schools. The class had two, three or four or five women entering a class, but never, to the levels that it would—that it would become; it would blossom.

Q: Sure.

FORE: So women in business schools was just starting. And it just meant that, you know, Wellesley women immediately thought, "Well, gosh, you know, we can do this." (Laughs) We can grade their papers—

Q: Of course.

FORE: — _____ take their classes.

Q: Every Wellesley woman I've ever known said, No, they could do anything. So it's a tradition that I think you are not alone in. But, you know, did you and your husband wonder about whether you should get married before you had been able to finish your undergraduate? I mean, was this considered to be something that was a question mark for you, or—and did your parents agree? If I may probe this area; you are not—you don't have to answer. (Laughs)

FORE: So, Alex, it's a time when we were all just starting to change our modes of behavior. You know, dorms were, in the co-ed schools, just becoming co-ed. We had not allowed men in our quarters at, you know, at many of the single-sex institutions. And so many of the rules were changing. And so Wellesley changed along with that. And so, it didn't seem to be an issue with the college. And with my parents, (laughs) it was, but, you know, they had understood that I might be headstrong about wanting to go do something, and so they trusted me. And they thought I was thoughtful and wise enough to make a good choice. I was blessed with wonderful parents.

Q: You certainly were. And did you—when you graduated, was your husband still at the B-school, or had he also graduated from the B-School?

FORE: We graduated in the same year, and so we went off to Denver, Colorado, and he went to work for one of the big conglomerates. This was the time of conglomerates, Alex, in Denver. Great Western United. Anyway, they were a very interesting company, and that's where we went. And then I went to look for a job. And so that's when I first saw the federal government. I could test well, having had a Wellesley education and a Baldwin education. And so, I did well on the Federal Service Entrance Examination. You may remember that from our deep, dark past, Alex.

Q: (Laughs) Right. Yes. And—

FORE: And so, I was taken in as an intern in the General Services Administration in the Federal Center, which was out on the west side of Denver. So that's where I had my first full time job.

Q: And what did you do there? In this General Services Administration?

FORE: As an intern, you get to rotate among all the areas because they want to see if you would do particularly well in one area and others. So I went through the procurement area, I went through writing job classifications and the personnel office. I went through how we would put up weather balloons so that we were testing weather in certain stations, the building service, whether or not we should have fire departments or police departments. I would write business cases as to what that would look like. This was the time when President Nixon had indicated that we would sell off some of the federal lands, so—and EPA-type of regulations, doing environmental assessment studies came in, and so I would write environmental assessment studies for deaccessioning acreage out of parks. General Service Administration, you know, has a lot of acreage that they look after, buildings—

Q: Sure.

FORE: —are banned, so—

Q: Most of Nevada, right? Most of Nevada (laughs) is owned by the government.

FORE: It is, but it's mostly the Bureau of Land Management that—but it is owned by the federal government. And so from my father, who knew about real estate and about building management and about, you know, just real estate in general, I—so I went into appraising. I mean, all of it became useful information for me later in life so that I would do well and be able to help my father in his real estate business in Chicago, and he had a milling business in the central part of California. And then he had a manufacturing company. And so I learned enough in General Services Administration to do a variety of things. And that was all very useful.

And I realized how I had a misimpression that somehow government was maybe not as effective as it could be in that the people who worked in government maybe didn't work as hard. None of that's true. People in government are just, I mean, we really have to be

respectful and admire and help them, support them. I mean, we need government offices that function well because they serve as communities. And so, I learned that in my time period with General Services Administration, which I would not have known if I'd just gone to work for a company.

Q: And the diversity of what you were doing sounds like it ideally prepared you for your jobs, both at State Department and AID, and your ability to walk into these various areas and not be a complete novice. Interesting; how long did you spend there?

FORE: Yes, it helps to have a broad education if you're going to go into State or USAID. So I was there for six or seven years. And I have found that everywhere you go, you learn something that you take with you that makes the next place you are in better because you know a piece of information or a way of doing something that would be useful.

I also got my Master's at night, and it was in public administration because I was interested in how government worked locally. So when you study public administration, you learn about all sorts of ways of organizing cities and strong mayor offices—and how you would finance, let's say, a sports arena. And it was an interesting look at public and private finance and management to see what kinds of public services could be delivered privately or could be delivered better by the public sector. So that started an interest in how that could look both in theory and in practice. But at least for me, when I was in graduate school, it was really theoretical. It wasn't until I was in a job that I got to try something out.

Q: But you started off as an intern at the GSA [General Services Administration], you stayed there several years, so you moved on to various other levels there, you know, doing all these various things. But you were GS-5 [the fifth pay grade within the General Schedule PayScale] to begin with, or something like that, and—

FORE: (Laughs) Very good, and then quickly into a GS-7 and then a GS-9 and then an GS-11. I mean, I was just zooming along up the ladder. I found myself most interested in real estate and in appraisals. I liked the interplay, how our natural environment and our built environment affects our communities. And I love national parks, so if we were going to deaccession out of national parks and monuments and other spaces, I wanted it to be done well for the communities. And if we were going to let go of some of the parks in a central city, well then maybe it could go to public and private use, where it could stay a park, so that it wouldn't have to become a parking garage. (Laughs)

Q: Yeah.

FORE: But yeah, I mean, you become a land use planner and—but also an appraiser of property because it carries the value. You are there on behalf of the taxpayer, so you have to get your best value, its highest and best use. But you also want it to be something that works in the community. So I found it interesting, and I found that I was drawn on the real estate side.

Q: And meanwhile, I mean, your husband was still working for this conglomerate, and seven years later, you from the start? Did he then move jobs, or how did that move take place, and what led you, because I guess you then went to California, is that it, or—

FORE: So my husband and I, unfortunately, broke up. I thought I'd very much like to start a business. So when I was in the federal government, on the side, I'd started a little greeting card company with my tennis partner. And they were tennis greeting cards. Now that's a very small niche market. (Laughs)

Q: What does a tennis greeting card consist of?

FORE: (Laughs) It means that you get a tennis-themed birthday card or anniversary card or Valentine's Day card, but you get a card that has—it has tennis themes. Anyway, I did all of the artwork for it; she did the wording. And we then tried to get our little greeting card company off the ground and realized quite quickly that we were not pricing our time in for our greeting cards. I would have my greeting cards in my trunk, and after I got out of work, I would then go to visit some shops and stores and department stores that might be able to sell greeting cards, and to show them our wonderful cards to see if they would like to buy them. Well, it was quite clear that we didn't have the economics underlying our business right. And so it forever stamped into my mind that you really have to learn, you can't just go forth and think you're going to be a great businessperson, you really have to understand the economics of your business and how—

Q: I thought you went to Wellesley and minored in economics.

FORE: (Laughs) I know, and how to price your product.

Q: (Laughs)

FORE: And there you have it, you know, from books to reality. Anyway, I knew I loved running little businesses. And so I wanted to do that. And so I went up to Seattle, and I was fascinated there, and I was very interested in seeing if maybe I could get into the boat building business because, you know, they have lots of houseboats up in Seattle, and—

Q: Sure.

FORE: —and it's a beautiful part of the world. And I was—I had an apartment that was just right opposite the fish ladder in Shilshole and right across from the sailing marina. And so, anyway—

Q: Did you know people in Seattle, or did you just go up there because of the houseboats?

FORE: Yep. I just went up there because of the houseboats and, you know, off you go.

Q: You had no—excuse me, you had no children at this stage, right?

FORE: Correct. None.

Q: Okay.

FORE: And so—

Q: So you were a free agent.

FORE: That's right. And so—but then when I was up there, my father called me. I had been in touch with him quite a bit because in, you know, thinking about doing a boat building business, my father would be my very best designer partner, everything, because he really knew boats. And he knew them from Chicago and Lake Michigan, and he knew them from California. So, anyway, he'd be great.

So, anyway, he called because the manager of one of his companies died of a heart attack. And so would I come down and help him out. And of course, I mean, of course, you know, your father's put you through school, and he's been your father. So, you know, you—so you drop everything, and off you go. And I told him that I would come down for two weeks; I would do the interviewing for him if that would be helpful. And so I could come up with a final list of candidates for him for who would be running this company of his. And I quickly found out that that was, you know, very ambitious. And actually, it wasn't grounded in reality because this was a small company called Stockton Wire Products that manufactured metal lath, wire metal lath. I didn't really know what lath was.

Q: (Laughs)

FORE: I didn't know how to build a house. I didn't know what a plasterer did. But that was the world I was now in. And manufacturing—you know, they were talking about AC and DC motors and transformers, and I wasn't sure that I'd really learned that. So, you know, what did the lath do, and, anyway, so I tried to learn what the company was doing while doing my search for whoever would run this company. But I had to keep it going, so we had to keep getting invoices out and getting loads picked up and loaded and getting products there and, you know, making sure that we had some staff in the morning on the first shift or the second shift or third shift.

And so pretty soon it was—I was very involved and had not made an offer to any candidates at the end of my second week. My father then said, well, take your time, keep looking for somebody. And you know, in the meantime, if you can stay, that would be good, not realizing that, you know, he thought, oh I was newly divorced; he'd put me under his wing; he'd teach me business. And, of course, his plan is what happened. He took me under his wing, he taught me business, and I loved it. And I never went back to Seattle; I picked up my things and came back again. And I thought I would just stay a short time, but I stayed for twelve years and learned to appreciate my father in a way that I never had. I didn't know him in business; you often don't when you're a child.

Q: Right, right.

FORE: —you don't know what your parent is like. Anyway, he was a very interesting mind and very creative, and we were a wonderful pair, and I was very lucky to work with him. And he was, you know, sort of like two generations older than me. He was born in 1901. So this was about, you know, 1978. So he was seventy-seven at the time, and I was in my twenties. So we sort of missed a generation in between, but that's what I was looking for to run the company; it was somebody who was in between our ages.

But, anyway, I stayed, and the industry was great to me, and they took me in and taught me plastering and lathing and getting out on the jobs and knowing how to build a house. And, I mean, I really—they were great to me, and they didn't probably in the beginning know what to do with somebody who loved Mozart and (both laugh) loved art museums. It wasn't what the plasterers and lathers and building material dealers did. They went fishing, (laughs) and so—

Q: So you didn't play Mozart in the background as the—

FORE: (Laughs)

Q: —as they were coming in and out? Your CV has this wonderful thing that I need an explanation for: "Operated the largest manufacturer of wire corner and foundation trims." What are wire corner and foundation trims in layman's terms?

FORE: So, Alex, if you were to look in the room you're in right now, do you have drywall and a gypsum plaster on the inside and some paint over it, or maybe you're in a plaster house? In that inside corner, there is a reinforcement to keep—

Q: Right.

FORE: —corner together—

Q: That I know about, okay.

FORE: —the plaster or the gypsum attached. And down at the bottom, you'll have weep screeds to let water out of the building either through the exterior or somewhere else. So it's that invisible reinforcement that you don't see. And so we—the company grew and grew and grew, which was great. And so it went from wire into all sorts of cold rolled sheet metals. We had our own machines and kept perfecting them and improving them. And so, anyway, it was a wonderful period of life, and it was very interesting. Anyway, I had a chance to run a company.

Q: And did your father have other companies of which this was just one? And so he was busy doing other things while you were running this company?

FORE: Well, remembering that he was in his late seventies, eighties, and early nineties when I was working with him—

Q: Yeah.

FORE: I helped him on each of his companies and to try to either keep them going, sell them, close them up, but all of it, you know, my idea of doing something in two weeks (laughs) was— it took us five years, ten years to do some of them, but we managed to get them all in good shape, and that was wonderful. That then meant that, while I felt terribly guilty about the idea of going off to serve my country in a place like USAID, my father said, yes, you should go. And by then I knew how to recruit—

Q: (Laughs) Right.

FORE: —a person who could take my spot and who would be a little bit older than me but not as old as he was, so that we'd fill in the gap.

Q: And was there another company that you were running also at the same time, in addition to the Stockton Wire Products? There's something—

FORE: Yeah.

Q: And what was that?

FORE: Well, so one was *Pozalite*, which is a cement additive. These are building materials—

Q: Yeah.

FORE: —so it's a cement additive that allows you to spray plaster. You probably see on the job sites these guns that shoot the plaster onto walls. For it not to cake and dry, you need something that keeps it soft, sort of like adding a soft butter in your plaster. And so that's what it does. And most of these are earths like bentonite clay that come out of the western United States. Most cementitious building is in California, Nevada, Arizona; so my major business focus was the western United States.

Q: I am fascinated by your knowledge of so many areas, including homebuilding, industrial development—this is a whole side of Henrietta Fore that I did not know existed, and it obviously is helpful in so many ways doing the rest of your work, the rest of your career. Were you still—during this period of what is twelve years or so—were you still single during that period, or did you meet your husband there during this period?

FORE: So I was single for nine-tenths of it. And then as I was running Stockton and these companies in Los Angeles, I joined a group called Young Presidents' Organization. And this is for those of—who are lucky enough to become presidents when they're young, and to give them a, you know, a group that they can talk with about various issues, you know,

like insurance or workers' compensation or things that you need to know if you're going to look after the people who work with you and for you and your customers. So I joined Young Presidents' Organization, and when I did so, my future husband was one of the members. We became good friends. And so we were friends for a couple of years before marrying.

And then I began being interested in doing something to serve my country, something that wasn't just making money that would have a greater purpose. I think many of us feel that in life, and that certainly is a strong thread in me, that I want to do something that is—makes the world better, if I can, in my own little way, whatever it is. And so I was considering, you know, if I could maybe apply in—you know, maybe I had to try doing the Federal Entrance Examination again and going in as a civil servant.

Or maybe, you know, I could do something that would help in some other region. I knew that I loved the economic, business world, and I knew that I loved the diplomatic, historic, international world because my mother was on one part and my father was on the other, and so I loved both. And so that would lead me into looking at jobs in, you know, State Department, USAID. They—that all seemed that that could be a really wonderful place if I just could figure out how on earth people ever got into those jobs. They were very lucky, but we out in California didn't have a clue how any of that happened.

Q: (Laughs)

FORE: There must have been something that you could do. And so at one of my YPO [Young Presidents' Organization] gatherings, Ken and Carol Adelman came out, and he was a speaker, and afterward, I just tapped him on the shoulder and said, you know, that I'd be really interested; you know, how do you do this? And then there was another YPOer named Warren Rustand, who had served in an administration, and he began putting together books of YPO people who were interested in serving, and so we all went back to Washington. And, I mean, there were maybe ten of us, which isn't very many when you think of all the jobs that are open and how helpful it would be to have people from business to actually serve in these jobs.

But I then came back, and I knew that I had to apply and how I would do that. And so I began to learn it, and then the idea was, well, maybe, you know, I could go to USAID, and I met Alan Woods and was impressed by him. And so he said that there was a small little bureau by the name of Private Enterprise, and it was very small, but if that would be something that I could be interested in, you know, they needed a nominee, and I, of course, said, I'd be very interested in if I can just get my company into hands. And so it all worked out. I found someone to run the company with my father, looking over his shoulder, and off I went to Washington.

And in this time, we became engaged. We were engaged when I turned in my paperwork for confirmation, but it was one of those long confirmations where all four of us who were waiting, Andrew Natsios and Rich Bissell and Ray Randlett and I, we were all

waiting for confirmation. It was, I think, nine months. So my husband and I waited to be married because I couldn't put in my paperwork all over again as a married person with all of his financial information added, so we waited, and then I got married right soon after confirmation.

Q: Nine months. What was going on at that time? This was at the end of the—

FORE: This is 1989, and so we're in [the] George H.W. Bush administration. And it's just, you know, there's a backlog. You know how this operates for Senate confirmations. And so you just wait, and I mean, it was a wonderful group, but we were all just waiting for confirmation, and so we all held together, and Alan Woods kept trying to get us out.

Q: But it's just, you know, this was not at the beginning of the administration when there's a great delay. This is—this was towards the end of the administration, right?

FORE: No, see, the election would have been 1988. So—

Q: Well, then, when—

FORE: Let's see, so '89. So I think that my formal nomination was probably at the end of the summer in '89.

Q: I see. Okay, so—

FORE: And then we had to wait until the spring. It was perhaps April 1990 when we were confirmed by the Senate.

Q: And had the office been filled by anyone, or—

FORE: Yes, my predecessor was Neal Peden. She was held over from the Reagan administration. And before her was our initial leader, Elise du Pont.

Q: I know Elise du Pont. She came in while I was still around, you know, that we—at that point, I thought this was the solution to all of AID's private sector problems. If Elise du Pont couldn't solve them, then—but, in any case—

FORE: They couldn't be solved, yeah.

Q: — (laughs), they couldn't be. That's right. But once you got in there, I mean, it gave you plenty of time to study up on what you're going to be getting into.

FORE: (Laughs) Yes. And to learn where the boundaries were for what you could do when you were a consultant and—

Q: Yeah.

FORE: —when you were, you know, later, but I had a wonderful deputy in Chris Russell, who, you know, as you know, a career foreign service officer can run any bureau, and—

Q: Well, that (laughs) may be a little bit strong, but—

FORE: And then when I came in, you know, then I had a chance to choose some staff—including a Deputy , and that's when I had the absolute delight of George Laudato.

Q: Oh yeah, and—

FORE: So, George Laudato and Ray Love and the whole generation went to work. We're all there to help to see what we could do in Private Enterprise. And then me and my fellow waiting-for-confirmation team, we were—we'd all had long enough to talk and get to know each other's portfolios that we knew what we wanted to do together, and Carol Adelman was there. And so we all just got to work, and Scott Spangler was there. And, you know, it was a very good team. It was just such a shame that we lost Alan Woods.

Q: Right. And what were you—

FORE: And Mark Edelman was deputy.

Q: —and what were you able to do? I mean, what did you set out to do, and given the constraints on the—this bureau, what were you able to accomplish, in your mind, as you look back on it now?

FORE: So it was a very interesting time, and Alex, it's actually a time sort of like now. And it was the time when we were really focused on Eastern Europe, and we were focused on Eastern Europe because the Berlin Wall had come down. And we were trying to rethink what a communist versus a capitalist society should look like, what a communal society versus a democratic society should look like. And so, as you can see, these were all issues that I'd thought about and was interested in.

And therefore, when Carol Adelman, John Blackton, and her team, came up with some ideas about how Eastern Europe could have, you know, a menu of services that we could offer, as USAID, to the states that were coming out of the Soviet Union and were now going to be independent states, the very issues that are now at play today, it is—it was a time when immediately we thought of, well, couldn't there be some private sector businesses that would like to go into these countries and help them get started again? And so we had a great legal team; you know, John Mullen was there on the whole side; he was with Tim Fry.

But in my group, Mike Kitay and Dale Sarro were very creative about what could be done. And so we created a guarantee authority and the Financial Services Volunteer Corps. At the time, we didn't call it that, but it is what it's called now—so that, as a private individual working, at the Federal Reserve, at a bank, or at a law firm, that you could join a small team and go to Europe for a short stay, and you could help Poland or

the Czech Republic. You could actually help the country; you could give them advice, policy, etcetera. So we recruited Cy Vance and John Whitehead to co-lead this group. And it meant that USAID, without having much money could lead public/private development of these former Soviet countries. My budget at the time in the Bureau for Private Enterprise was fourteen million dollars a year, so we didn't have much money, so you had to think of things you could do without money, that—and so this idea that a legal firm or a bank would—at the Federal Reserve—would lend someone to do a project, like in Poland, that you would get banking, that you would get checks into the society, that you would get them being used—credit cards, you know, things that are basic to the societies we knew, but weren't existing in any of these countries of the USSR.

We had people who led every country, and there would be small teams of five or six or seven who would go out. They would stay—they would talk with the prime minister and the head of their banking sector, and they would organize what needed to be done economically for the country, but also where you needed to place your budgets so that health, education, all of those issues that we know of in USAID, would move forward for the people. We wanted economic development in each of these countries, very similar to the Marshall Plan, but we didn't have that kind of funding, so we needed to get it going. And so the Financial Services Volunteer Corps was born, our first sort of beachhead, it was our—it was what we could send out there, quickly. So we got that going and it helped set the unified structure for capitalism and democracy for the next few years.

Q: That sounds terrific. Were these people volunteered by their corporations, by their legal firms, and so on, so you did not have to pay these people?

FORE: Correct, correct.

Q: That's wonderful. Yeah.

FORE: Yeah, it's the only way we could get them out fast, get the best, and the corporations and, you know, they could see that it could be future business, but in any case, they were helping the world be a better place. And that is absolutely what you need now. The more you look around the world, you would wish that we could put more volunteers out there of every age group because they can carry information. You know, we've had farmer-to-farmer visits, and there's nothing like a farmer talking to another farmer. If you know dairy cows, they know dairy cows, they will do a great job. And so bankers talking to bankers, lawyers talking to lawyers; it makes a difference. And you could see that the United States could have a whole cadre of people like this, who you could send out to countries that are just struggling. They don't have the people power, the women and the men with the backgrounds and experience to know the international world or to connect their country to that international world, much connect their communities and their rural villages. So the more that you could send out volunteers, it would be great. That was one. And then another—

Q: Let me stop you there, if I may, to ask another question. I mean, one of the problems that I knew about the World Bank and AID subsequently had been that the people that

come out of the career backgrounds on development, for the most part, did not understand and know the kind of economies that were reflected by the Soviet Union or their successors. So did you find that you had a problem at all with these people trying to adapt—your volunteers trying to adapt to a system that was hard for them to understand, so it then became more difficult for them to propose a way in which their expertise could be used?

FORE: Yes, of course, because none of us knew those systems well enough. And we didn't speak the languages; we didn't speak Polish or Czech or—

Q: Right.

FORE: —you know, so—but, you know, there was such desire on the other side for people who did, who were dual linguists or tri- or quadruple or quintuple; —

Q: Yeah; right.

FORE: —I mean, it's so many, that they could work it out. And everybody can be a quick study if they want to be, if they care about the area, and we took very good people—you don't volunteer for these jobs unless you're willing to get into them.

Q: Yeah.

FORE: I mean, you're not there to just go out to dinner. And so, you know—

Q: Sure, sure.

FORE: —they just work day and night really hard. And so, their first visit might be two weeks, and then they might have to go back two weeks later, or maybe it would be, six weeks later, but their corporations paid for the airfare and hotel rooms. Then we paid a minimal stipend, and we sent a young and able USAID officer with them who would then look after that country from a USAID point of view. So one who comes to mind is Lee Roussel, who had been one who was there. So we had a USAID link in- country; they weren't just there on their own, they know the economics and development. They weren't experts in that particular country system; they had to learn the system.

And Alex, as you can well imagine, many of the Soviet systems were really steeped in red tape and in clearances, and they had completely different modes of operations. So to get them into our Western system was also important and that they understood what—the legal frameworks were different—but they understood what the legal responsibilities were as well as the economic opportunities, and that's very important. So it was training of people—of local people, and then training of our own people—those who could carry it on.

Q: Carrying it on, _____. To carry it on, of course; do you have a sense that some of these were sustained after your volunteers left?

FORE: Oh, definitely, and the Financial Services Volunteer Corps still exists. And there was another initiative that was going at the same time, which was privatization, which you remember, Alex, was that, you know, we had many factories that were in what we then called Eastern Europe, now Central Europe, that were making one product and so they were often single purpose. They tended to be heavy bulk items, so they might be making casings for refrigerators or tractors. And an entity like General Electric would want to come in and make light bulbs. And so the privatization of these public entities that were driven by the Soviet system to economically make product X to go into the Soviet supply chain, but now these factories would be sold. There would be a price put on the state owned factory, and they would be sold to a private company that would do something else with them. So here, on privatizations, that was right up my alley because I'd been an appraiser. So—

Q: Of course.

FORE: —and I knew what private business would want to do so that I could think and talk on both sides of a transaction. So we were working with, now, investment bankers who would want to take these public entities to market. And how should we do that? So each country was thinking about whether they wanted to have shares in all of these privately held enterprises that were given to the people of the country. So the Czech Republic, and Alec Tomlinson was great on this one, would have one approach, Poland would have another. Some countries would pay off each citizen in a country, let's say, \$300, for their ownership of the shares in a public company X, Y, or Z, and they got equity shares in others; where the public received shares, that would help us start a public market. If we could get a stock market moving, it meant that we had a way to get future capital raised for these entities; they could be sustainable. It meant that ownership could be partially local, even though, let's say, a General Electric or others would come in. We understood how to do the capitalist system, but it wasn't understood in those countries, but we needed to go through it and to make it as fair as possible and make the beginning of a capital market and economy successful.

So USAID and our little Private Enterprise Bureau was part of privatizations, but so was Asia—the Asia/Near East/Europe Bureau. And—but then everybody became involved in it, so Africa, Latin America, and others, and the reason they became involved is because the Soviet empire had so many of these state-owned organizations, and privatization is how we were going to move them into the private sector and into our capitalist world. And many of the countries that had followed the Soviet model out around the world were now interested. So we'd look at privatizations in Sri Lanka, we'd look at them in Bangladesh, we'd look at them in Latin America. It meant that all of the entities in USAID were involved in the privatization, the changeover from the Soviet Union becoming Russia, and the world at large trying to pull these countries into a capitalist, democratic world. So that was what we were trying to get accomplished, and it was for the long term.

It was a very interesting time, and I could use my private sector knowledge, as well as my public sector knowledge, at that time and place. And then, as it turned out, Asia was split off from the Europe/Near East/Asia Bureau. And so we became Asia and Private Enterprise. And Asia was really already clicking on all cylinders in private enterprise, and what had been the Asian Tigers, now we had little tiger cubs that were coming out.

And so we were really excited about trying to get them prosperous—focused or what they could be doing for their people, and what we had learned out of, let's say, the Indonesia model or some others, but it was very much how the economics of the West could help countries grow, be productive, and bring prosperity to their people. And that was an underlying drive for USAID.

Q: How receptive did you find the USAID bureaucracy? I mean, this is, for the most part, not one that is steeped in the private sector, even though, as you were saying, that it was beginning to take on these aspects, but did you find it easy to work within this AID structure, or was that a frustrating experience?

FORE: For me, Alex, the way into the structure was to get to know the people. And I was blessed with George Laudato, and, you know, Ray Love and all of the other AAs [assistant administrators]. So, you know, you got to know the bureaucracy and what it was there for, you know, Janet Ballantine, and I mean, they were just—they were great. And as a result, they wanted to help; they could see it was a new world. Did they have all the skills? No, none of us did. We didn't know the Soviet system. But we could all pitch in with what we did know, and it was interesting.

What we didn't have was a budget, so, you know, Doug Tinsler and others would go look for money, and people would just try to look for funding where they could. Funding was probably our biggest challenge because, as you know, USAID is very projectized, and there's color of money. So, you know, could we use health money for privatization? Well, probably not, you know, could we use other, child survival? You know, we just—I mean, we were struggling with getting funding, so we had to ask for services for free. And then we had to get private companies in there. There was lots of competition from other countries and their companies. But we had to then rely on procurement and others so that it would be fair and open because we weren't just going to give access and investments to anybody, because we were looking carefully at investing our taxpayers funds.

So we needed things that would be sustainable for the long term. We needed people that were committed. People weren't sure whether they wanted their careers to be in this public-private arena because, maybe this was just a passive fad. This was, after all, the third term of a Republican administration, so, you know, probably the Democrats were going to come in and change it all, so, therefore, you know, why would they want to do private enterprise, but the world was changing, and this countries were asking for democracy and for capitalism, and so, you know, quite a few just came to help. And so they did, and they did it—they kept their jobs, and they helped us on the side. And, you know, and when you have—we were just a little team out looking for people, and people would help us all over the world. So in the missions, you know, they could either see that

they needed to do a privatization of a big public entity in their country. And so they'd say, okay, tell us what we need to do. Mission directors and their staffs are so willing. I didn't find it overwhelmingly frustrating, quite the opposite.

What I couldn't get used to is the time it took to do things. You know, it just seemed to me that we could speed up this process a great deal if we could get rid of some of those clearances and, you know, and if we had some funds. I mean, I wanted to go out and earn money for us so that we could go do these things, but we had to go to Congress, and Congress wasn't in the mood for spending money. And so we didn't—I didn't have a way, like a business, where you could go out and sell a product and earn money. So we had to sell the ideas and get partners, and, actually, in government, you can be very entrepreneurial, but you need partners, and you need ideas. You need to know what you want to get accomplished, and you need to know operations; can you actually get it accomplished? And if you, I mean, this is like manufacturing wire lath; you need to know it from the beginning to the end as to how to actually operate. And if you're a good operator, you can get almost anything done.

Q: Did you go up to the Hill quite regularly, both for official testimony and for informal meetings with the Hill staff and members?

FORE: Yes, but you know, Alex, they really don't care about a tiny little bureau (laughs) in USAID, an assistant administrator who's just, you know, new, and, you know, so it wasn't like they asked, oh, could we do a hearing for you? So, you know, you were called up some. I would talk to every staff member that I could. We had good Legislative Affairs people. And so the Ray Randlett team and others who were there, you know, they really—they helped us, and all of us tried to respond. And in the beginning, when this—the privatization portfolio was under Carol Adelman, you know, she had a lot of good contacts. We'd all try to work together, and—but Congress—it was never as often as it is probably currently. And it's never as often for the lower-level people as it is for the higher-level people, so, you know, they—probably there could have been more in retrospect, but, you know, Congresses, they have many things on their mind, and—

Q: They do.

FORE: —this was only one.

Q: And how did the loss of Alan Woods, other than personally, how did the loss affect you?

FORE: Well, it meant that some of the people like Molly and others who were with him who were so good would transition out, and that we were waiting for, you know, that same leadership. He was really well respected and knowledgeable, and he knew what he wanted to accomplish. So it affected us in that we just—we lost a champion.

Q: And, I mean, his successor has been perhaps the most—what's the word—vilified, I think—I mean, as far as I can tell, his successor was the least well respected of all the

eight administrators from day one. So did you have much interaction with his successor? Did you have to spend time trying to convince him of any of the virtues of these programs you were talking about or were you pretty much left alone to go ahead and do what you wanted to do?

FORE: There are some pluses with being a small bureau.

The issues are small, so you are often, you know, sort of, well, whatever you think is best. So, you know, he—the successor administrator, Ron Roskens—he helped us; he didn't harm us. He was busy with other things. And so we didn't have any—that he was not an impediment to getting things done. The systems we were working with, you know, for the Soviet Union, or the lack of funding, were much more difficult. So—

Q: And did you go out at all yourself to Russia or any of the other countries with some of your teams?

FORE: Yes, so the good thing about the Private Enterprise Bureau was that it was worldwide. So, I was able to travel to many places, and as you know, I would want to go. I want to be with the people on the ground. I want to be there, working right beside them. I don't want to be remote in an office pushing a pen. So I got a chance to go out and see lots of the mission directors. It was, I mean—they were terrific. I have such enormous respect for them. I just—you know, I just—I'm sorry that we have—that we are—we have lost and are losing some of the older mission directors. They taught me everything. They are why I've had the career I've had, and they gave me insights that were extraordinary, and I have, I mean, I just—I've loved them. Walter Bollinger. I mean, the names just—they're just dozens and dozens or hundreds of them, Alex, but they were great teachers, and I got to see them in their environments, and that was very helpful. And some, you know, we would often see the ambassadors, so, let's say, a Frank Wisner, who was fabulous in the Philippines and headed to India, and we sent out one of my very best division directors, Linda Morse. And, I mean, they were a great team together.

But you realize that the people make an enormous difference, who you send; they connect with their ambassador in country so that they become a good working team. The work, to me, is on the ground; the field should drive it, not headquarters. So what they say should be what goes. What you're trying to do is make their life easier and to send them ideas, programs, funding, everything that they need and clear the—you know, so do the air cover with Congress and the administration for them, but they're the ones who lead. And if you have that kind of an opinion, you've got to get out there and see them, so I went out there to see them.

Q: So how did your next job come about? I mean, you were in this role for a couple of years; was it that long that you were head of the Private Enterprise Bureau? But then along comes Asia. So how did this happen?

FORE: So it's all in that same George H. W. Bush administration. And so we took Asia and put it in with Private Enterprise, and it became Asia and Private Enterprise Bureau.

And so I went through another confirmation, but this time, I'm still married, so I (laughs) don't have to wait for anything—

Q: (Laughs) Right.

FORE: — ____ ____ . And so one of the things that we did during Asia and Private Enterprise that remains seared in my memory bank, and, in fact, I have its poster here with me, is that we started the U.S.-Asia Environmental Partnership. And it was really the first of its kind with being a public-private program. And we just—we felt so strongly, and you can see our budgets (laughs), we—that the solutions to what was lying in the future were going to be public and private. But the systems within the government weren't set up for that. But maybe we could create a partnership in which we could set it up to do public and private work. It was set up with a very specific purpose, which was to have clean air, clean water, and clean land to walk on, so that if we could get that, as our mission, the U.S.-Asia Environmental Partnership could move to help 'green' Asia. It was a forerunner in two fields: One of the first public/private partnerships and one of the first for the planet's environment.

So what was in it for the countries was that they could make sure that the areas that they were concerned about with cleanup could get cleaned up. So that could be on land; it could also be factories that were spewing particles into the air that they did not want, so they wanted carbon filters. It could be that they wanted to save the coral reefs, like around the Philippines, because their fishermen and fisherwomen needed those coral reefs for the fish and the health of the habitats. And we were going to help all of them with technical assistance, projects, partners, and capital.

We could also see that pharmaceutical companies and beauty products companies were heading into the developing world, let's say, Indonesia, where they could find pharmaceuticals. So they needed to develop these well because we also had the whole issue of clearing of lands and the burning of the forests because the farmers needed land for agriculture, whether it was good land or not; they just—so they were burning forests. So if you were going to save any of those plants that could help in pharmaceuticals or could help in cosmetics, a public-private partnership might be able to help on that. And if we could get an income stream going through a public-private partnership, then it could help create long-term assistance for that national park or that region, that area within the country. And if it could be a public-private partnership, then we wouldn't have overfishing of a coral reef or the dumping of fluids or chemicals that would damage the reef. I mean, it fits together as one. If we were going to do a privatization, then we would make sure that there would be the capacity for technologies, often out of the United States, that could help with having scrubbers in their emission pipes.

But it was set up that it would be a public-private partnership with real, solid, long-term reasons for both the private sector and the public sector to want to participate and keep it going. And so that's what we launched with the president, and Tom Nicasro is great on this. He got the call on Christmas Day from Brent Scowcroft that our US-Asia environmental partnership was approved for President Bush to announce in Singapore.

This is 1991, right before the end of the administration. And so we launched it, and Lou Reid in Indonesia was seminal for this, but a lot of others were too.

And it's just—it was a precursor to what we are also seeing today, Alex, which is a very big climate movement. I think no one felt that we came out of COP26 [the 2021 United Nations Climate Change Conference] with enough, and we are all now trying to sort through how we do climate care while we also have to make sure that it is sustainable locally and sustainable economically. So it's so doable. You know, every time I look at it, I just see solution after solution that could be put in place, but our systems aren't set up for it. So we're set up to either be public or private, and what the world needs are public and private, and it certainly is true for the environment. It certainly was true for changing to a capitalist system and doing privatizations. And so I came away from this period of time feeling that we should do more so world public-private entities.

Q: Who were your partners in this—no, Asia public-private—

FORE: The US-Asia—

Q: —for the environment?

FORE: —Environmental Partnership. There were maybe—I'm just going to say two dozen major partners. And I bet I have a file here somewhere (laughs)—

Q: (Laughs)

FORE: —with who they were. But think of entities like, you know, Johnson & Johnson, pharma—

Q: So big corporations that were at work globally, right? So—

FORE: That were at work global—well, for us, Asia—

Q: Yeah.

FORE: —so that we're interested, let's say, in the pharmaceuticals of Asia. We also had toy manufacturers; you know, Mattel and others. Toys, there are many toys that are made in Indonesia, and, you know, you don't want to cut down a tree to make every toy. So, you know, what could they be made out of? We had companies like Dole and others in the Philippines, who wanted to help out on the fishermen and the reefs. But there were also companies that were interested who were actually in the buying of seafood business. And, you know, you just— we took the ones who were there. They were predominantly U.S., but there were also some Japanese and other companies throughout Asia who could help.

It was a time, also, when the United States was concerned about the hegemony of Japan and their economic ability to outpace us in Asia, that they were growing larger than the

U.S. presence in Asia, and that Japan would take over. We didn't want to lose the good work that we had done in the past, but we knew that other partners would come in. So we tried to make them partners so that we would all achieve the ends for the developing countries, rather than making it a competition. But there's always one path that's competitive and one that's collaborative, and they move along in parallel. So, you know, it was a friendly competition, sort of like [a] foot race.

Q: _____. (Laughs) And did you have a private sector co-chair, or was it run out of your bureau?

FORE: Yes—

Q: I see.

FORE: —it was run out of the bureau. Lou Reid was its first executive director. And we did have co-chairs, and I'm trying to think, since it was President Bush that announced with Lee Kuan Yew, were they the co-chairs? I think they may have been because we got twenty-eight countries to sign on in Asia. I think we had twenty-six public sector agencies and twenty-seven private sector partners. And so I—it might have been President Bush and Lee Kuan Yew.

Q: That's terrific, but you also had a bureau with a broader mandate than the environment. I hadn't realized that you had merged Private Enterprise and the Asia Bureau. This was a way of giving—of avoiding having to bring in someone new to the Private Enterprise area so you could continue to do both. I mean, did you find that a taxing responsibility or a challenging and delightful one?

FORE: Challenging and delightful, and it was, Alex, because of the people. So, you know, the people are the most important part of anything, any organization, any endeavor, and the people in the Asia Bureau were just great. I mean, that's where, you know, Walter Bollinger and Linda Morris came from. They came out of that Asia Bureau, and they were great. And so we had a lot more talent that we could put to work. And we were—they were very interested in what Private Enterprise was doing. So it was a nice synergy. And when you have a George Laudato and a Ray Love around, you know, they know everybody's history and who would be good at what, and so, I mean, we just—we had a great time putting good people in good places and trying to get it going, but then the administration ends, so I have to leave them.

But, you know, they carry on, but, I mean, it was a time when, if you believe in people, if you give them the respect for their experience, which is enormous, they will do great things. And they did. And so it was a great mix to have Private Enterprise and Asia together at that time.

Q: If you look back on that time period, short as it was, what were the big issues that you remember having to deal with? Were there major crises of some kind or another in Asia at that point that you had to worry about?

FORE: The competition with Japan is one that came to mind immediately because of funding sources like the Asian Development Bank and what kinds of programs you would do and where you would do it. So we really wanted to do some economic adjustments within Indonesia. But you really need to do it with the Asian Development Bank, and you need to do it with the Japanese. And so that was absolutely an issue. We always had hurricanes. As you know, the typhoons in Asia are legendary. And a—you know, this was a time when that was true. Thailand, I remember, was very much part of this, and we had a very good mission director, Tom Reese, there.

And so there were always issues—Bangladesh, it's just, the geography is terribly hard, it was so vulnerable to typhoons in the region. So there were natural disasters, and there probably were more natural disasters than there were manmade conflicts in Asia at the time, in that time period. But there were lots of militias, so within a country, there were always some militias that—so, in the case of the Philippines, like in Mindanao and others. It was always a problem. And I think, you know, it continues to be, but there were not larger wars, the kind that we are seeing now in the Middle East and Ukraine.

Q: Was this the time when Andrew Natsios was in charge of the disaster area in—

FORE: It was. Yeah. So Andrew Natsios and Rich Bissell and I and Ray Randlett and Ste—and Scott Spangler and Carol Adelman and Jim Michael, we were the group operating at that time in this administration.

Q: So a team—a great team. And you managed to work together very closely, I gathered.

FORE: We did.

And, of course, Andrew and I have stayed friends, and we got—

Q: Of course.

Yeah. So I think that we'll—you know, this is going to be a good time to stop before you move out of AID at the end of the Bush administration but are there any additional thoughts about that period when you had both Private Enterprise and Asia as your responsibility, beyond what you've already said? Is there anything more we should know about that period and what you learned about AID during that period, in addition to the very strong comments you've made already about the value of the career staff and mission directors and all that you managed to learn from them, and so on, all of which, I think, has been clearly reflected in the attitudes of the staff towards you, too, but, in any case, anything further that you think would be worth noting?

FORE: First I think sometimes organizations can dictate their future by developing their sense of mission. In this case, Asia and Private Enterprise went together. We tried very hard to get Private Enterprise involved and embedded in every bureau. We didn't

accomplish it. It's still work to be done. I think that we would benefit by understanding and creating mechanisms where public-private partnerships can work.

We seemed, put in place another entity, a guarantee facility, and this was out of the legal staff with Mike Kitay and housing's Peter Kim. They became a very useful entity for us, and it was something that I have ever since wanted to place in the middle of programs that I have seen, whether it's in the State Department, elsewhere in USAID, at the UN. Guarantees are a real facility; they can be used in public or private transactions. Mike, with John Moen and Tim Fry, really ended up pioneering what that could look like at USAID. And now that DCA has moved into a new agency, AID will benefit by using guarantees, any of the financial instruments that are non-monetary but can use the balance sheet of an AID. And the mortgages that are not yet spent at an AID can be useful. And it's a mechanism that the United Nations needs and USAID needs. So designing that, Alex, I think there is still work to be done, the ability to have public-private partnerships, use them, and to let them move smoothly. You don't have to think of paying corporations to do things. They will do things if it's in their interest, if they have a chance to have a future in it, but we tend to strangle one side or the other, and we could change that system. So that would be a second area.

A third one is when you have small bureaus, it helps when you get more scale. USAID is at its best when it has scale, when it is operating in every country, when it is not just limited to only doing countries that are the very poorest. Every country has parts of it that are underdeveloped and parts that are just world class. India is a great example of that, but it's true for every country. USAID has so much experience and knowledge.

I would love to see USAID much bigger because it has that expertise, and what the Private Enterprise Bureau taught me was that having more people and having more funds means that you can accomplish—you can leverage to accomplish so much more on behalf of the United States. And U.S. leadership is expected in countries, and you can't lead if you're just simply too small of a scale. So don't starve little entities like Private Enterprise or Asia, because they are either too small or Asia, because it was doing so well that they could do it all by themselves. USAID is a[n] extraordinary organization, and it can be more extraordinary if it is resourced.

Q: I should stop at that point, but on the guarantee side, did you work at all with the housing guarantee people who obviously were working on urban development in a very effective fashion, I think, but you haven't mentioned them, and that is AID's long-established guarantee program.

FORE: You're absolutely right, Alex. Peter Kim and the housing program, as well as the authorities, were totally the leaders in all of this, and when I came in—and Peter Kim was there, it was wonderful. As you knew, I'd love real estate, so I was very intrigued. And Peter was a seasoned pro.

Q: Right.

FORE: I was the authority. And we had a lot of the Jewish Russians who are now moving into Jerusalem, and so where the green lines were and where the housing authority could be operating. And, as you know, the big money that was going to Egypt and Israel and the set-asides for it. So Peter Kim, (laughs) I mean, he was exceptional. (Laughs) And Peter taught us a lot, and Mike Kitay picked up many of those. And the fact that we could move guarantees to be something that could be used by all of USAID is just the beginning of what USAID can do, so right you are, great legacy.

Q: Right, I—

FORE: Hats off to Peter. (Laughs)

Q: —I was lucky enough to do—to interview Peter for his oral history not too long before he died, so it was—that was great. Henrietta, I am going to turn off the recording in just a moment here, but thank you very, very much. This has been a really wonderful opportunity to hear from you about all the wonderful things that you have been working on and where you came from. So I'm looking forward to the second session, where we will move you out of AID and into the U.S. Mint, which is a totally different kind of operation. And we'll see how much we can cover in our next session, but I thank you very, very much. It was absolutely fascinating, so thank you again.

FORE: So, Alex, you're welcome. And you are hereby authorized to cut this down to five minutes. (Laughs)

Q: No, no. (Laughs)

FORE: Everything that you need to, and just tell me if we need to move along more quickly next time. It's fun talking to you, and it's great to see you.

Q: Well, this is now the opportunity for Henrietta Fore to continue with the oral interview that we're carrying out. This is the 18th of March 2022. So I'm delighted once again, Henrietta, to see you. And while we had pretty much completed your assessment of AID during when you were head of the Bureau for Asia, I know there are some things you want to add at this stage. So go ahead and say whatever you'd like to say, bring us up to your speed.

FORE: So Alex, thank you very much. It's great to see you again this morning. I reflected on a question that you asked me that was a very good question, which is, do you get frustrated with the pace and the timing and the process of foreign assistance within USAID in these years? And I had responded to you that I really wasn't because the people were so good. But on reflecting more, it was clear to me that an additional reason why I was not frustrated, is due to the sheer volume of the projects that are moving through your purview at any one time. So let's say that there are 200 projects moving.

Five percent of those projects will move very fast. They'll move in a few days because there's a crisis at hand, like what is occurring now in Ukraine. Another 5 percent will be moving through quickly, not as quickly, but very quickly. And then 60 percent will take a long time, a year, and a half to two years. It's sort of a normal gestation period for a good program that's thoughtfully developed with country partners for country partners in partnership for USAID. And then the last 20 percent you will not see in your time period as a political appointee. If they are too long term, you will help them, you will improve them, you will get them nurtured, but there will be just too few ways to move them.

And then I found as an appointee that you can only help the ones that there is political will in the country, that they wanted to move it, because they're your partners; they must want to do it—you don't want to force it on them—and where you had the economic and political environment in the United States to want to move forward on it. But there were always so many programs that it doesn't make it frustrating. It makes it instead a creative and entrepreneurial challenge as to how to get them moving, how to sort them, how to get them at the scale to be effective so that they can be real long-term, self-sustaining development projects.

Q: I guess that it also gives you particular appreciation for your counterparts in the ministers, for example, of development in these countries or finance ministers, whose life in the job may be only two years or four years themselves. So they have, in a sense, the same kind of interest in seeing progress come fairly rapidly while it's under them. I mean, that has served as a reason why many programs don't get off the ground because they don't have that political support you were talking about. But who looks after the 60 percent or whatever percent that are not doing so well? And if they're done in a year or two years, that's already very fast by the standards I've heard of. I mean, do you get sheltered from that as the Assistant Administrator for Asia, as you were? Do the people who work for you worry about the ones that are not doing so well or take longer?

FORE: Well, so Alex, you don't get sheltered from everything, but they do shelter you from some things. So sometimes it is within USAID that the stoppages occur because the legal office or another office just says, you know, this will not work. And then they don't have the time to actually think through what the solution might be. So there's always a group of projects that are held because of internal disagreements. They're not yet out of USAID. And then there are a group of projects that are held in-country. To your very good point that ministers may have changed, and so the new minister gets to come up to speed on it, and, you know, if their staff is still there, they're pushing for it. But, you know, is it the right one? And then you need to be sure that the two work together. So, yes, you get sheltered from some because you're not usually the one who's working it

in-country; that usually is the mission director and his or her staff in-country. So there are some parts you're not there with.

But to me, an assistant administrator's role is to try to give air cover so that all of the programs of the people who are working with you can move as fast as possible. So you need to keep asking, what can I do to help your project? You'll notice that I didn't give you 100 percent as to what happened to all the projects. There's another 10 percent of the projects that are just in gestation; somebody's thinking about them, they're an idea—

Q: Sure.

FORE: —and those are so important. An agency that has ideas, that has knowledge about what's working in development; they're just—they're thinking; they're trying to come up with what might be a good approach, who would be the right partners; they're in gestation, and an assistant administrator can be very helpful there because they may have seen something in their walk of life that might help USAID career people so that maybe it can work better, or they might know the country or something. It's collaborative. But that kind of work makes it interesting. It's entrepreneurial; you don't feel the frustrations as much, and you don't let the frustrations come through as much because there's always something that you can be working on because of the sheer volume of the programs and projects that are moving through.

Q: And do you have—did you have, excuse me, did you have the option to pick out the ones that were most interesting to you? Or did you find that the issues were such that when your colleagues brought to you the problem cases or the opportunity cases that were the most critical and require the involvement of the assistant administrator to help break the logjam, give a push, put in this expertise that you have as an individual, that kind of stuff? I mean, it's a very—probably a very hard question to answer, especially at this—how many, you know, thirty years ago, but does any of that ring true to you?

FORE: For me, I don't have a big ego, but I do have creativity. There will be some things that I'm interested in, like the environment, that I didn't feel had gotten enough attention, and public private partnerships because people hadn't lived in the private world to know what might lie out there that could be helpful for our programs.

But on the whole, you're there to serve. So you have to be the person who takes the ideas of your people and tries to help them with them and move them, but also be a critical eye that if it looks like it's not working, or if the country just does not want it at this moment in time, or the prime minister just will not do it, that you just say, okay, let's park this over to the side until we're able to get some other colleagues who would be interested in it or if

we can't get funding out of Congress or something else. There's always some reason, but you try your very best to move everyone's projects because they're thoughtful; they're good; they're experienced Foreign Service Officers and civil servants. So, you know, trust them; go with what they need.

Q: I think that is a wonderful basis for us to move on at this stage, but it obviously has relevance for when you become the administrator of AID and how that compares, but—so we'll come back to that. And if I don't remember to do it, you come back and tell me how being the AID administrator changed your perception on this or amplified it, given the responsibility for the entire agency.

It's the end of the George Herman [sic] Walker Bush administration. And, I guess, January 20, you submitted your resignation, as everybody else did at that time. And then it isn't for another eight years before you go back into the government. Do you wish to reveal what you were doing in those eight years? Just so that we know that you were not sitting around and—it's hard to imagine you're just sitting around and crocheting or something like that.

FORE: Thank you, Alex. Yes, I'm afraid I haven't been very good at sitting around and crocheting. (Laughs)

Q: We've noticed; we have noticed that. (Laughs)

FORE: (Laughs) The idea of serving the government is often difficult for your family. So I, in private life, then focused on family. When I got married to Richard Fore, my husband, he had four children. So we moved West to be with the children and so that they could be heading off to school, and we could be seeing them, so that in those eight years, we spent more time with the family. And I went back to my company that makes wire lath and trims that we discussed—

Q: Right.

FORE: —to make sure that the company is doing well. And I started a little company that could help with doing other projects. So we began doing projects with opening home improvement stores with Hechinger. You remember Hechinger, a big home improvement company.

Q: Very well.

FORE: Mexico—

Q: Were you part of—were you—

FORE: —was just at that point where lots of families were thinking about how they could progress and could they put a little money into home improvement, and thus, they needed big-box retailers and home improvement stores. And it's the— you know, there's so many families who would like to do the work themselves, so that going down and getting a bag of cement and putting up a, you know, a second story on a—on their home or, you know, getting their own paint and painting, they would like to do it. So home improvement was at a big moment in time for Mexico and for Mexico City, but also for the nation as a whole.

Anyway, so we worked on that. And it was interesting for me because it allowed me to think about some of the things that I knew of from USAID, like green sea turtles and their eggs and birthing in Mexico, but also, what about home improvement? And, as we know, I liked the construction industry. So that all seemed very natural and interesting.

Q: And you did this in partnership with Hechinger's [sic]?

FORE: Yeah. And so, ultimately, we decided not to go forward because there were changes going on in the United States in big box retailing with the competition coming against Hechinger's [sic] from Home Depot and Lowe's, etcetera. So we didn't go forward, but it was interesting. And it was this mix of how business could do something that would help develop communities and families and—but be a force for good.

And then, I also began serving on several corporate boards. So I went on the Dexter board, which has—was the oldest company on the stock exchange and had a number of nonwoven materials that they were developing for hospital gowns, for a variety of purposes. They had early been into nonwoven materials, and they were now starting to head into some of the biotech and that—with life sciences, so gene trapping kits and others. Anyway, I found it fascinating, and met several scientists that I would be friends with for life, like George Whitesides and others, who later helped me with USAID and United States Mint work. And I found it an interesting way to look at what public corporations were doing and what they could be doing better in the neighborhood.

So what I tend to also do is to join nonprofit boards, and I did so, so Center for Strategic and International Studies and the Asia Society and many, many others, just to make sure that every one of us is giving back and is helping when we're not in the government, but we're helping the final goals of the government in the best way possible. So I did that. And then, all of a sudden, it was eight years later.

Q: And you're still on some of these boards. I mean, aren't you still on the CSIS [Center for Strategic and International Studies] board and CGD [Center for Global Development] board, too, I think, may—

FORE: Yes, CGD and Aspen Institute and Middle East Investment Partnership and others. So I go on them, and then every time I serve in government, I come off them. And then often, I come right back and come back on them again, but sometimes not. And so I think it's very important that you immerse yourself in the communities that can help, and you know more, and you can bring many of the lessons of foreign assistance in USAID to these nonprofits. And it's remarkable how few people actually know what USAID does, its size, its reach, that it is a good investment. And so I think it's important that we who have served in USAID get out there and talk about it and talk well about it because if not, Americans don't take the right pride they should in this great institution.

Q: So, for example, with the Dexter Corporation, did you find occasions to talk about or to utilize the AID connection at Dexter, or were you talking mostly about the nonprofit boards that—

FORE: So, in Dexter, many of their nonwoven materials would be used out around the world in the health programs, but they weren't selling to a government. But they would come, the other middle people, because it was a technology and a material that did not pick up bacteria and germs. And so you could use it for hospital gowns, and they could be reutilized. So I knew it would be useful. It didn't need refrigeration, it didn't need anything; it can just move out there. So I knew it could be useful. And it—but it was not that I could directly, you know, help with a—

Q: Sure.

FORE: —program of USAID. I think I was still too early in my career on corporate boards, but later I thought of lots of ways to do that. And I also joined another board that was called Hartford Steam Boiler, which sounds like it should be steam boilers, but was actually an insurance company—

Q: (Laughs)

FORE: —which—

Q: Well, it was in Hartford. It couldn't be anything else, right?

FORE: (Laughs) Yeah. But it had a glorious past, starting in the days of the steam boilers. And so in that it's insurance all over the world and engineering so that when hurricanes and typhoons would come through, you know, will roofs stay on buildings? Will the buildings be sturdy enough to be able to stay put? What kinds of insurance should you have for homes, health, crops, you know, just the whole gamut of the insurance world is interesting, but you can use your international experience on a board like that, I found, more so than I could at Dexter. So each situation varies. And, once again, you have to listen to where the company sees its growth, where it wants its innovations, and then try to follow what you know to connect those dots so that it becomes something that's a win-win for both the developing world but also for the corporation that you are working with so that it's a greater good, it's a common good; it's a common benefit.

Q: I am wondering if on something like these corporate boards, you were simply approached by these companies or whether you knew somebody who knew somebody. I mean, I'm just curious as to how these arrangements develop. I mean, I'm sure it's—in some cases, it's happenstance. But I can imagine that they were eager to have you, but I didn't know how, of all the corporations in the United States that might have been smart enough to ask you to join, how did it happen with these?

FORE: So, it's an interesting question. And I think one never fully knows how the boards find their candidates. But in my case, it was a wonderful headhunter at an organization called Catalyst in New York who wanted to help women who could serve on boards to get placements on boards. She knew of the first board, Dexter in Windsor Locks, Connecticut. And then once I was on that board, then the Hartford Steam-boiler, also in Connecticut, said, oh, well, there would be somebody, and we could use the international. So then, you know, you get recruited onto that board.

So I had the pleasure of two boards that were in Connecticut that—and it was due to one great recruiter. And I think for many of us, there's somebody that we meet in life who just—we connect with. And if we are not shy and say, oh, I'd like to serve on a corporate board, so that they know you'd like to do it, they may think of one, but the key for shy people like me is to actually tell somebody that you'd like to contribute because if you don't, they'll never know. And for many of us, we were brought up that we weren't supposed to say what we thought; we were supposed to, you know, have somebody—just have them think of it.

Q: Right. Were you the only woman on these boards initially?

FORE: No, on both boards, there was one other woman, but, as we know, Alex, it's not enough. You need—

Q: Indeed, and—

FORE: —you need one, two, three, four, five women on every board. (Laughs)

Q: Well, and it still is the case, and you're talking about the 1990s. But this was—the same story is still true today, so—

FORE: It is; we haven't made much progress on some of the diversity fronts, but they also need people who served in government and who know about USAID so that it isn't just USAID out there trying to make a difference. It's that U.S. leadership, ideas, and ideals are moving in the world because of the products and services and programs that we have and that we're doing it as a group. So I'm a big proponent of lots of USAID alumni serving on boards.

Q: Well, you are an ideal model for that. I'm not sure how many are able to follow in your footsteps, but that's terrific. And so where were you living when this was going on? You say you wanted to be with the children. Where did you go?

FORE: Nevada.

Q: Oh, still in Nevada at that point?

FORE: Nevada. So the children were in Nevada, so off to Nevada we went. So—

Q: So the—

FORE: —we were up at Lake Tahoe and Reno and sort of that area, so—

Q: Right.

FORE: —we would be with the children.

Q: So the corporate boards were in Connecticut, but you were physically in Nevada, and presumably in those days, the—no, meetings were not held by Zoom. You were traveling a fair amount during that period to go to board meetings, I would take it. Yeah.

FORE: Yes. We weren't yet in a Zoom culture.

Q: There are certain advantages to that, as well as disadvantages. Okay, so you—as you say, eight years pass. Now, there's a new administration, this time with George W. Bush, and your resume says—your CV says—that you became director of the United States Mint. Now, that sounds fascinating to me. How did, of all the panoply of opportunities in the government, did the Mint arrive in your inbox?

FORE: So, as you can understand, my background would have led me into two cones of work. One would be international affairs/development, and the other would be economic and finance. So when you're going through the White House process, if you're willing to serve, when you're going through the process, they'll both be out looking for, you know, where might there be a match. And so, I had the pleasure of meeting the Treasury Secretary, who was announced very early, Paul O'Neill. And his deputy was Ken Dam, who certainly knew State Department, so—

Q: Sure.

FORE: But I just—I mean, I really loved Paul O'Neill. And he was excited that here was somebody who knew metals and manufacturing and business, and—

Q: You should explain who Paul O'Neill was before he became treasury secretary, and why he's interested in metals (laughs) and—

FORE: So Paul O'Neill was the chairman and CEO of Alcoa, the big aluminum company. And so when he looked at a place like the Department of Treasury, it was famous that he came in and asked Larry Summers, what was the safety record of the Department of Treasury? And of the few questions that Larry Summers could be asked, this was not one that Larry could answer. (Laughs)

Q: (Laughs) Right. I can imagine, even though he may have tried.

FORE: So—

Q: Had you known Paul O'Neill before?

FORE: No. But, his record is so well known that he was one of the many very prominent leaders in the business sector who had also served in government and who had a very clear outline for how work can be done. He used to often say that to motivate people, you have to tell them what you want them to do, you have to give them the tools to be able to accomplish it, and then you have to pat them on the back to say thank you. And he believed that, and he carried it out in a department like Treasury.

Treasury has a lot of agencies that are associated with it that he oversees. It's a small department compared to a State Department or USAID. And the largest part is the Internal Revenue Service. One of those little parts is the Mint. And so he needed someone to run the United States Mint, and I just thought that I could help. And, as you know, Alex, I graduated in history. And what is a coin? It is history carried in your pocket. You know that I minored in economics. So here I was with the economy of money moving in the country so that on any day, sixty-five million dollars' worth of money was in trucks on the road from the United States Mint. We're the largest in the world, so you really had a major entity. And I minored also in art, and what's on a coin? It's a bas-relief sculpture. It is an artwork, and there are lots of collectible coins.

I was a chair of the International Mint Directors, so all of the collector coins that we would produce around the world, as well as the sovereign currency from every mint everywhere. We were always in competition with the other gold minters because there is a real market in gold and in gold coinage. So you're in the markets every day buying and selling precious metals—gold, silver, etcetera, so that's a business activity; you are minting them, and then you are selling them. In the beginning, you know, we were just starting to really be able to sell online. Online was just becoming a way of doing business. Before that, you always had to go to a shop and buy, let's say, a little coin set, but now you could buy and sell online. And so the Mint moved from being able to move a million dollars' worth of coin products in a month to moving it in a week to moving it in a day to moving it in an hour. And that's a very pivotal point if you're in business (laughs) and you want to increase projects, and you know it's America. So when I'd go out to one place or another; you know, I'd bring my little U.S. coin sets to, you know, give as gifts for whatever prime minister, president you're meeting with.

And you can also talk about, you know, when you're in the factories and plants in England or Netherlands, where their—wherever the mints were; Italy, you could be talking about what they're doing on their art—artistry and what they're doing in their supply chain and how they're doing their ordering. Technology was moving fast with the internet, and precious metal purchases when we saw an opportunity to move technology into our artistry. And so we moved from artists who were carving everything by hand to artistry that was partially aided by electronics. So that instead of taking a year or two to create a coin, that you could maybe do one in six weeks. And that would make a significant difference in productivity and product lines.

Anyway, very interesting from a product creation, and I—and it was very interesting being in Treasury because it was a different world than the USAID world that I had seen before and a little bit of State Department world, but I hadn't seen much of State; I'd

really just seen USAID. Department of Treasury was different in how they and how they interacted with Congress and the White House. So it was a very interesting time. And then Andrew Natsios was at USAID, so I'd keep up on what was going on with USAID from my little spot at the Mint.

Q: How had—when you say that you interacted with State Department through the Treasury Department, or at least some, and with AID, but, I mean, I certainly have experienced the link between Treasury and AID on all kinds of issues, where Treasury usually was the blockage on anything that we really wanted to do. But as head of the Mint, you were part of the coordinating body of the Treasury Department, or you were in the senior staff and senior decision—is that what it was?

FORE: Yes, yes. This is the senior staff of the Treasury Department. And so, you know, you're involved with both domestic finance and international finance. You're in very close contact with the Federal Reserve. They hold many of your U.S. mint gold bars or their gold bars that are, in New York assigned in the cages for each country. The U.S. holding the gold of that country. The U.S. Mint holds many of its gold bars in West Point, NY and in Ft. Knox, KY. So coordination is essential.

And so one side of it is the financial/domestic side. Another is the financial/international. So there comes in CFIUS and all of the other—the terrorism finance, to your point about what restrictions you need to put on U.S. funds that are flowing out overseas. But it's also, you know, how do taxes and the income coming in for the coffers of the United States. The Treasury Department sees the flows of money to the government. As always, there are tight budgets, income and expenditures do not match and the government runs out of money. And so Treasury Department needs to find ways that a President can continue operating. The Mint adds to the budget with seigniorage, so when I was at the Mint, we were able to contribute more than a billion dollars to the U.S. budget. So you're a money-earning entity; you're a revenue-producing entity; —

Q: How did you do that?

FORE: —it's something that I wish I could have done at USAID, and I must say that I thought about, well, is there some way USAID could do this, because you are minting money? And so you're a money maker for the United States. So it was important that I could do as much of that as possible so that I could contribute to the budgets.

Q: But what is it that produced the revenue that you could contribute to the budget? Was it the sales of these coins and things like that? Or what—or did you just produce some money and give it over to the Treasury Department? Where did it come from?

FORE: It's not as simple as the latter one.

Q: I can imagine.

FORE: So, income comes in two ways. One is the selling of products. So you're making, let's say, a proof set for a collector. So, you're making it at two dollars and fifty cents, and you're able to sell it for ten dollars. So that profit you then use for your own overhead, and so you need to keep your overhead low, and then you send the rest into the US Treasury, that's one type. The second type is seigniorage, and that is in the nation's currency. Let's say, a penny; a penny is copper-coated, and the price of the precious metals in it were rising close to a penny, but they had not gone over it.

So we were not making money on pennies, which is the biggest production for a mint. But our biggest money maker was quarters because we had the quarter program going on, where we launched new quarters in every state in the Union. We could produce these quarters for less than twenty-five cents and the profit went to the U.S. treasury. So we would be—and so whenever these quarters would launch, people wanted to collect them, and they put them into big maps, so that you could put in your quarter for Massachusetts, your quarter for Nebraska. And we launched in the order that the states joined the Union. So it was a history lesson, you'll be glad to know. And it was a lesson about what that state cared about. So whether they put a Palmetto tree or a flamingo or they put some beloved part of their state on their quarter. It was a political process, so you came out of the state legislatures with what the design should look like, then our artists took that and made them into coinage designs with the right relief and the right formats.

Collectors take coins out of circulation, which drives more demand for coins. So in this, it means that you can—if you can engender enough collecting and enthusiasm of your own money, then you create the seigniorage that can go into the general coffers of the United States. So I had the benefit of a 50 State Quarters initiative that was zooming along. And we just really talked about it. And coin collection enthusiasm was really high among school students and collectors and also—so it just meant that we were able to generate more profits for the United States budget.

Q: As a young girl, did you collect coins?

FORE: Yes. As a boy, did you?

Q: I did, I did. They're still upstairs in the attic. (Laughs)

FORE: Very good.

Q: Do you still have yours?

FORE: Yes, I still have mine. And I really came to appreciate the collections; the numismatic collections that people had are extraordinary. And there were some things that, you know, were really rare coins that came out, like the double eagle that came out, that we were able to auction off; that was another source of income. So anytime that we could find something that the United States government could own, like the 1933 double eagle or, an early Saint-Gaudens design that could be something that the coin collectors would like, it was—it just meant that there would be excitement among coin collectors at what was going on in the world around them.

Q: This is really fascinating. I suppose we should move on, but my whole understanding of the U.S. Mint has now been expanded enormously because I just think of the Mint being this building down on Fourteenth Street or whatever it is where it's churning out, the dollar bills and all that sort of thing, but—okay, so you were there.

FORE: Alex? May I just add something from the period?

Q: Yes, of course.

FORE: The United States Mint has facilities in San Francisco, Denver, Philadelphia, and West Point, New York, and they oversee Fort Knox. So this was the time period when September 11 happened. And when September 11 was seen on all of our televisions, one of the pieces of intelligence that came through within a couple of hours was that there was—there were maps of iconic places in the United States that were deemed targets. And one was the United States Mint, that it was iconic and would be a place that could be hit.

Q: In Washington?

FORE: No we do not mint in Washington. So Philadelphia is the largest mint, and it's about half of the nation's money supply. Is that—

Q: So was it the target?

FORE: —this is the Philadelphia Mint.

Q: Was that the one that was the target, or—

FORE: Yeah, Philadelphia Mint, the largest in our country, was the target. We didn't know about Fort Knox. So for Philadelphia, I made the decision that we should be really watching it and be very careful on it, but that we would just try to keep it going. But mints have their—they have machinery that takes a day—two, three days, five days to cool down or to start up again. So it's hard to shut them down or to start them up again. So we closed on September 11 to send our people home, but we didn't shut down Mint, but we closed, and so we weren't minting. We decided to reopen the next day to send the message that the U.S. was strong and open for business.

And just to make sure that everyone would be all right, we moved into planning with the Department of Treasury and the National Archives to follow what had happened during World War Two, when they moved national treasures like the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution to Fort Knox. So we began working on how to move them. They have to be kept at set humidity and temperatures. During President Roosevelt's time, they moved them by train. And so we then began preparing how to get them there. At the Mint, you have your own police force; there's the Mint Police, so that we could move, we felt, these great treasures of America safely and get them into Fort Knox. And we had to make sure that Fort Knox had the control. We didn't know how long we would have to keep them for—would it be weeks, months, years? Was this the beginning of a real war? We did not know.

Q: Sure.

FORE: So we moved the great treasures of the United States to safety, and that was all the Mint, moving it to Fort Knox. So September 11 was a very important moment for us. The second very important moment that came in these years was—I had mentioned to you that Paul O'Neill had asked Larry Summers about what his safety record was for the Department of Treasury. Well, we had an audit at the Philadelphia Mint for safety. And it came out that OSHA [Occupational Safety and Health Administration] gave us 126 violations. And we hadn't done repairs or plans in a fire safety way. We didn't have, let's say, we have a storeroom; there's one door in, and the same door is the one you come out. This is good if you're trying to keep it safe and to make sure that no one leaves with money in their pocket. So you go in and out the same door. But it's not good when you think about safety hazards; you need a second exit. So the mint was not designed in a way that OSHA felt was appropriate in today's world, even though it was designed for safety.

So we thought about what to do, and we made a decision as a Mint that we should close down the Mint. And I remember going to Paul O'Neill and saying, Mr. Secretary, we want to close down half of the nation's money supply. He said, well, this does not sound

like a good idea, but okay Henrietta, if you really feel you need to, three days. And I came back and said, I think we're going to need six weeks; we have a lot of cleanup and repair that we have to do, and we're going to be in violation if we don't do it. I think we can keep the nation's money supply moving with just the Denver Mint, that the Denver Mint can go in overtime. We can send some of our staff there; they can pick up the whole mintage for the United States in whatever period of time we need to do this safety work. We've talked about it as a Mint and with our unions. I think we can do it.

So he gave us permission, and we closed down the Mint. It's the first time it had ever been closed in its history. And we cleaned it up, and people took such pride in it. It was supervisors; everybody joined on little Tiger Details. So you would be cleaning up your area in a multidisciplinary team with people who were working in the office on payroll, the supervising manager and the workers on the floor. You'd all be doing it together in sectors. So each area shut down, addressed their violations, and each area came up on its own timeline. And, when the Mint came back up again six weeks later, we began winning awards from OSHA. And so Paul O'Neill, the Treasury Secretary, was very proud of it.

But what it changed was the environment in the Mint itself. And people felt they could do things differently; they didn't have to do things the same way, that we had collaboration across the country on mints; we had collaboration with the Federal Reserve, with OSHA. And it taught me that if you can get your people with you to change an organization, they will do it willingly, well, and thoughtfully, and they'll do it in units. I got letters afterward from wives of people who'd been minters for twenty, twenty-five years who said that their husbands would come home; they had been working so hard at the Mint to clean it up, they were now cleaning out the garage; they were painting the floor of their garage. They were so impressed with the work ethic, but their people were now committed to safety at home, they were committed to cleanliness at home; they changed as individuals, as well as an organization. And it's a great lesson to learn if you ever get the chance to learn it.

Q: Yeah, I mean, these unanticipated benefits of extending the work of the Mint into the common—the household; that's extraordinary. That's a wonderful story. On the document business, you were taking the essential documents out of the National Archives? Interesting. And it's all because Fort Knox was seen to be the most secure location. How long did—

FORE: The safest place in the United States, so it was where we protect our national treasures. It was in government hands—and it wasn't that far away. So if anyone was after icons for the United States, it would be, we thought, if we could do it quietly and well,

that we could get them there. And we did. They were safe for future American generations.

Q: How long did you have to keep them at Fort Knox?

FORE: They stayed quite a while because what happens is that, you make the adjustments, and then it's—then the National Archives then thinks, well, maybe we'd like to change our exhibit a little bit now that they're out. And so between the National Archives and the Mint, we sort of worked on each one, and they all had different times, but they stayed quite a while.

Q: Fantastic; really interesting stories. All right; anything more in this period that you want to relate before we move to the Department of State? No?

FORE: No, I think that's fine. Alex, it's been long enough, and I'm sure there's lots missing, but— (Laughs)

Q: No, no, it's whatever—

FORE: It's wonderful to have a chance to just say what great work all these people did.

Q: Right. Okay. So was this process that—I mean, how did it—I mean, this was—I'm sorry, this was during the second Bush ad—or the—was still in the first Bush—G. W. Bush administration. So what was going on that led you to the Department of State?

FORE: Well, Alex, as you know, when you finish one term, and you're heading into a second Presidential term, many of the positions begin to move and roll over. And Paul O'Neill had left the Department of Treasury. And so therefore, I felt that I had completed my term. And I was working well with John Snow and Sam Bodman, but when the question came up for Department of State and working with Condi Rice and Bob Zoellick as the under-secretary for management, it just seemed that maybe that could really help Department of State and USAID. So off I went.

And, as you know, I actually like management. I think management is important, how agencies run, how organizations run makes a difference for its people. And if you can make it better for people, it will become more productive, and you'll get everything accomplished faster, better quality, and just everything improves. So paying attention to management, I think, is important. And I could see that we had a lot of issues in USAID, so no doubt State did, too. And so that's why I headed there. And I like Condi Rice very much, and—

Q: So, she asked you if you would make the move. And this was a position, though, that needed confirmation by the Senate. Was this a fast—

FORE: They all have—so, I did two confirmations in USAID the first time, for Private Enterprise and then for Asia and Private Enterprise. And then I did a third confirmation for the United States Mint, and now here I was heading into my fourth confirmation for undersecretary for management at State.

Q: And was this a smooth process, the one for Management? Does it take a lot of time, or—

FORE: Oh, they always take time. I mean, they always take time. So then, I mean, they're never smooth, and they're hurtful, and they're just terribly hard. And I don't know how to change that in the systems.

Q: That's not part of your management responsibility, unfortunately, —but this time, at least, you didn't have to hold off getting married or anything like that. You were already married and—unlike the first time you were—needed confirmation. So did you hold on to your Mint job at the same time while you were awaiting confirmation for the State job?

FORE: No, I think once my nomination came out, once it heads over, you then begin to go into the briefings in that State Department. So you then—usually you're a consultant, but you're definitely in that Department. You don't stay in your old position in your old Department.

Q: And during this period, which is what, 2005 to 2007, what were the big management issues you had to confront at the State Department? I mean—

FORE: Well, there's constantly the issue about getting money for programs because the world does not stay still. So whether it's money for Lebanon or any other area that is struggling. You know, we at the time had the consequences of the Iraq War and the spill over into the neighboring countries. So the Middle East was an area of much focus and attention. And we could just see that money was going to be difficult for raising funds. And you needed to make the case and gather the budgets to make the case, but also hire the people so that you could carry it out.

And one of the issues that we clearly needed in the Department of State was to staff up. At the United States Mint, I had managed to reduce the overhead costs 10 percent year on year because we could do things more efficiently, and we had a system that was a

revolving fund, which is an enormous gift. It means that you have a checking account that you can buy your metals with, you could pay your salaries, and you could deposit income from your sales. State Department does not have that; USAID does not have that, though you wish they both did. But as a result, it meant that we needed to staff up.

And we needed to upgrade many things. I mean, the IT systems; 190 different systems, some of them connected, some of them not connected, some of them classified, some of them unclassified. If an organization cannot talk to itself, it makes it very difficult. And we needed to talk to other agencies—the Department of Defense, and we needed to talk to USAID. And the systems didn't work; it didn't work within us, and it didn't work on the sides. So you need funding for that. It is hard to get funding for those institutional but essential operations. So raising funds was always a major issue, whether it was for programs, whether it was for people, whether it was for systems within the department.

And then the second is, getting all the right people in the right places at the right time. It's like a chessboard or a checkerboard. It—people with the right language and knowledge skills that—wherever you needed them. And so we realized that there were some things that we just didn't have, and one was when Iran became more and more of an issue that we knew that the Department of State needed be on top of, that diplomacy needed to be at the front end of the diplomacy-development-defense tripartite stool. We needed to have diplomats, and we didn't have enough diplomats who spoke the languages of Persia. You realize that your Foreign Service Institute, a great institution in the Department of State, needed to just be working on readying more people who carry the right languages for the world to come, the world that we now are dealing in.

It also made me realize that there were some of these capacities that I wish USAID had so that we could send more of our Foreign Service officers and civil servants into the Foreign Service Institute because it was a great educational institution. And at USAID we never had enough time. We didn't have enough time between postings to go do language training, but Department of State made that time so that you did have time to learn your languages before you headed out. And part of it was because of the Consular Cone. You had to have the languages, so that you could interview locals for visas and passports. And that was essential that you were able to talk to the people in their own languages. So you had to learn Greek or Chinese, and we never had enough Chinese or Arabic speakers because the time to learn the languages tended to be years; three years minimum, five years most likely. And we would want to do immersive training and send them into universities in those countries so that they would be learning to really feel the language rather than just at the Foreign Service Institute.

Anyway, those people and operational issues are always at hand, but the world seemed to be moving more quickly than the Department of State in terms of its capacity—

Q: Yeah.

FORE: —to respond to them. So that was one part. And so we had a good initiative of increasing the number of Foreign Service Officers. Congress was great about helping us, and with Condi Rice, and then with John Negroponte later as deputy, we had advocates for the fact that we really needed more personnel. We needed more capacity that State Department and USAID had been starved. So that was one.

A second one was repositioning. We found that we were heavy in our postings in Europe, and that we had lots of Foreign Service officers who were serving in European capitals, but really we needed them out in the world. We needed them in the Middle East, we needed them in Latin America, we needed them in Asia, we needed them repositioned. So Nick Burns was the Under-Secretary for Political [Affairs] at the time, and he and I worked to try to get State Department repositioned. It was something that Secretary Rice was very much involved in. For it made a difference to rebalance where the Department of State needed to be focused—which was not Europe.

But it was clear that we just didn't have enough people to cover everything. And it's very important to cover the capitals in Europe, as you see now, when we're getting a coalition gathered for Ukraine. If you're going to gather coalitions of the willing, you have to have diplomats out there. But we also needed diplomats in the developing world because the developing world is coming on economically and strongly, and we needed to have ambassadors there. And since Ambassadors usually led the country teams, where USAID and the mission directors were, we needed to be sure that they were good ambassadors and that they understood the economics, the politics, the social and cultural environments they were working in, and—

Q: Well, were you—

FORE: —some of them would be career, some political.

Q: Were you successful in doing this repositioning?

FORE: Yes. And the repositioning was successful; we were able to do it, we were able to save some money for doing it. We were in the process of building many embassies around the world. In this time period, we were building the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad,

and many of our embassies, like Baghdad, were being built under fire, which is very difficult—to have your construction crews under rocket attacks every night.

Q: Yeah.

FORE: But we were able to build them, but the increasing responsibilities were to make them hardened, to make them impenetrable, to move our people out and away from their community offices but into a hardened building. And America began looking like a fortress. We kept trying to figure out ways that we could make them open or open up America Centers, similar to the libraries we had once had. We tried to reinvest some of the money in a way that would make America leadership something that people in developing countries would not only know, but they would respect, admire, and learn to love. They would believe in the ideals that we held of democracy and capitalism and the ability for everyone to get ahead in society.

It's an interesting mix. And this was also the time when communications were changing, so how we spoke, how we spoke online to many of these countries began to change, and we needed to fund it and get the right people and the right skills gathered. And there was much that we could learn from the private sector because many multinational companies were out there communicating very well with the people in countries and, therefore, we could learn something from them. But that's always difficult because, you know, you're a U.S. agency, and—

Q: Yeah.

FORE: —you know, you're not out talking all the time with what are the communication techniques that you have for, let's say, a customer in Brazil or in the Philippines or in Sudan that are working, that the Department of State should learn from or USAID should learn from, but that's conversation that we need to have.

Q: Did you have to go up on Capitol Hill frequently to try to build the support and gain the funding? And, if you did, who were the key players that were the most helpful to you?

FORE: Well, you know them all. It's the appropriators, the authorizers were part of it, but it's those who sit on the Foreign Relations or the Foreign Affairs Committees, and they became crucial to us. And, you know, Alex, it's not just the senators and congressmen; it's their staff. I mean, there are some great staffers up there. They've been there a long time, and they are really, really good. So, you know, the Tim Riesers and Paul Groves of the world help the agencies and an Under-Secretary for Management a great deal, as well as their bosses, who really believe in America and in American leadership, and they've seen

it through the years. They understood, but the world was changing so quickly, and U.S. government agencies are not fleet; they're not quick.

So, you know, it's just—you need to try to get some of that sense of urgency. And you need funding. It made me dream of, couldn't I make some money somewhere, (laughs) you know, like ____—

Q: Coming from the Mint, of course, you knew how to do that, right?

FORE: Yeah. Couldn't we make some money so that we could invest it in some of these systems that aren't—they're not coming through as being “must-fund?” I mean, who's talked to, in the time of Ukraine, about improving the IT systems in State Department or USAID? Nobody, and so nobody's giving money to that, but—if you don't, then you can't communicate in the countries, and you can't communicate with yourselves. So you just need to keep trying to raise the funds for that.

Q: How much difficulty did you have inside State Department with trying to bring about some of these changes but finding that the bureaus, either the functional or the regional bureaus, were—not so fleet as you would like, (laughs) to use your term? Did—was internal struggle a part of what you needed to address, as well as winning hearts and minds on the Hill?

FORE: Yeah, so there's always a struggle internally whenever you do things like repositioning or reallocating. We also had a number of issues on the consular side. My role as the Under-Secretary for Management oversees the visas and passports, and so it means that, how we screen the people who come into America—this is after September 11—is a real issue. So, should you have, let's say, Saudi students coming into the United States to study? You should, but how do you do that? And some people felt we shouldn't because that's where it was a source for many of those who created September 11. And—

Q: Yeah.

FORE: —and thus, you have to temper both what you think you need to do for your country and what many other voices from the nonprofit and for-profit and congressional offices are saying you must do. So, if you have one hundred voices, you know, talking to you about what should be done, you'll need to sift between them and choose the course that would work now and accomplish most of the ends that you hope to accomplish for the American people. So, compromise is part of it. Internally, there's always a worry about status and budgets and size of offices.

We were also remodeling the State Department, so we had to take some people out of their offices and move them to other space or other buildings off-site. And that's always difficult, too. People don't want to move when they've got all their file cabinets and, (laughs), they're used to commuting, and they've got a parking space. And so they're just sort of small personal things that get involved, as well as issues about the offices themselves, and then the interests of your country. So it's always a—I mean, it's always difficult. And yes, there were disagreements, but you just keep moving through it. And I had a great Secretary and Deputy Secretary to work with and Under-Secretaries, so we just did our best.

Q: Were there appreciable differences between your experience in other government bureaucracies, including the AID bureaucracy, and this position? I mean, this was probably wider-reaching than anything that you had done before, but did you see that a lot of what you'd been doing before was relevant to what was taking place now that you were at the State Department in this management role?

FORE: Yes, because, all of the operations of the Mint and the operations in a private company are what you need to have the State Department working well. It's just like a big company, but you have all the same issues. So from procurement and how that moves in the Department of State and, the medical officers and where you have medicine, and our links with Department of Defense, let's say for Tamiflu. We were able to get Tamiflu from Department of Defense, and it was their procurement that we were able to use.

So you put—you are able to use the experiences from everything that you've done in the past in the next position, and hopefully, do it better with more understanding for what the levers are that will make it work because you're just trying to get the government to operate well and to fulfill its function of serving the people. So getting it to operate and doing it collaboratively with Department of Defense, Homeland Security, and the other agencies is very important, but they all have their own different cultures. They have increasingly difficult processes. And because I had the pleasure at United States Mint of a revolving fund—

Q: Right.

FORE: —you dream about some of the conventions that you have in one agency that you do not have in another that would be useful. Department of State had not really been a big contracting center—USAID had done the contracting—but it had now become it because it had gotten programming funds from Congress. So they had to learn it and do it well. And not every office or officer was used to doing procurement, and it's not easy. And yet

you don't want USAID or State Department just to become contracting agents. That's not their highest and best use.

So part of that is the puzzle of how you allocate skills within a government. Department of Defense had great procurement facilities. So, could we use them for some of these capacities? Could we do more public-private? So, let's say, on passports, could passports be partially privatized, just like the creation of paper for the United States? Bills, you know; it is cotton with a thread—threads in it. Could you do something like that with the pages of a passport so that it's not all done in one place by one entity? They're just questions that the United States government has to deal with in every agency. And I found it interesting because I felt that if you could make the U.S. government more effective and more efficient, that would be helpful for our leadership. And it would mean that whoever was in charge would be able to get more responsiveness from their agencies because they would be better able to meet the needs.

And so, as a [sic] Under-Secretary for Management, you're just trying to make everything work better for the people and the processes that are involved, and that includes Congress; make it work better that—so that when people say, let's do an airlift into Ukraine, you know how to do it, and you can get it done, and you can get it done fast.

Q: On the passport thing, did you actually succeed in farming out some of the—

FORE: This is partially privatized.

Q: Because that does seem obvious, yeah.

FORE: Yeah, it's the other thing we went through in these years, because you're mentioning passports; we had Hurricane Katrina. And so when New Orleans was inundated by the hurricane, it meant that all of us who were part of the U.S. government, if we had facilities in New Orleans, we got involved in what the recovery could be or should be. And since I was—as Under-Secretary of Management at State, we had a consular office in New Orleans. And I had a great Foreign Service Officer, an Assistant Secretary, Maura Harty, who was in charge of passports and visas and this operation.

But what New Orleans needed was when the people left to go to Texas or somewhere else because their homes were swamped and their city was swamped. They needed to have a place where our consular officers could go to work and earn some money, and they could get their children to school and all of that. And so it was the beginning of hybrid work, and it was the beginning of how the United States government was able to quickly start up some offices.

So our passport office in New Orleans was one of the very first that were open, and it became a place where others would come. Sometimes we didn't have the elevators; people walked up the steps. But it meant that visas and passports were important because identification was important. Sometimes when you're in those hurricanes, you lose all of your—

Q: Sure.

FORE: —identity documents. And if you have lost it, you need to get it back so that people know you're a citizen of the United States. And a passport is the way to do it. And if you're not a citizen, but you're here on a visa, you need to get your visa. And if you don't have it, then the people will either be sent home, or they become identification-less; they can't access their bank accounts or go to school or anything else. So identification of citizenship was also the way that we were going to get remuneration to families. And so therefore, it became extremely important.

So it was a very important office, and it really served the city of New Orleans well in those time periods. But it meant that, therefore, you got involved with how you feed the people that were there. We had a lot of responses from people overseas, countries who wanted to make donations to the United States. We would get donations of tinned food products from, let's say, Britain, that they would give so that we could give them into New Orleans. But what happened is that we and Department of State couldn't accept it because the Department of Agriculture hadn't approved the ingredients for consumption in the United States. And as a result, we couldn't, so we ended up giving them to a developing country, let's say Guatemala or Honduras, who had hungry people that—and they could accept them in their countries.

But we had a lot of offers of help, and some of them were dog teams to look for people, some of them were medics, some of them were field tents. So we took in all comers and organized where they were going to go, how they were going to help, but it was wonderful to see the outpouring of other countries wanting to help the United States at—

Q: What ___—

FORE: —during Hurricane Katrina.

Q: And was the work being done by the consular officers or—

FORE: Yes.

Q: And when you say—said earlier that this was the beginning of the virtual program, so were some of your people in—have they gone to Texas? Where was the—how was the virtuality working?

FORE: So for some, they couldn't leave wherever their home was because there was no more public transportation. There was no way for them to get into an office. For others, they had gone with the group to Texas because their neighborhood was flooded, their children couldn't go to school. It means that you have to leave everything behind; you have to leave your job, your school, and leave your everything behind.

Q: Yeah.

FORE: So we were able to have them commute in virtually.

Q: I see. Okay.

FORE: We knew that identification was important, and so that was all the consular office. And then all these donations that were coming in, we were doing that out of other offices, in addition to the consular office, but, it's just—it is—it shows you, though, that you can be kind to people and that there are times when people just need everything, and—

Q: Oh, yeah.

FORE: —and you just have to get to them if you can, if you possibly can. And we found that some of our best partners were the Home Depot locally because we could get things from Home Depot much more easily there than if we had our own procurement-supply chains. But we didn't have little procurement cards—

Q: Yeah.

FORE: —for our people because we'd never had that before in the United States that we had to do it. But you adjust your systems; you get them up and running so that you can do that. We issued credit cards.

Q: Did you have that whole system and how it worked written up so that the next time—I mean, there have, of course, been additional floods in New Orleans, but hopefully there won't be in the future, but was this process evaluated or written up so that the—long after you left State Department and so on, that they would know how to do this?

FORE: So, true to government service, there were evaluations and after-action reports so that you would try to remember and create a history that others could follow. My greatest intent was that we would get the systems in place so that people could just use them every day because the things you learn in an emergency are the ones that you should be using on a daily basis. They're faster; they're effective. And they probably drive you more into the private sector so that you use all of the capacities around you rather than remaining insulated, just talking to your own agency.

And so my hope was that we could just create it as an everyday workload of—so that people could just get their work done faster, better. But yes, there are, and so hopefully, others can learn from it and can know what we came up with. We—I mean, there were some things we just really wanted to change, like the Department of Agriculture.

Q: Yeah.

FORE: And we were not able to do that. So there were some things we had to leave for another administration to conquer.

Q: I think that's been true up until today. One of the things that had been an issue before, and I just wondered whether there were remnants of that issue left behind—was there any interest in absorbing USAID into the Department of State structure?

FORE: Yes. There were lots of discussions. I think they had gone on all during the first and second term of George Bush, and they were, I think, legitimate questions about how we should be organized. And you can see today that there have been some reorganizations that have been done in subsequent administrations for both USAID and State Department. But, as a whole, the discussions were, should it be merged in, should it be—become a second Deputy? Should it be a—free-standing? Should it be Cabinet-level? Should it be at the level of the National Security Agency so that in all meetings, USAID carried a seat at that table, or not? And so it ran the gamut, Alex, and I think that that discussion still continues, and along with it was whether or not there should be a rewrite of the—Foreign Affairs Act. I think we've been part of that discussion for thirty years.

Q: Right, right. And I guess it's still with us today.

FORE: Yes, because we're all afraid to open up the FAA, lest it become worse. And yet, we all know that it needs improvement. So I think the organizational issues were certainly discussed at this time period, as was the legislation.

Q: And were you asked to take a position on these reorganization issues—

FORE: When I was—

Q: —as the Secretary of Management?

FORE: —Under-Secretary—

Q: Yeah.

FORE: —for Management?

Q: Yeah.

FORE: Yes, but since I'd been at USAID, I mean, I was a pro-USAID person. And so, I would just speak up for the experience and the skills of USAID. Andrew Natsios, my predecessor and friend, had a very strong opinion as to the organizational placement. My opinion was stronger about the work and the people that we did. I could see a lot of ways that you could run the organization; I didn't think that who was in charge was as important as what we did. And I was more worried that USAID was being underfunded and was being hollowed out, that there weren't people and there wasn't the understanding and respect for the programs, and that USAID was having to leave too many countries. I was more worried about that than I was the reporting line of the USAID administrator.

I just didn't know if USAID really could become cabinet level. I thought we had a—maybe it could be, and—but I just—I didn't know. And I wasn't the one who was going to negotiate that one with the president, to see if USAID could become a Cabinet-level agency, so—

Q: And when you were advocating that AID had all these talents, were you ostracized by some of your State Department colleagues?

FORE: Well, every department feels that they're superior, so—

Q: Right.

FORE: But they also hadn't lived in USAID, and they didn't know how good the people were. And, you just realize, I mean, it's also true with Congress, too. People come in with their impressions and what they think, but until you're in the organization, you really don't understand the full strengths and weaknesses of an organization. But once you're in

it, you do. You just should listen to those people who've lived in it, because they know what the strengths and weaknesses are, and that's a great asset. And if you can organize around your strengths as the U.S. government, no one can beat us. But if you organize around your weaknesses, I mean, it's a struggle for everybody.

Q: Well, is there anything else specifically about the management role that you would like to say? I think we're coming to the point where you move to AID again. But is there anything about the management role that you would like to say that you have not had a chance to say so far?

FORE: I oversaw as the Under-Secretary for Management, an initiative that was how State Department and USAID in management could be more coordinated. Could we do things together that would be synergistic? There was a lot of skepticism here on both sides. Neither one wanted to, and I could see both sides, and I could see why they were struggling, and there had been some initiatives with the creation of the Coordinator of U.S. Foreign Assistance.

So Condi Rice had asked Randy Tobias to look over all the foreign affairs budget, sort of as a Deputy lite, but a second deputy, and in thinking about that, the idea of merging some of the management functions, or could one agency be doing something and giving services to the other, and the other could be paying for those services, and therefore, you wouldn't have to use both. So, things like the Foreign Service Institute could be a wonderful asset for USAID. Could more USAIDers go there? Could more USAID people come to teach there? You know, all of that could help aid our funding, procurement, you know, the IT services, you know, financial reporting, _____ missions. You know, could any of that benefit from the agencies doing them more together in little joint teams, but there was just so much skepticism, it was very hard to move, and you know that sometimes it just takes time for the cultures to see each other.

I think there was—because there's never enough money—there was a lot of jealousy about, let's say, money going into Middle East programming in State Department; why couldn't it come to USAID? In State Department, they were saying, because USAID does their own projects, and they don't let us in, and they take two years to do it, and we need to do something new, so we should do it ourselves. There are reasons on both sides as to why you don't want to do it. You want to have control of your own money in your own programs, which meant that you needed to get earmarks off of the Hill to be able to do that work. But that was difficult, that was—I had hoped that we could make more progress there than we did. But it's like the work with DOD [Department of Defense]; we were trying very hard to get some of the 1207 funding. And—

Q: What is 1207?

FORE: So that's when DOD has funding pockets they can put it in; the 1207 pocket is a pocket that Department of State can dip into for personnel, for paying of personnel, for paying of travel, for getting them out to countries. So it meant that, let's say, in the war on terror, which was going on, we could staff; we could send some staff to a certain country using 1207 funding. So it's a funding pocket. So if we could get [one] hundred million in there, that meant that we could scale up on our security side. So if you could create more of those pools of funding that allow each agency to get what they need to get their groups out there and funded, that will help. It's not just about programs, and somehow we always end up with more program money than we do people money.

Q: Right.

FORE: And then the people can't get out to actually look at the programs because we don't have any money for travel, and we don't have money to pay their salaries. So you have to get that balance right. So the connection between the departments makes a difference.

Q: And was Randy Tobias already in place there? I mean, when did he come in, and how much overlap with you was there?

FORE: That's a good question, Alex, that has slipped my mind as to when he came in. He was doing PEPFAR [President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief].

Q: Right.

FORE: And he'd done a good job on PEPFAR, and Secretary Rice brought him in, and I don't remember when. And did I have overlap with him? I did because we were there when he was being set up as the first F, the director of foreign assistance, which would oversee State Department, USAID, PEPFAR, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera, about thirty-four agencies that had foreign affairs funding. And so we were there to try to help him.

Q: So it was that beginning of it—I mean, I've forgotten how long he was in that role before he left—

FORE: I have forgotten, too.

Q: Well, he's enough; we can find out, but—so, I just want to touch on the next stage because you're about to move into AID, both in that role that Randy Tobias had and the

head of AID. And I think this is a—would be a good time to stop and then pick this up at our next and presumably last session, but not necessarily. But I just—so you and he were both there at the same time. He left, and is that the trigger for your moving to AID? And did—was Andrew Natsios the AID administrator at that point?

FORE: No, so—

Q: —I've lost track of time here.

FORE: Yeah. Alex, we should probably just actually look it up because I don't remember the timing well enough.

Q: But don't worry about that, but—so your predecessor as AID administrator was—

FORE: Randy.

Q: —it was Randy. So he had taken over for—

FORE: He was double-hatted.

Q: So he was both AID administrator and the head of that F and other things, and a deputy secretary of state in that role. So Andrew was already gone by that time.

FORE: Correct.

Q: Okay; that's what I was not sure of. Okay.

FORE

Yeah. And I'm just—I'm not sure enough on—

Q: It doesn't—don't worry about it; the dates are easy enough to put in when we get there. Okay. Is it now appropriate to end this? And we'll start the next session with how you were asked to take over these responsibilities in 2007, your having been head of Management for two or three years at the State Department. Okay, does that make sense?

FORE: Okay.

Q: All right. So we'll end the recording now, and then you and I can decide on when the best time would be to begin again.

Q: I am delighted to resume this oral history interview with Henrietta Fore. When we left the interview it was when you were with the Department of State as the Undersecretary for Management. The thing is that you were also about to become the administrator of AID. You took Randy Tobias' place in his role as both AID administrator and as the coordinator of all foreign assistance. Randy Tobias resigned on April 27, 2007. But you were not confirmed or sworn in for about seven or eight months, November 17, 2007. In that period of time, you were continuing your role as management in the State Department. How had George Bush nominated you as soon as Tobias left? Or was there a long period of just uncertainty in this whole thing? How do you remember that period? Because that was quite a long period for AID to be without an administrator, which must not have made it easy when you got there. Can you tell me a little bit about what that period was like in between?

FORE: Yes, I can. Let me tell you what I remember from it. When you're in the State Department, and with a good Secretary like Condoleezza Rice, and a good Deputy Secretary like John Negroponte, you're working as a team. I was able to act and to make some decisions, but not all decisions. I don't quite remember when the nominations went forward. But it was very clear that the intent was that all foreign assistance, whether it be held in the Department of Defense, whether it was in the Department of Agriculture, whether it was in the EPA, or the Department of Education, Department of State, Treasury, USAID, or PEPFAR would come under a coordinator. So when Secretary Rice was in cabinet meetings, or in the Security Council, she could speak on behalf of foreign assistance as a whole. That it was coordinated as one, or if it was John Negroponte, that he could do so. The role was such that you would pull together all of the strands of US foreign assistance. It's a very interesting premise, it is now enshrined in a formal Deputy Secretary of State Department. There is a second deputy state department. At that time, it was like a Junior Deputy Secretary. That is the way it was considered at the time. You had to pull together all U.S. foreign assistance across all agencies. At that time, it was also all the management roles in Department of State. It was all personnel and all budgets that had to do with foreign assistance, State Department, and USAID personnel. Now, it's a very interesting mixture of streams of information and decisions that need to be made. We did it as a team. It was not something that one person did alone. So the time before confirmation did not particularly matter this time. There wasn't a feeling of an interregnum, because it was the same administration, the same Secretary of State that was overseeing it.

Q: You could serve in these acting roles, even though you hadn't been confirmed, and that was because you had been confirmed at that senior level.

FORE: Exactly. As Undersecretary for Management at state, I could take another State Department, and USAID management/budget coordination role.

Q: I see. This notion that, as you say, it is a coordinator light or secretary light. The notion that you were able to coordinate all the spigots of foreign aid is mind boggling. Were you actually able to do that? This was what the original notion of ITCA was, many years before, which never really operated because of agriculture, treasury, and the other entities. At that point, there were fewer entities that were really active. They had no interest in being coordinated by the State Department or by the head of it by anybody else. But you found it feasible that they cooperated with you. You were able to exercise a coordination role for the US government?

FORE: Yes, but a lot of it has to do with the people that are in the roles. Some of the biggest money that was moving at that time was in PEPFAR (President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief). That had not been around during the ITCA years. When I first came into USAID, we often talked about indica and its role and how USAID's leadership had—and had not had an effect. These were the years in the late 1980s early 1990s when we at USAID were in the main State Department building. It seemed we should be able to coordinate. Now, in this period, in the first decade of the new century, Secretary Condoleezza Rice was trying to consolidate this. It means that OPEC, the Millennium Challenge Corporation, others who were Trade Development Authority, and others that we knew were part of the economic side, as well as the policy side could be coordinated. We knew each other, we had either served in this administration or another administration together. It helped that we already had good communication. We understood what we needed to do, and why we needed to do it. We could see the benefits from being coordinated. It worked at that time in a way that I don't know if it would normally work or in the beginning of an Administration. Many of us were old friends. Coordinating all of those spigots carries a benefit for the United States government and United States leadership, we do not look disjointed. When we then go out in the field and we are talking to a partner country, we do not come as a group of individuals who come in succession. We come as a group that's coordinated, we know our section of it, and we move it. It's not perfect. There are so many hundreds of projects that are moving. It helps to try to bring them together and to understand that there are regional needs, country needs, as well as self-interest from each one of the countries as well as the United States. I thought it was an important role. It was an important change in history, a new path of how to do foreign assistance.

I also found that it was very helpful to have budgets of state and AID seen together by one person, and personnel issues seen together. It allowed me to come in and not miss a beat once I was confirmed, and to see if we could launch the development leadership

initiative to increase the number of foreign service officers at USAID. I had been watching the downsizing of USAID. I knew how important USAID officers were and how important development knowledge was. We couldn't lose the knowledge, but we needed to scale up. All of this time period was useful in terms of being ready to just come out strong and clear on what we needed to get accomplished in a short period of time for USAID when I had the honor to serve as the Administrator. Everyone, particularly Alonso Fulham, Rich Greene, Jen Kunder, Office of Management and budget and the Hill... Nita Lowey, and her staff.

Q: That's a remarkable story because it puts a great stress on personal relationships and friendships. And the notion that these entities would fit together with much of what aid was doing. It's not a story that you hear very often because I think there was once a book that Carol Lancaster wrote that counted 75 different entities that each had some budget involved in this. In the days when I was head of policy at AID, we had most of the budget responsibilities for everything. Then we could parcel it out to other entities to do what should be done. But somewhere along the line, it all got dispersed. That will come back to this very important initiative on personnel. One thing that John Norris says in his notes about you, during your tenure, is that you were able to bring back some of the functions on the budget to AID since you had known about this. First of all, I think that it's wonderful that you had this management focus to begin with at state. It obviously was a good lead in as you've described it. On the budget, did you also have the same success and pull back some of the functions into AID?

FORE: Mixed reviews, because our budgets are really at the bidding of Congress. If you are earmarked, or if there is a desire for a certain program in a certain division or department of another agency, there it is. So you don't want to stop the programs, but you would like to coordinate them if you can. Every dollar can be invested well on behalf of the United States. It wouldn't be nice to be able to go back to the world in which all the budgets went to one place, and then they're parceled out. But it was not a luxury that we had. The budgets that you are preparing are really for your successors, so they'll be two years out. You have to do your best to try to pull them together, make them cohesive, and get them focused on US interests. Hopefully, US interests do not change that much at the water's edge. We know what America stands for and what we're trying to accomplish. For that part you just do your best, but it is a fractured budget and it is a fractured policy. The key is to try to pull it together as much as possible. I think Congress usually wants us to pull it together, even though the budgets that they send us are fractionalized.

Q: My experience is that Congress is much more supportive under Republican presidents than under Democratic presidents. In recent years, it has been much more unified in support of the AID program. I think you laid the ground for that. It's too bad that you

didn't have a four year tenure at least. So you would be able to create the budget that you could use rather than this. Tell me about the Development Leadership Initiative because that was clearly a very important development and you started on that. Bring us back to that and how you manage that and what it was.

FORE: You remember the staffing days of the 1970s, 80s, and 90s. USAID had the ability to field people in almost any area of expertise anywhere in the world. We were operating in most countries. As a result, it created a depth and breadth of experience, and a stature, and a strength. That was very, very solid. What happened during the years, was the budgets began to reduce. USAID was being shrunk because people didn't understand what the foreign assistance budget was doing for America. They didn't understand what it was doing in the foreign countries either. They would hear stories about corruption and other issues. As a result, the budgets just kept going down and down and down. Earmarking for programs does not mean that you actually get an operating budget for your people, your systems, your travel, and getting them out there. That's what AID was lacking, it had begun hollowing out of people's salaries, expense, and countries. It was getting to a very serious position.

We were trying to double the number of foreign service officers. We knew it was a big ask, but we had some great people to work with in Congress. I must say, working across the aisle with Nita Lowey was an absolute pleasure. We worked well together. When you get that bipartisan support and work well together on behalf of foreign assistance, it meant that we had a chance. Some of the toughest fights you do within your own Administration. Just getting things through OMB can be difficult. But we had some old pros who were around to help us. John Negroponte helped and Condoleezza Rice helped. As a result, we were able to get it through. It was very clear that the capacities of USAID were getting so low that we needed to restart a new initiative.

Then we were faced with another issue, what kind of skills do we need in our new Foreign Service officers? Would they be different from the past? One of the things that we asked was, did you have some experience in the private sector? The private sector was out in the world around us and in these countries. Often our officers had not spent time in the private sector, because they'd been career Foreign Service officers. But if you're hiring in again, would it be helpful? We recruited many young people who'd had experience in the private sector. I think that also helped. It made us more forward thinking about partnerships that we could do with nonprofits, with for-profit corporations, and with the public sector. It created a better breath. The quality of the young people was excellent. Then we struggled to address how to get them trained. How do we get all of this knowledge in? We've lost so many people just like you. I'd asked George Lovato if he could come back and serve. Could other, retired FSOs be mentors and teachers?

I also asked Janet Ballantine, if she could come back and serve, to see if we could start a mentor group. So that USAID alumni, some State alumni, and those who had been in USAID and State could come back and work to mentor the young group that we had coming up. We had classes and training. Since the USAID did not have its own Foreign Service Institute, we borrowed some classes from the Foreign Service Institute and our own alumni to train our young. We were able to get classes in and get them moving. Then we needed to have Mission Directors who were willing to take our young and to take them out in the field without having a lot of experience in Washington. They needed to get them out into the field and they did. The USAID Mission Directors rose to the challenge and the office directors in Washington rose to the challenge. Everybody just went to work to try to get us the right skills, experience, and talent. They have been great. It was a turning point. USAID had been shrinking in its experience, knowledge, and people. We allowed it to grow and blossom again. If I'd been able to stay longer, I would try to double again. We needed more foreign service officers. We had all the business cases as to why we needed them to go for OMB and Congress. Administration came, so I couldn't do that part. But at least we got the first part started.

Q: How many were you able to add during your tenure? Do you remember?

FORE: No, but I know that those numbers are around. It was significant, for us it was a doubling. Some missions worried that there were going to be younger in their mission than there were experienced older staff. But they learned so quickly. They bring new skills, enthusiasm, and excitement. They soon found that it was all right, even though you thought you needed to have one older person for every younger person, maybe you had two or three younger people for every older person. That's just the situation we were in. You had to try to get your expertise to this young generation, as fast, smartly, and intelligently as you could. We trusted our people to do that and they did it.

Q: One other initiative, which you recommended and you urged is that not only are you able to bring in alumni to help train some of these people through these formal classes, but you urged the alumni to organize. Now the Alumni Association knows that you are the source of their being an Alumni Association. Thank you again for that. I'm not sure whether the alumni would ever have gotten organized, had you not stimulated it. Was there more to it than what you were just describing in trying to gain some of the experience that the alumni had?

FORE: You're absolutely right, that the impetus was that we needed all of the expertise of the alumni, and we needed it fast. Whatever the alumni were doing, if they could just drop it, and help us out, or help us out part time, that's what we needed. All who were

alumni came to our rescue. It was really important. There were some other things that I hoped we could accomplish. Because I have been to reunions at my college, Wellesley, I know what a benefit it is to get the mentoring when alumni come back. You just make connections. The older classes know things that you just don't know yet. You don't know people or places yet, but the older alumni do if you have a chance to get to know them. It's also that I knew the people who had served before, because I'd served before. I knew that our history, our experiences, our evaluation, and policy departments were not really operable in the way they had been. So we started the policy again. Boy, did that make a difference. We refocused on intellectual property and restarted program evaluations. We didn't really have funding for it, but we did our best to cobble it together.

USAID goes through periods—where we are backing regional and national institutions. Our institution building, particularly in the Americas, it's one that you don't want to lose that history. It is why you write the history of USAID. Then we go through other periods where it's people-to-people. We have periods where we just want to focus on the least developed countries and get out of middle income countries. For many of us, we felt that middle income countries needed us just as much as the least developed countries needed us. Then every country has some part of it that is extremely undeveloped. India is a good example of that. Is it smart for USAID to be out? We learn something from every country that we have. But how do we share that knowledge? How do we create a body of knowledge? Sort of like a global development common where people can come and they can learn about the institutional changes through the decades of a USAID and can learn about the experiences. What worked, what were spectacular failures, why did it fail, could it be used somewhere else, could it be scaled up, and how do we change the world. For that, the Alumni Association is essential. What you've been doing, with backing the writing of a history, of sharing experiences with each other and with knowledge, so that both public and private sector can learn from the experiences of the officers who have served in USAID, is just essential. My dream for the Alumni Association would have all of these aspects. We would have mentoring from current alumni, we would have a way to institutionalize the knowledge of the periods that we've been through, and we would have a way to exchange experiences of successes and failures in countries. We would have a way of weighing in if there was ever going to be Foreign Assistance Reform, if there was going to be some look at the legislation, or if there were going to be suggestions about how to reorganize agencies and departments in an administration. Our alumni as a stream, could be a powerful group for this. Those were my dreams for the Alumni Association.

Q: I think the alumni are grateful to you for having that vision. While it will never be completely fulfilled, I think you would be pleased by some of the developments. Including the fact that there are about 50 mentoring pairs of mentees and mentors. This has been an ongoing process for the last 5 to 7 years. I think the alumni feel they benefit from it. I

guess that the mentees do as well. It's mostly about trying to help these people who are thrown into situations where they are new to it, whether you don't have the mentoring possibilities in the field as there once were. That's just one aspect of what's being done. I've been encouraged that there also are now more recent retirees joining in, it's not just the people who retired 20 years ago. Are there other aspects of this period of your 14 months as the confirmed administrator, as well as this time leading up to it? The kinds of things you've mentioned, like the Leadership Initiative and the public private partnerships, that kind of thing. Is there anything else that stands out as a feature of this period that has given you great satisfaction or left you unhappy in some way?

FORE: There are two things that come to mind, but I'm sure there are lots more. One is the people that were doing this. When you are double hatted, which is what I was, in State as the Director of Foreign Assistance and USAID as Administrator. I tried to spend mornings in State and afternoons in USAID. That way I would have a schedule, like open office hours with professors at colleges. So that people would know when I was in the building, and if they had something to discuss or decide, they could bring it. They could count on the Administrator being in or the Director of Foreign Assistance being in. It was really important that we tried to build trust between USAID and State. They're brother and sister, but there's sometimes competition. A lot of the competition is around money and who gets the funding. Sometimes it's also about the people that are out there and the collaboration. Whether it is in Washington that the offices work together or whether it is in the field that the individuals who are heading it, like the Ambassador and the Mission Director, are getting along and their staffs are getting along. It was something that I really worked at. Because I lived in both environments, I knew that there were edges that were friction. We really tried to work on making it a team, so that you play to the skills and you play your best. All of us have been part of sports teams and you need to pass the ball to somebody who's going to be able to score. It may not be smart that you just keep it to yourself, but you pass it to somebody else to score. We had to get a mentality of who everybody was, what their skills were, who you pass the ball to and when, and how you did it well together, how you become a winning U.S. team.

Creating the Development Leadership Initiative, meant State came in by USAID's side and worked together to help USAID get it. That's the kind of approach that I wish were there now. I wish we could engender everywhere that agencies really pitch in to help each other to accomplish something that's essential for them. It was essential for USAID to have that Development Leadership Initiative. If State hadn't come in to weigh in beside, it probably wouldn't have come through if they'd gone negative. But they came in strongly. Creating that trust was people. On the USAID side, it was Jim Condor and Alonso Fulham. On the State Department side, it was Rich Green, Kushali Shah, Chris Milligan, and others who were coming over. Some USAID personnel came into State in the foreign

assistance office, some State came into USAID, but we tried to get more secondments across agencies. In budget work, this is really helpful. In policy work, this is really helpful. I wish we could do more of it. I had looked at what DOD (Department of Defense) had done across their forces, Air Force, Army, Navy, Marines, etc. and they had an initiative where you could second and rotate among the services. Couldn't we be doing that in State, in AID, and in the other foreign assistance, the big foreign assistance entities. I think it would be really positive. Nobody in Congress's given us that authority yet, but I think it would really help. The other thing it would really help is if we could go back to secondments into the private sector, whether it's a big nonprofit NGO, or whether it's a big corporation. People understand enough to leave their issues at the door. It is very helpful if somebody, let's say from Google, can come into USAID and talk about what Google is doing. And for USAID to have somebody going into Google, even if it's for a short period of time, perhaps six weeks. It builds skills and trust. I guess what I'm saying is, to encapsulate it, it's the building of trust between two agency departments. That is essential and that's what we were trying to work on in this time period.

Q: Were you recognizing that it was not long enough to do what has taken centuries? When you left on January 20, 2009, did you feel accomplished that you achieved some of this bringing together? Has there been some progress in this area?

FORE: There's a wonderful Churchill quote about wishing he could tell the British people that they were nearing the end of the war. But all he could tell them is that they are at the end of the beginning. I had the feeling we had done enough, that we had begun. We had teams that could work together, could talk to each other, and could operate together. We had people from USAID who were learning the State system and State was learning USAID systems. I think they were gaining a renewed respect about how to work together, and in what ways and where their strengths were. It had begun and that is all I could do in my tenure.

Q: After you left, did successive USAID administrators call upon you and ask for your advice and guidance? Whether they took it or not, did you find that there was some degree of collegiality among all of you who have been USAID administrators?

FORE: Yes, there's a strong collegiality. It doesn't matter Republican or Democrat, everybody reaches out. If it isn't the person who's in office who reaches out, we who are on the outside reach in, because we know how busy you are when you're in there. We know that, but yes, everybody reaches out. We stay friends for life. That's good I think. There's one other area that I don't think I did as well. The one of building trust and understanding of what each agency did. I tried to relook at the issues of where we were staffed, how we were staffed, how our budgets moved, and who was contracting for

projects in the field. The State Department was becoming a big contractor in the field. It wasn't their area of expertise. USAID was a big contractor, but we didn't want USAID to become just a contracting office, all procurement officers with NGOs out in the field. Trying to rebalance that, how you run projects, how you operate them, who initiates them, where the funding comes from, we wanted to try to organize that in a better way around skills for state, USAID, and all of the foreign assistance entities. I don't think we've made much progress.

Q: It's not wrong to say that these problems have persisted until today. It isn't as if they've been easy to overcome. What would you say were the main reasons you did not make as much progress as you would like, is it just built in bureaucratic procedures? Is it congressional requirements? Is it a people problem?

FORE: All of the above, you've got it. That is all of it. As a result, the United States government is slow. It's not good enough for the United States. You would never be this slow in the private sector. You would have a computer system that operated for all of you. You could actually see, if you're in a country like Ethiopia, what programs are underway in the country from all US agencies and foreign assistance. We didn't have the money to get the IT systems. Therefore, we didn't have the information. People had to connect in the field and sort of say, what are you doing, what project, you've got one right next door to us, and you're doing what in a school? It is poorly organized for scale and speed, so you wish to change it. I tried to get it streamlined, effective, and operationally useful, so that when making a policy decision, or when an operational decision is carried out, that we execute brilliantly. It was just terribly hard. Everybody was reinventing the wheel all the time on the procurement of a program. The fact that it takes a year and a half or two years to get a well-designed program out in the field, is simply too long. You should be able to get something up and running in three weeks. We don't have that and the United States Government needs to get to that place. As a result, you need the help of Congress. You need help from all the people in the bureaucracy because they know their systems and they know what you could streamline. We probably need the help of some of the IT companies so that things can move quickly, fast, and inter operably.

Q: In your encouragement of the public private partnerships, were those able to illustrate a faster, more private sector-oriented speed? Or were they, too, caught up in this bureaucratic miasma?

FORE: They were caught up in it, but occasionally a couple of programs would make it through very fast. That's back to the idea that maybe five or ten percent really move through with speed. The difficulty is often in the government. There's a suspicion that private companies are trying to make money off whatever the program is. It's sometimes

true and sometimes businesses aren't. Everybody gets put into the same bin, as if they were receiving money from the United States government, even though some were not. As a result, you had to move at the pace of the United States government procurement regulations. Partnerships where it's side-by-side funding, where the private sector entity puts in \$500,000 and the US government puts in \$500,000, should work faster. Somehow it all sometimes gets linked together as if it was all US government procurement. We have to just keep looking for ways to speed it up, lighten it up, streamline it, and recognize that the private sector is at work in these countries before, during, and after the government programs. It's the local private sector, as well as the US private sector. Can't we make them into a partner that's a partner for speed and scale?

Q: A goal that your successors have tried to deal with as well. One last question in this area. Secretary of Defense Gates made a statement and John Norris quoted him. What he's suggested was that the best way to support the security of states is to put more money into diplomacy and development, not in just military armaments. I just wondered whether you had anything to do with his making of that statement? That's the one part of this I've never heard any comment on. You were there when he made the statement, or at least you were in office then. Can I trace some of it back to you?

FORE: Yes. Secretary Gates was terrific. I should have mentioned him earlier in the foreign assistance with Secretary Rice and John Negroponte. He was a real supporter. We would not have gotten the Development Leadership Initiative without Secretary Gates and his backing. The Department of Defense came in strongly. When I was Undersecretary of Management, we had used this convention of 1207 money as a way of trying to fund some of the programs in the State Department.

Q: 1207 is the money that is in the Pentagon, but is accessible to State, right? Yes, I remember you said that before.

FORE: When I thought of being involved more deeply into USAID and the foreign assistance position, I asked the Department of Defense if we couldn't use some money for USAID. We had lots of good discussions and found ways that we could move funding, either on a humanitarian basis in times of crises or in times of development that was longer term. We needed both the people as well as the funding because we were down in our headcount and skills. We talked about both people and money. I had a great relationship with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Secretary Mike Mullen. He was great. What he would often say was, Henrietta, you know more about what's going on in these countries often than we do. I said, Yes, it's true. USAID and State Department on the ground, but particularly USAID is really in with the people. They know a lot about what's going on. We tried to think about ways that the Department of Defense could support

both the diplomatic and the development side. They knew that we came out before them, making friends in a country, and hoped that we never needed the military. But when we did need the military, maybe we could put them to work making a few wells for water in a village. They have so much engineering expertise. Our engineering experience in USAID had once been very strong when we were doing infrastructure projects in USAID. In my first years in USAID we had some engineering projects in Asia. Dams, other things, Fred's Zobrist, and many of the engineers who were part of the team. But we didn't later. We did not rehire engineers. It meant that we needed help from the Department of Defense and their engineering expertise, so that we could move some infrastructure development projects that needed help. If we could get help on the Department of Defense side, then it would benefit everyone in the country, as well as the United States interests. I think I was part of the group that was around Secretary Gates, so that he would feel confident in making a statement like that.

Q: Well, it's obviously been repeated many, many times. I hope he still believes in it.

FORE: He does.

Q: Good. Does that cover all the critical points, in the ones who can remember, at the stage of your last foray at USAID? You had been there earlier, as you say, and this was the time that you were actually in charge of the whole place. You've made very clear that you have very strong views about the importance and quality of the people, and about how you are a great exponent of the work of USAID. Any last thoughts before we move away from that because you still have a lot of career ahead of you?

FORE: One experience came to mind that I had forgotten to mention earlier. There was a time period, the summer of 2006, in which there was a number of bombings of Beirut, and much of this was coming from Israel. We needed to do an evacuation of American citizens out of Beirut. It was a very interesting time for us who were in the Department of State. Secretary Rice and the Deputy Secretary were out. They were in St. Petersburg at a Forum along with Nick Burns, the Undersecretary for Policy, when the crisis began to unfold. So we gathered a group of individuals who would deal with the crisis. Since I was Undersecretary for Management, it meant that I was responsible for all of the visas and passports for American citizens, the outreach of who was an American citizen, and the getting of how we could find help to evacuate Americans. Could we get some help from the Department of Defense? Would some of the Navy ships be available? Could the Marines help us and where were the ships? Could we get private carriers? So we looked at cruise ships, Disney and others. Did they have anything in the Mediterranean that could help us evacuate American citizens out of Beirut, and then where would we take them? Cyprus was very obvious, Larnaca, the main port there in Beirut. Could we also

take them up to Incirlik, up to the bases in Turkey? But how do you evacuate citizens? There were about 25,000 that needed to evacuate. The radio towers and television towers were taken down. So how do you communicate? American citizens were running to the embassy to ask for help. Some had children with them, some had papers, some didn't have papers. We needed to sort all of that out and get them down to the docks, but do it in a way that they wouldn't get hurt in the bombing, and that the docks wouldn't be taken out. and that we would have a boat waiting. Communicating with Americans for an evacuation and transporting them, we used everything we could find. We found cattle carriers that were there from Norway, and we placed people on these ships and we got them out. We safely evacuated 25,000. We had one baby born on board one of our ships, Ambassadors Jim-Jefferies, Harry Thomas, and Maura Hardy were indispensable partners. and most of them went to Cyprus. One of the things I once again learned is that when the cannons speak, the State Department and USAID people run toward them, and they say, what can I do to help? My phone was ringing off the hook saying, can I come and help? They were USAID and they were State Department people. They just , particularly consular officers. They wanted to see if they could help in some way. They were in Europe and they said, I could make it down to Lebanon, or I could make it into Cyprus, I could help there. It's what you're now seeing as people trying to help in Ukraine. But it is an extraordinary expertise, it is something that should not be lost in the annals of history. There is a cadre of people, when the time gets really tough, they get going, and they were there for us. It's just hats off. You learn that when you're in these positions and when you're in these tight spots. It also meant that I made friends over a Department of Defense because I was hammering on their door all the time trying to get help. It meant that then I could use it later, when we wanted to try to put forward foreign assistance together, that I had friends all over the government who I could reach out to, to say, we've got a new mission, we've got help, we need your help to help on the budgets, and we need to grow USAID again. It all adds up to a team that's at work overseas and it's not to be forgotten.

Q: This is a very good example of the oft used phrase of 'whole of government'. That often doesn't mean anything, but what you're describing is, once again, something that's very dependent on your personality, your enthusiasm, and your leadership, that you're able to capture all this in a way that is useful, not simply in the individual issue that stimulated it. But beyond that, so hats off to you too. Shall we retire from USAID and move on? Does that sound sensible to you?

FORE: It means that we go into the Alumni Association.

Q: What it shows is that you then have a number of years, when you are once again, immersed in your own private sector activities. Although, for you, private sector also

means membership on a vast number of public sector or public interest or boards. You never actually give up your interest in the importance of helping people. I won't try to list them all, but are there several boards? Because the next time you move into a key position of responsibility for an organization is 2018. You have about 10 years before, right?

FORE: Yes.

Q: During that period, in addition to your work on your own companies, are there some boards that you were particularly active in and enthusiastic about? Are there any you wish to single out or not?

FORE: I've loved them all. When you do the kind of work that we all do, you can never leave your international self to the side. What interests me most are non-profit organizations and corporations that are helping in the United States and internationally. You can make some sort of synergy out of the public and private sectors. I think it's everywhere, there's always synergy. For various reasons, I found every one of them interesting. I also think that it's very important for those of us who have served in government, to make sure that we serve in the private sector. And for those of us who have served in the private sector, make sure we serve in government. Then both of us serve in the nonprofit sector. It'd be nice if people could serve in, and academia, but they've got to have the right skills. At least those first three, everybody should have those as a basic if possible. If you're going to contribute to the world around you, you are to serve. You are to serve the people, the policies, and the programs. What you do on boards is you try to connect the dots for them and make it more effective and better, in every possible way. That's what I do on all the boards. We'll be here a long time if I get to talk about all the boards, but I tried to serve on about a dozen boards at a time. I'm the long loyal type. If I go onto a board, I will often return to a board after my public service. At the Center for Strategic International Studies I've returned to three times. I think in the Aspen Institute, I have also. That is also true of the Aspen Institute, Asia Society, and CECP (the Committee for Encouraging Corporate Philanthropy) too. But some were new like Women Corporate Director because the need is urgent. You'll find that if you can help and if you can be part of making the world better through an organization, you will do so. The corporate boards, I was blessed with having a mix of manufacturing, direct consumer retail, Biopharma, and Exxon Mobil. There was a mix of research and development, marketing, products, services, big platforms, small, and innovative, and some companies where a third of the product line is new every year. For other companies, technology and molecular change. You learn things from each entity about what you can do, that would be better. Some entities that I was with were the same size as the State Department or USAID. Others were very small and in very different industries. We were

dealing with policy. For me, policy and ideas have to be executed, they have to go operational if they're going to have an effect. If you're going to change the world, you need to put policy and ideas into use. And what we in the government sector know is, how to get ideas and policies to work for a government. That makes a very big difference. We can bring that to every board we join.

Q: I would imagine that there are not many people who are on these boards who have the diversity of experience that you do. This mix that you've described and your sense of responsibility are wonderful and somewhat unusual. I won't say unique, but somewhat unusual to have had the senior positions in government and very clear responsibilities in the private sector, at various levels and types of businesses. It seems to me that boards all over would be clamoring to have you on their roster. How did the UNICEF appointment come about? Was this something where you were nominated by the Trump administration? Were you approached by the United Nations? Tell us how that came to fruition. How did it start?

FORE: I really did not think that I would be serving again. But when the Trump administration came in, the White House personnel was understaffed, as often White House personnel are. They had asked for names for people for a variety of posts. I gave them lots of names for people who would be excellent at serving in one role or another. At a certain point, they asked if I would be interested in doing the job at the United Nations, with UNICEF, because they needed someone who'd been the equivalent of a minister of foreign assistance. There weren't too many of us, that was narrowing it down. They said they'd really like to have a woman. Then we were really narrow. I said, if called—I would serve, but couldn't you call a couple of other people. I would get them some suggestions and then they kept coming back. I talked to a couple of friends, Madeleine Albright, who had just passed away, just to ask her what she thought. Also some of the past UNICEF directors to see what they thought. Everyone said I think you should do it if you can possibly make the time for it. I asked my family and they said I could. That meant then that your nomination would go in from the United States for that position. We didn't want to lose the position. My nominator then goes over to the State Department then goes over to the United Nations as a nominee. Then interviews at the UN, and meeting with the Secretary General. The Secretary General is fascinating and I liked him right away. That made it easy. It's a double hat of a different sort. You both run UNICEF, as a global organization, and then you are on his senior staff for the United Nations. You do both. Because the UNICEF main office is in New York, you're often at the Secretariat and the UNICEF building is right across from the secretariat. I could see all of that and was delighted when Samantha Power was nominated for USAID. That brings it full circle for those of us who have had a chance to serve in the State Department, in USAID, and the UN.

Q: Coming into UNICEF, in comparison and contrasted to USAID, other than their interest in developing countries, are they wildly different in the way they work? Did you see a lot of similarities and issues that you needed to deal with once you started at UNICEF?

FORE: I think for many of us, we really don't understand the United Nations agencies until you serve in them. Maybe that's true for almost any organization. One doesn't really understand USAID, State Department, or Treasury until you serve in it. I think the UN is one of the least understood entities if you're not in that world of the international civil servant. It was actually a merger of USAID and State. It's like having a little State Department. You're involved in policy issues and you are involved in the crises. UNICEF is one half humanitarian and one half development. There's very short term crisis work and there's very long term development work. Since you're working with children, meaning 18 years old and under, it means that you're really investing for the future, whatever kinds of programs you do. Similar to USAID, it is a world in which the development ministers of countries that are donors, like the DAC and the OECD group, are also the ones who become donors to UNICEF.

My former colleagues, those who had been heads of development agencies, I would now see again, as part of the UN, even though it was nine years later. They were still around because they are often in parliamentary systems. They would be a Minister of Development at one time and now they're the Minister of Trade, the Minister of Defense, or the Prime Minister. You would see a group of countries that were part of your sphere of influence in a way that was much closer than either State or USAID. Those colleagues become your board of directors of a multi-lateral entry entity, UNICEF. Therefore, every country is making donations to UNICEF and has people from their country serving in your agency. UNICEF is about 20,000 strong in 192 countries. We raise our budget every year. There is no funding coming out of the UN Secretariat itself. We raise \$7 billion a year. Two-thirds from governments. One-third from the private sector. Those connections with all of the other countries and ministers became exceedingly important because they are major donors. It's a US purview. There have been United States Executive Directors for many recent years. It has great relationships out around the world and brand recognition, which means that you can get much accomplished. You're also trying to make the world better for this next generation, which means that you think about the world in a very big, open, and bold way. It's a whole new generation and they need a lot of opportunities. You are investing in the future.

Q: Since you've only stepped down within the last couple of months, are you yet in a position where you can look back and see what you feel are the greatest accomplishments

within this structure you've described? With the ups and downs of funding, global disasters, and COVID, which you also lived through, are you able to assess where you think your greatest accomplishments have been in the four years you spent there? It's asking a lot of you I appreciate, but don't be too modest.

FORE: I was just about to become modest. I was going to tell you that it's not my accomplishments, it's their accomplishments. But I was definitely there, encouraging, being a curator of what I thought could really move, and then trying my best to drive program movement and momentum to get some things accomplished. I think we moved forward on a number of fronts, and I can tell you some. One would be that we spent a lot of time on the whole notion about how you open up opportunities for the young. There often is a sense that UNICEF should be just for younger children, under six, but it goes up to the age of 18. But people are a little bit wary of adolescents. None of us quite know what to do with adolescents in our own families, much less what kind of programs to put in place for adolescents around the world. When we looked at the demographics, adolescents are the largest cohort that the world has ever seen, 1.8 billion between the ages of 10 and 24. You say to yourself, that's going to be the generation that is going to change this world. What could we do for them? In my tenure, we focused on trying to open up opportunities for young people. Adolescents were an area that had not been paid attention to because it was difficult. No one funds adolescents, they fund child survival, but now we need to raise the need for adolescents.

What do adolescents need? They need everything. If you begin to look at the world through their eyes, their number one request is we want a modern education, we want to learn something that's relevant, so we can actually make a living. For most of them, they were bored, they didn't feel they were learning anything in school, and the dropout rates in Sub Saharan Africa for secondary education is just appalling. More than half of those students leave school without being able to read or write. That has enormous implications for our world. You can just imagine what it's like to run a country if people cannot read, write, and count. We have to educate young people around the world. So we started a number of initiatives and programs, and rebirthed the adolescent young people areas and expertise within UNICEF. Young people really need it.

We were so thankful that we did because when the pandemic hit, people began to realize that some of the things that young people were talking about, is what the whole world was about to talk about. The whole world needs to figure out how to get an education and they're going to have to get it online. How they're going to actually make a living. They want to talk about mental health. Now everybody is now understanding that we better talk about mental health because everybody at every age has this problem. But the young people taught us that and it was because we focused on them. For two years, we were

able to focus on young people and get ahead of the curve. When the pandemic hit, we were in great shape to just come roaring into the pandemic. We wanted to come out of the pandemic stronger than when we entered it. We weren't going to sit back and let the pandemic trap us into feeling we had lost two or three decades of progress.

We were going to open up opportunities for the young. We started an initiative called Generation Unlimited, which is a huge public private partnership, you'll be glad to know. Part of our mission is to connect the other half of the world to the internet. Half of the world is not on it, half is. We think we can do it with low earth satellites and small Wi Fi connectors. We think we can connect every single school. We convinced many of the telephone companies to help us, the big ones all around the world. This way we could map where schools were. Many governments were surprised that they had schools in certain areas. If we could map them, then we could gather all of that demand for connectivity into a common bid for the use of lower satellites. It could become a utility, just like any other utility, like electricity or water, at schools all around the world. We could connect all of them. We could do it in the next three or four years. It would change the world, and give a more level playing field to the next generation.

The other problem that we have globally, is that we don't have enough girls going to school. When times get hard, you keep your girls at home, they do homework, they look after the elderly at home, or you marry them early, because you're worried that they will not be safe if they continue at school, and you will not be able to adequately support them. In Afghanistan now, if we can get online education to all those Secondary School age girls who are out of school, it will allow them to continue all of their school studies. Connecting every school to the internet is a big idea. We're on it. We're launching a bond issue for \$5 billion. Europeans are strongly behind it. We need government help and we need private sector help. Then we're going to need lots of teachers who will learn along with their students because we don't have enough teachers in this world. We're trying to encourage them. We're trying to encourage a lot of the young people to become teachers and healthcare workers because we don't have enough nurses and doctors either. We're hoping that we can reach them this way. They'll be excited about learning, they'll be excited about life, and they won't feel hopeless. There's a lot of depression, anger, and anxiety among the young. If we can give them some opportunities and some goals, they can go for it. That's one very big area of focus that was reignited on my watch.

Another very big area that was on my watch was how to deal with the pandemic. Since UNICEF is the house in which one half of the world's vaccines go through, we buy them for other countries so that childhood vaccinations can take place in every country in the world. It's usually for children under the age of one or the under the age of five. It's everything from measles, pneumonia, smallpox, diphtheria, and polio. We try to get

childhood vaccinations out to keep children safe. We were moving 2 billion vaccines a year and all the equipment that goes with it. Now we needed another 2 billion vaccines for COVID, so we needed to double. All of my experience in the private sector for how you scale up supply chains came to bear again, it was useful as to how you move vaccines. We had closed airspace and we had countries that would not allow planes to land. We had to work with their equivalent of FDA approval, so that you would get vaccines approved in a country and so that you could bring them into the country. We did communications, so that people would understand that vaccines can make you safe and you should get a vaccine. We worked with all the governments so that their health care workers knew how to use the vaccines. It was very complex because of the ultra-cold chain that was needed out of Pfizer. It wasn't just as simple as it might look. We had solar panels going up into rural villages to try to connect to refrigerators, so we could both keep our vaccines cold en route, but also cold when they were stored in the village. It was a big undertaking for COVID and for UNICEF to assemble because we were the largest in the world for vaccines. COVID did lots of other things for us. The effect on UNICEF was difficult, difficult on everyone. But the supply chain issues were extraordinary. The people in our supply division were extraordinary. They just worked 24 hours a day and they are still on it. But we need 2 billion syringes. It is hard to get everything from the right place at the right time to the right place at the right time. That's UNICEF at work trying to get the world vaccinated. We were dealing with a pandemic and we will deal with future pandemics.

Q: You have a system for delivery of the vaccines for other diseases and presumably there are people who are skilled in getting those vaccines into the arms of people. I heard that one of the big problems in these countries, far off, is that even when they have vaccines they don't have a system for getting them into the arms of people. Did you find that was part of the system? Was UNICEF also able to address and deal with it?

FORE: Yes, you're right. This is an enormous challenge. Part of the problem is funding. Every country has a health ministry that is somewhere between being underfunded to being abysmally funded. As a result, it is very hard for them to have enough health care workers and enough equipment at the hospitals and health care centers that are operating in their country. The rural clinics often are without supplies of all sorts, obstetric equipment, therapeutic foods for children that are malnourished, and pharmaceuticals. All of those things are missing in many of the healthcare systems. What UNICEF does is they help the Ministry of Health understand inventories, where they need supplies, and we try to get it to them. We help in training the health care workers, who are there, and try to make sure that they are paid and that they are operating.

But it is such a challenge during a pandemic because many of the health care workers and many of the teachers had to go home to look after their own families. You're already short staffed, you don't have your equipment, and in a year's time we would maybe order 2000 masks. In those first few months, our order book was 2 trillion masks. The magnitude of a wave was just coming across the world. We needed gowns and masks. We needed to try to get the doctors and nurses vaccinated so they could look after other people. We needed to get more services for those who had died and get them off the streets into respectable burials. It overwhelmed most of the health ministries. As a result, funding for the local countries is essential. The United States came in strong, which was great. And it just reminds you that the United States can be this enormous power of good for good products and services, and its public and private sector. We would never be where we are in vaccines today without the private sector R&D, and what they created in vaccines. This new development of mRNA has changed the world. We think now we could get more of these vaccine manufacturing plants out around the world starting with Africa. That would help the world as a whole. The pandemic taught UNICEF a lot. I think it taught the world a lot. We really managed to move a great deal. I will just tag a third area I think has been very important.

Two weeks into my tenure at UNICEF, movement began to really resonate in the United Nations agencies. We were called on as leadership to see what we could do about sexual abuse, sexual harassment, and abuse of authority within our own entity. I really believe good management makes an enormous difference, and you have to look after your people. We began a number of initiatives in which we first began to talk to our people about what they had heard and seen in their own workplaces. Were they respectful, or were they not worth it? Did we have harassment within our walls? We needed to know about our workplaces. We knew there were a lot of cases of United Nations personnel, maybe it was the peacekeeping troops, who had taken advantage of children or young women in a development or humanitarian setting. There were also cases of nonprofits personnel who had sexually abused people, Oxfam came up, etc. It was both inside our own walls and outside. We began talking to people. We were all taken aback at how much there was that people hadn't spoken about. They kept inside but there was a sense that we did not have respectful workplaces. It took us time to do this, but we were determined. We set up a new position, which was looking at our culture. It was off of my office so it was very clear that the Executive Director cared about it, and was going to do something about it. And it moved it over the next two years, into a place where everybody was getting into it.

Then came out of the United States, the whole movement of Black Lives Matter and a feeling of racial differences that resonated in almost every country, but in very different ways. Sometimes it was racial, sometimes it was religion, and sometimes it was ethnic.

There were often those who are at the top of the country's elite, and those who were at the middle, and those who were at the bottom, who were of different backgrounds. We were in the position as an agency that we'd gotten ahead of the curve on our internal culture, because we cared that then we could address sexual and racial inequities, ethnic inequities, and religious inequities. By the time I left, probably the strongest number of messages that I got were hundreds that came in from all over the world. It was about changing their culture, they changed their culture, and they did it because they had a reason to do it. They had experience on how to do it. It meant more respectful workplaces.

I hope it will carry on. It makes so much a difference during a pandemic when some people are working at home. Sometimes your home is the place where the sexual or physical abuse is happening. Sometimes it's at work, but that people felt that they were being cared for in both environments. We made it so they could go home, they could look after their children, we knew that they would be first a parent, second a teacher, and third a professional working for UNICEF. We didn't expect them to be UNICEF first. We knew they'd be a parent first. By doing that, we gave them the respect within our organization that they could do their work, and we trusted them to do it. Our productivity went up, but it was tough.

It was terribly hard for some, the amount of deaths and needs just outside your door. UNICEF came through strong and we came out of these two years of the pandemic stronger. I was really proud of them. That was the third big initiative that we hadn't thought we needed, but we found that we needed and we worked really hard in the UN on the outside, with the peacekeepers and with our nonprofit partners. You have to clean up inside as well as outside to have credibility outside. We've now got some UNICEF models that the other UN agencies and nonprofits can use.

Q: This was not just in UNICEF, at headquarters, but throughout your worldwide offices worldwide?

FORE: Every office in every office had to have conversations about what was going right and not right in their offices. People began to understand each other and to learn what was happening to them when they made a remark. They might think a remark was funny, but it wasn't funny to the person that heard it in the office. They did and they hadn't realized the effect. It could be security guards as to how they reacted to somebody in the security checks. It could be a supervisor calling on just the top men in a meeting. It changed how we looked at each other and we were more respectful.

Q: That's marvelous, but it must be so much more difficult. In this international setting, as you pointed out, in various countries, you have various levels and traditions that are culturally anathema to what you're trying to achieve. When you come into a UNICEF setting, presumably, people are expected to treat everyone with respect, even if in the broader society outside it's not followed. How you implement it takes extraordinary sensitivity and skill.

FORE: Yes, yes. Which is why it was so important that our people believe in it and they are talking to each other. They'll know best, whether they're in a small outpost of three people or they're in a large country office of 500 people. There are also all the NGOs who work with them, the contractors who work with them, and the people in the ministries that they work with. They all reflect the society they are in. So we are trying to create a more respectful workplace and society because in our case, the children need it. They need to have a world of opportunity and respect in the world they're coming into, but it's difficult. One of the harder ones you would think would be easy, but isn't, was early marriage. We try very hard to keep girls in school and we do not want girls to be married before they're 18 years old, while they're still a child. Many of them will get pregnant. Then it's children who bear children. They have a terrible time in childbirth and they're often anemic. It's really hard, so we really encourage no child marriages and we advocate it everywhere. But then what do you do when in your own offices, one of your people gets married to a 14 year old or a 16 year old because his sister or brother have someone that they need to marry? They thought he would be good, and he may be 40. But it's a child. On the one hand, they are of their culture and their family. On the other hand, they are part of a normative United Nations human rights organization that is looking after the rights of children. It is very complex.

Q: How did you solve that one?

FORE: Carefully.

Q: We're going to wrap this up soon, but one of the things that has amazed me in the last couple of years is the degree to which leadership in organizations such as UNICEF, but not limited to UNICEF, have managed to run an organization of 10,000 to 20,000 people virtually. I know part of your time you were not in New York in your office, but you were at home in your office. Is there anything you can say about how you managed to cope with running such a gigantic organization? Without being able to walk down the hall and grab somebody and say, we've got to deal with this or that, how did you do it?

FORE: This could be a longer discussion. The short version is, in my case, it helped that I had two years before the pandemic in which I was able to get out to the field and see

many of our offices. I had made a point in my first weeks of being on board to go around to every office, all of our buildings, and all of our floors to go see our people, to meet them, and to see what they were doing. It was helpful for me, so I knew them and they knew me.

Q: Once more I welcome Henrietta Fore to this oral history session. It is our fourth session because we were cut off for recording problems, just as you were answering my question about how you managed to run a big organization virtually during this pandemic period. You had explained that you had two years in order to prepare for it, and that you knew the offices and the people and you had that advantage. But then comes the real shutdown. Once that happened, how did you manage? I think even if you knew people, it's still not quite the same as being able to wander down the hall and see people. So tell me about how you do it.

FORE: Thank you, it's great to be with you again. You are right that it is helpful to have been with the people. In both New York and in the field, you can then feel their environment, their workplace, and their ecosystem. Additionally, you can feel what the pressures and the opportunities are that lie around them in country. When the pandemic began to be seen, we carried on normally, because we were at work in the field. UNICEF (United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund) is a real field based organization. But we found that we had a case of COVID in our New York headquarters. So we needed to close down the New York buildings and to send people home, and to make sure that everyone would be as safe as we could make them. We were the first UN agency to close our New York office, but it didn't mean that we were closing UNICEF. That communication was essential, in those early days. UNICEF was still at work and our people were at work everywhere around the world, whether they were at home, in an office, or in a field program. An office might be virtual, but it was hard at work.

It was the beginning of a realization, that as a leader and as a leadership team, we needed to communicate more to our people because we weren't in an office. You couldn't just go down the hall, or call an all staff meeting, or get your office together, and say here are the things we need to do because the following events have occurred. So communication became essential. We were very, very fortunate that we started an initiative earlier about making sure that our offices were connected, that people have connectivity, and they have enough bandwidth, which is often very hard when you're out in the field. The Sahel is one of those areas with the remote offices, that is very hard to get connectivity, and you have to download much of what is coming in. Your headquarter offices are in developed countries with quick downloads and lots of bandwidth. But we had done an initiative to make sure that we would be connected and that helped. We also turned to devices. Who

needed laptops, cell phones, or some other device, so that they could have connectivity at home or wherever they were going to be working? We were clear that this was a new way of operating and that we didn't know how long it would have to take place. But we needed to be generous in our outlook about work hours, workdays, devices that you were coming to work on, and how you connected and communicated. Some offices decided they would do gatherings once a week, some offices decided that they would do staff meetings every morning for 15 minutes or 20 minutes. Other offices were a little bit slower because they found that people didn't want to get off their telephones, and they didn't want to go on video. But, video connections were now everywhere and we got that capacity out to all of our offices. Then we asked our people to make sure that they turned on their videos when they were in a meeting. It sounds like a very small thing, but it means that you're connecting to a human being, rather than a black screen. It made people feel together. The most difficult were those who were young, and new, just coming on board to UNICEF. They had not been in any of our offices and they didn't know any of our people. They were coming into a virtual community and we needed to train them. That was our biggest challenge, our newly hybrid workplaces needed training and collaboration to be effective.

As the time continued, we just kept communicating, communicating, and communicating. Some of our people were based in other areas than their posting/working country. On my senior staff, I had Europeans, Africans, Asians, and North and South Americans. As a result, everybody would take some part of the world that they would travel in. If we had a meeting or something we had to attend, our Africa based leadership would go, our Europe based leadership would go, our Asia based leadership, or our Latin America based leadership would go. We made better use of the travel for the people who are already in the country, whether they were actually posted in the country, or whether it was a home base that they went home to during the pandemic. But this wasn't their home posting. There's a whole other set of issues about how you pay people because of post differential, but we tried to be as open and flexible as possible. If you had to be home because you had a sick parent or child, you headed to your home. And if that was France, or if that was Argentina, or if that was Rhonda, you headed home and you could work out of that place. When we called on you to go to South Africa, or Senegal, or Ghana, you would go from that point. It meant flexibility on behalf of our systems, and our processes, and our procedures. A generosity of spirit, so that we understood that people would be a parent first, a teacher second, and a UNICEF worker third and they would do their best. We found that productivity went up. And as I had mentioned, we found that we came out of the pandemic stronger. Not that it's over, but it's somewhat over. We're at the end of the beginning of the pandemic, but we came out stronger. That was because of the underlying processes and the intent of leadership to try to help our people.

Q: And people were able to keep on traveling, even early on before there were vaccines and other things. So they were prepared to get on a plane. Did you find that you had many cases of COVID among staff in those early days?

FORE: Yes, people got on planes and went where they were needed. In the places where we had humanitarian disasters occurring, people just went to the front lines. There weren't vaccines and there was nothing out there in the way of equipment. Everything had closed down during the pandemic. In the beginning, airspace closed and we couldn't get supplies into many places. Our people would have to cobble together whatever they could from a grocery store, or anywhere that they could find things, to take to help. Because when those humanitarian disasters happen, you need water, food, blankets, pharmaceuticals, and they tried to get them anywhere. It was very, very difficult, but people managed. There were some places where it just meant that you couldn't get any help from the outside. You had to make do with whatever you had in your town or your rural villages. But in other places, we were able to get planes in because we were UNICEF and because we were the United Nation. We had connections with health ministries, airports, and all of the places that needed the help. It was difficult, but it helps to be an organization that is in 192 countries in the world, so that you have staff everywhere. And they worked creatively in their home countries.

Q: It's an incredible story. It's really impressive what you were able to do. You were doing this from your home, as much as you could? Is that where you were during this whole exercise?

FORE: When we closed the building in New York and got word to the Secretary General that the UNICEF, New York office building needed to close, I headed home to my husband on Friday. I thought that I'd be right back on Monday, but I ended up in quarantine in California with my husband. Then he took a couple of falls. I was there for two years in California and the house, looking after him, but he's getting better now, so all is well.

Q: That's great. I think again, when you think of trying to keep the organization going and providing the kind of leadership you did, and doing that, it's just a remarkable story. I suppose there are elsewhere, remarkable stories. You must have lots and lots of stories, that you already implied, among your own people, who managed to provide the kind of support that people expect from UNICEF.

FORE: You're absolutely right on that, the people do expect UNICEF to always be open. And that's what we told our people. I work New York hours from California. I was regularly up at 3 AM to start my 4 AM calls. But that was true for all of us, all of us

worked 24 hours a day whenever we were needed. We tried to work in the time zones where our offices were, where our office work was supposed to be done. It was a 24 hour world and we just had to adapt. I think everybody did, in an amazing way. We did lose some of our UNICEF staff to COVID. I think it made all of us immensely sad at the loss of their lives but also determined that we were going to try to get protection out to all these frontline workers, health care workers, and our own staff who were working, because we knew that they needed protection. We had to get vaccines, protective equipment, masks, oxygen generators, bed mattresses for hospitals, bed pans. Everything you can imagine, we needed to get out there. You never wonder what you're going to do when you wake up in the morning. It was hard to be anything other than totally committed to trying to get help everywhere in the world. And I think that's what our people felt. I know it was what I felt and my family understood completely, the commitment. My husband just tried to be quiet and just stay in bed. I would come and get to him to help when I could. I think that happened with families all over the world, in the time of the pandemic.

Q: It was an advantage and you're being physically there, even if your mind and daily activities took you away. I think that that's terrific too. I assume that UNICEF is now back. You are no longer there, but UNICEF is back in its New York office. Is the New York office open?

FORE: Yes, it is. The United Nations offices are open but they're not fully open for all meetings. There will be some meetings, a UN Security Council meeting here or there that will be in person, some that will be in hybrid mode, and some that will be virtual. That's true for all of the UN meetings and conferences. Hopefully, this fall we will be able to have an in person UN General Assembly but, we have not had one for the past two years. I think everyone is adapting. I personally think that we will have hybrid work for the future. I think we will never go back to the old way of working. But I think people miss the office, I think people miss the creativity. Our 20 Somethings missed socializing, and they really missed it. The young families, people in their 30s and 40s, really appreciated the time at home, and I think they're going to miss not being at home. For many of our arrangements, we are trying to allow for flexibility, so that you will not come into the office more than two, three or four days a week for most people. We have new HEPA filters in all the offices so they are cleaner, but we need more space between people. In some of the office arrangements, they are set up like call centers or they're set up in open areas. People want to have some Plexiglass or glass between them and another person who's speaking. We've altered our workspaces, I think most people have, but if they haven't, it's time to do so because I think we're going to be in this for a while. And the other thing we have on our mind is are we ready for the next pandemic? What will it be?

How can we be sure that we are on top of it? So UNICEF and the United Nations are also planning for the future.

Q: UNICEF, most of all, has been dealing with these, the pandemic or diseases around the world. With all your vaccines and other things, you've been busy and thinking about this. You mentioned one other thing I'd like to ask about, which is the participants' arrival during this period of new staff, who've never met anybody. You said that you tried to integrate them somehow, but have you found that those young people stayed? Even though it wasn't the same circumstances, were you able to retain those people you had high hopes for?

FORE: Yes, which is good. We have. There is a type of person who usually does international development or humanitarian work. They tend to be really passionate about the field and they want to serve. That means that once they're in a great organization, like UNICEF, or USAID, or State Department, they will stay. So far so good, but we're going to need this crew everywhere. They are going to start going out and traveling. There haven't been as many international conferences as there used to be, and maybe some of that is good. We've also found that you can attend more conferences by zoom than you can in person. That will allow many of our new young recruits to attend conferences that we would not have the travel funds to send them. But now they can attend, so there are some benefits that we can pass on to this new group.

Q: You actually retired at the end of January? What was the date of your formal retirement?

FORE: January 31.

Q: It's very hard to imagine Henrietta Fore actually retiring completely. Presumably, you have boards and other things, but what lies ahead for you? Can you predict what you're likely to be doing over the next 10 years, in addition to enjoying being with your husband and your family? Do you have other aspirations and hopes for what you will be doing with your time?

FORE: You're right, I don't have the temperament to be sitting at home. I do feel that there's lots that needs to be done in our world. I'd like to do something to help the common good. I've been thinking about starting a private equity company led by women, that would help in some of the fields that are just in the midst of a big revolution. E-learning is certainly one of those. Distance Learning is in a big revolutionary period. I think it's going to change the world and I'd love to try to see what innovations I could help move in the world. Another area that's in a big revolution is the health sector.

E-Health digital health is coming and it's coming fast. Bio electronics, where we have implants in us, that communicates with the body but also communicates electronically, with objects in our rooms. I think it's growing so fast, and it can be for the common good. I would love to try to help in that. And Agtech the growing of food efficiently for people and counsels everywhere.

I also know that there's going to be lots of change in the financial sector and in investments. Innovations need to move, and they need to move in public and private spaces with public and private funding. We don't have a world like that yet, but finance is decentralizing. It is enjoying all sorts of new varieties of currency, digital currencies, and others. Investments are moving, I believe, strongly into how you can invest in a public and a private way. So I'd love to help that too. I will look for places where I can contribute, and where there are opportunities for our world. I'm not sure of everything. We're eight weeks into this now. I haven't got it all planned out, but I do have some offers on boards, both nonprofits and some for profits. I will say yes, as often as I can and I will try to just continue contributing. I think it's part of the beauty and the strength and the excitement of our world.

Q: I cannot tell you how wonderful it is to hear that you are not going to be sitting back and just, what is the old expression, clipping coupons. You are going to be as active, in a different way, as you ever have been. It has been wonderful to hear about this career. It will be wonderful in a few years to hear about the next stage of this career. I hope that you will allow me to come back and do another oral history in 10 years. While you are still a very young and energetic Bryn Mawr girl, and doing all these wonderful things, I will try to build still be able to walk and talk. Henrietta, thank you very much. This will be a fascinating account and your spirit and drive is to be very much admired by everyone. We'll look forward to reading your oral history. Any last words, before we cut off the recording?

FORE: I had one thought. Thank you very much for engendering a chance to think about life as a whole. Many of us just never spend that time. At least for me, as a person who is shy, I don't talk about myself.

Q: It doesn't show too well that you are shy.

FORE: I do believe that sometimes in life, you wonder why you're doing things and you wonder if some area of knowledge that you're acquiring will ever be useful for you. I used to think that when I was in school, and all during my life I thought that. But I have been amazed and astounded at how one is able in life to use many different pieces of experience and knowledge in a way that you just never expected that you could. I'll just

give an example of that. When I was doing my work in development, I would often come across programs for water. I thought that water was an extremely important area because we need it as human beings, the animals on the planet need it, the plants on the planet need it. How we have clean potable water and what we use it for is very important. When I was at UNICEF, it was very clear that water was the intersection of climate change and health. If you did not have clean water in a hospital, doctors could not wash their hands and if you did not, you could not get on top of any of the diseases. In climate change, we are getting floods where we do not want them and they cannot control them. We are getting droughts in an extraordinary number of countries. It is creating real havoc in food systems and in life in general. In private life, when I went home to California, it's on a ranch in California. On most of the ranches, we grow avocados and lemons. But we are all in the middle of a drought. It's a multi-year drought and it is serious. When I was in Yemen and Jordan, the Jordan River Valley is really low, in Yemen, it's very low. It brings cholera to the people. Water will be extremely important. I didn't know that when I was a young girl sailing out at sea. I was on a big ocean, and thinking about desalination, and about droughts and about what lay ahead for our world. But somehow in life, all of those experiences come together so that you can make good decisions. You can realize how important it is for people in communities all over the world and understand what they're going through. It's a tribute to life, that if you're curious, and you're willing to learn about many parts of life, you will put them to use in your career and in the jobs that you have the honor to serve in.

Q: That's a wonderful way to end this portion of your life story and a good lesson for us all. I wish you luck with trying to do something about the water system too. In addition to all the other things you've mentioned, water surely is very important. Henrietta, thank you, once again. I really appreciate your taking the time to do this. I look forward to seeing you again soon.

FORE: Very good. Thank you for looking after the USAID alumni. Without you, it would not be where it is today.

End of interview